



**CYNTHIA A. HARDING, M.P.H.**  
Interim Director

**JEFFREY D. GUNZENHAUSER, M.D., M.P.H.**  
Interim Health Officer

313 North Figueroa Street, Room 708  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
TEL (213) 240-8156 • FAX (213) 481-2739

[www.publichealth.lacounty.gov](http://www.publichealth.lacounty.gov)



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Hilda L. Solis**  
First District

**Mark Ridley-Thomas**  
Second District

**Sheila Kuehl**  
Third District

**Don Knabe**  
Fourth District

**Michael D. Antonovich**  
Fifth District

April 21, 2016

**ADDENDUM NUMBER 2  
TO  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
FOR  
CHAMPIONS FOR CHANGE – HEALTHY COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE 2016-003**

On March 14, 2016, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (DPH) released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Champions for Change – Healthy Communities Initiative.

This addendum consists of two (2) parts as outlined below:

- PART 1 - Modifications and Revisions to RFP Provisions, Attachments, and Required Forms
- PART 2 - Response to Proposer Questions

**PART 1 - MODIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS TO RFP PROVISIONS, ATTACHMENTS, AND REQUIRED FORMS**

As indicated in the RFP, Section 4.0, COUNTY'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, Sub-section 4.3, County's Right to Amend Request for Proposals, DPH has the right to amend the RFP by written addendum. This Addendum Number 2 amends the RFP as indicated below (new or revised language is highlighted for easy reference):

1. RFP, Section 1.0, INTRODUCTION, Sub-section 1.3.6, Partnerships, is hereby deleted and replaced in its entirety with the following:

**“1.3.6 Partnerships**

Strategic partnerships are a key to success in the implementation of the Champions Initiative in order to effectively coordinate interventions across multiple layers of the SEM. The Champions Initiative will identify and

engage with partners that will help ensure successful implementation of nutrition education and physical activity promotion, as well as selected PSE strategies.

It is the responsibility of each Proposer to determine whether partners are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected PSE strategies.

Partners may be identified and included in the proposal at the time of submission; they may also be added at a later date. Partners could include coalitions, non-profit organizations, school districts, HeadStart and/or state pre-schools, law enforcement, local businesses, transportation officials, media representatives, etc. For example, if a community based organization desires to work on behavioral economics strategies in a school setting, the community based organization could identify a school district partner that would provide access to teachers, students, and classrooms for the provision of nutrition education and physical activity promotion activities. The school district partner would also provide access to food services staff, cafeterias, and other designated eating areas in order to achieve objectives related to the Smarter Lunchroom Movement.

However, if the Proposer determines that no partnerships will be required in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected PSE strategies, the Proposer must justify its decision in its response and explain why the proposed initiative does not require support from outside organizations.

*Note: Subcontracting is not allowed under the Champions Initiative.*

2. RFP, Section 7.0, PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, Sub-section 7.8, PREPARATION OF THE PROPOSAL, shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced by the following:

**“7.8 Preparation of the Proposal**

Each proposal and subsequent copies must be submitted in the prescribed format outlined below. Any proposal that deviates from this format may be rejected without review at the County’s sole discretion.

Proposers are required to submit a full proposal by the deadline identified in RFP, Section 7.2, RFP Timetable, to the person and address identified in RFP, Section 7.12, Proposal Submission.

**Proposers may submit only one (1) proposal for funding in one (1) proposed SPA. Proposers will not be funded to work in multiple SPAs. Any and all multiple proposals from one agency or proposals to provide services in more than one (1) SPA will be deemed non-responsive and disqualified.**

**DPH may reject any proposal that fails to adhere to the required format.** All proposals submitted to DPH must be written in English. They are to be organized and assembled into one volume in the format and order described below.

1. Submit one (1) original proposal package, unbound, SINGLE-SIDED, including all required attachments and forms with original signatures. Do not staple or professionally bind the original proposal. Use a rubber band or binder clip to keep the pages of the original proposal together.
2. Submit six (6) DOUBLE-SIDED professionally/unprofessionally bound copies of the original proposal package (including copies of all required forms and attachments).
3. All material must be typewritten, single spaced, with a 12-point font on 8½" by 11" paper, with the 8½" ends of the paper as the top and bottom of the page, and 1" margins. Header and footer margins shall be no less than 0.3".
4. Number each page sequentially including attachments, and provide a complete Table of Contents for the proposal and its attachments. Label each section clearly.
5. Footer must include Proposer's name and proposed SPA where the proposed initiative(s) will take place.
6. The entire narrative (Sections A, B, C, E, and F) must not exceed thirty-one (31) pages. Page limits exclude table of contents, budget, budget justification, sample monitoring forms associated with Quality Control Plan and required forms. Any responses beyond the allotted page limits will not be read or scored.
7. Other than the attachments specified in this RFP, no other exhibits or attachments should be submitted with the Proposal."

3. RFP Sub-section 7.9.5, Proposer's Qualifications (Section B), Sub-section B, Proposer's References (Section B-2), paragraph ii, is hereby deleted and replaced in its entirety with the following:

"Prospective Contractor List of Contracts, Appendix D, Required Forms, Exhibit 3: The listing must include all Public Entities contracts in Los Angeles County for the last **three (3)** years. Use additional sheets if necessary."

4. RFP Sub-section 7.9.6, Proposer's Approach to Provide Required Services (Section C), Section C-2, Proposed Program, Section B, Eligible Sites and Target Audience, Number 2, first paragraph, is hereby deleted and replaced in its entirety with the following;

"2. Utilizing one of the three methodologies identified below, list the eligible sites **and the single SPA** where the proposed initiatives will take place AND provide a justification for choosing these locations, explaining the demonstrated need for nutrition and physical activity efforts and supporting policy, systems, and environmental changes."

5. RFP Appendix D, Required Forms, Exhibit 1, Proposer's Organization Questionnaire/Affidavit, has been replaced in its entirety to reflect the revised Minimum Mandatory Requirements. The revised Appendix D, Exhibit 1 is **attached hereto, as Attachment I.**
6. RFP Appendix P, List of Qualifying Census Tracts, has been replaced in its entirety to clarify the identification of qualifying Census Tracts. The revised Appendix P is **attached hereto, as Attachment II.**
7. RFP Appendix S, Mandatory Intent to Apply Form, has been replaced in its entirety to add additional space for entering selected Locations (Qualifying Census Tracts, etc.). The revised Appendix S is **attached hereto, as Attachment III.**

## **PART 2 - RESPONSE TO PROPOSER QUESTIONS**

As stated in the RFP, Section 7.0, PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, subsection 7.4, Proposers' Questions, questions received by the March 25, 2016 deadline, grouped to reflect similar questions, and corresponding answers are being issued as part of this Addendum as follows:

### **GENERAL**

- Q1. Could you provide information on who previous winners of the grant have been and a sense of the types of projects you're looking for? Also, could this**

**be a shared award with a "sister" organization and if you have any thoughts about a potential good pair for us given our focus?**

A1. The Champions for Change – Healthy Communities Initiative is a new project for DPH. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.3.6, Partnerships, it is the responsibility of each Proposer to determine whether partners are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change (PSE)\_strategies. See Part I of this Addendum, Item 1.

**Q2. Was just wondering if breastfeeding fits into any of the projects you are focusing on and whether we would be an appropriate candidate to submit a proposal? I know there is some overlap in what we do in the worksite wellness program with lactation accommodations?**

A2. No, breastfeeding/lactation accommodation is not an available PSE strategy, pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4, Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation - Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategies and Targeted Layers of the Social Ecological Model (SEM). Also, pursuant to RFP Section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, the selected PSEs are aligned with selected nutrition education and physical activity promotion strategies, to create synergy across multiple layers of the SEM, in order to increase the likelihood of making the healthy choice an easy and preferred choice among low-income communities that are eligible for SNAP-Ed.

**SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION AND SECTION 2.0 – CONTRACT FOR CHAMPIONS FOR CHANGE – HEALTHY COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE**

**Q3. Does this require any other funding matches on our end?**

A3. No.

**Q4. How early can the project begin? In the RFP it states that the budget term will follow Board approval and then continue through Sept 30, 2017 with the option for two following years. In building our Budget Justification, should we write Aug 1, 2016-Sept 30, 2017 as the 12 month timeline? Our past budget narratives w/ DPH have followed the fiscal year terms of July 1 to June 30.**

A4. Pursuant to RFP Section 2.1.1, Anticipated Contract Term, the contract term shall be effective following approval by the Board of Supervisors and shall continue through September 30, 2017.

Please note DPH anticipates recommendation to the Board of Supervisors no later than October 1, 2016.

Per Appendix C, Budget and Budget Justification Instructions, Term 1 is October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017. Optional Term 2 is October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018, and optional Term 3 is October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019.

- Q5. Regarding the 20 grant opportunities, since we have 5 mini-districts from LAUSD, are we allowed to apply for 5 grants? How is the county appropriating for nutrition education at schools, if LACOE and LAUSD does NOT get any of the grants?**

**Section 8.7 appears to indicate that each contract will be limited to a single SPA, but it is not clear whether that is this case. Under our current NEOP contract we are providing services in six different SPAs. We need to know whether or not this new project will limit us to working within only one of those SPAs.**

**Do all selected service sites need to be in the same SPA?**

- a. If no, can a proposer split their service sites in more than one SPA? How will the contract then be determined?**
- b. If yes, if a proposer wants to provide services in more than one SPA, and has enough Service Sites, do they need to submit a proposal for each SPA?**

**Section 8, Sub-section 8.7, pg 59 - Our organization provides services that span across multiple SPA areas. Can you expand upon the selection criteria for organizations where this is the case? For instance, would you prefer that we declare a SPA area where the majority of work will be done or should we simply declare all SPA areas that we will service and expect that the county will choose a SPA assignment for review purposes?**

- A5. See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 2. Proposer's may submit only one (1) proposal for services to be provided in one (1) SPA only. Any and all multiple proposals from one agency or proposals to provide services in more than one (1) SPA will be deemed non-responsive and disqualified.**

- Q6. We have heard other orgs who received these funds in the past, say the \$300,000 annual amounts were more than they could spend. Is it possible to apply for less money?**

**Can a Proposer be awarded more than one contract for multiple SPA locations, and will each contract be for \$300,000?**

A6. The Champions for Change – Healthy Communities Initiative is a new project for DPH. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.5, FUNDING, Sub-section 1.5.1 Availability of Funds, the County is anticipating funding approximately 20 contracts in an estimated amount of \$300,000 (annually per contract).

**Q7. Based on my review of the RFP, it appears that the grant may be federally funded. If the grant is federally funded, we will need to know the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number so we can review prior to submitting our proposal.**

A7. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.5, FUNDING, Sub-section 1.5.1, Availability of Funds, funding for the Champions Initiative is made possible by the United States Department of Agriculture's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education program, and is administered through the California Department of Public Health to local health departments.

The CFDA number is 10.561.

**Q8. Under Sub-Section 1.5.1. (Availability of Funds), page 13, language states that, "Funding for Years 2 and 3 is contingent upon availability of USDA/CDPH funds." 1) By when does the County expect to know if Year 2 and 3 funding will be available? 2) What are the specific conditions (if any) that will make a grantee ineligible for Year 2 and 3 funding?**

A8.

1) County anticipates knowing about Year 2 and Year 3 funding by September 2017 and September 2018, respectively.

2) Pursuant to RFP Section 2.0, CONTRACT FOR CHAMPIONS FOR CHANGE – HEALTHY COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE, Sub-section 2.1.1 Anticipated Contract Term, the option for Contract renewal will be evaluated every year based on performance, continued availability of funds and approval by DPH and the Board of Supervisors

**Q9. Would an Executive Director with a Masters in Clinical Psychology (focusing on Community Psych and Wellness Programs) who's also certified as a Nutrition Educator in CA, and has over 10 years' experience developing and facilitating nutrition and food systems programs under federal and CA State contracts, qualify for the full time position?**

**Would a Master in Urban Planning (MURP) degree also fulfill this requirement?**

A9. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.1, Administrative Requirements, the Project Coordinator must be 100% Full Time Equivalent on this project.

Yes, a Masters in Urban Planning fulfills the Project Coordinator's requirement of possessing a Master's Degree in Public Health (**or equivalent**, e.g. Master's in Public Policy, Master's in Public Administration).

**Q10. Page 3, Section 1.3.1: "One (1) full-time Project Coordinator [one Full Time Equivalent (FTE), 100 percent funded by the contract]. The Project Coordinator must hold a Master's Degree in Public Health (or equivalent, e.g. Master in Public Policy, Master in Public Administration) with experience in implementing public health projects in underserved communities." Question: Is a B.S. or B.A. with years of experience in public health acceptable for the Project Coordinators position?**

A10. No. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.1, Administrative Requirements, the Project Coordinator must hold a Master's Degree in Public Health (or equivalent, e.g. Master's in Public Policy, Master's in Public Administration).

**Q11. Will it be acceptable to have staff work at 80 – 90 % time since that is considered full time at our agency and our agency will be providing in-kind support to support the program. (Objective 1.1)**

**(Section 1.3.1, A) In regard to the requirement for a 100% FTE Program Manager (with MPH), does this position need to be filled by one person or can we include 2 staff on the budget at 50% time each to fulfill this requirement? Appendix A-1 1.1.2: do we need to have only 1 full time health educator, or would it be possible to split this 100% time between two people, each dedicating 50% of their time to health education and the other 50% to other project activities? Having a staff member 100% time doing only health education work seems isolating and not strategic for completing all SOW activities.**

A11. Pursuant to Appendix C, Budget and Budget Justification Instructions, a 100% Full-Time Employee is defined as an employee of the agency who works 40 hours per week. The Program Manager and Health Educator positions must each be filled by one (1) person and cannot be split between two or more people.

**Q12. (1.3.1 Administrative Requirements) - What is the minimum and maximum funding we can request to pay the full time project coordinator, and the full time health educator?**

A12. There are no minimum or maximum amounts. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.9.7, Proposed Budget and Budget Justification for three (3) years, the budget justification **must** be feasible and cost-effective for the required quantity and quality of activities in Appendices A-1, A-2, and A-3, Sample Scopes of Work, including staffing patterns, salary amounts and budgeted amounts consistent with the

amount of work, type of activities to be performed and appropriate in terms of the scope of the project.

**Q13. Does the "health educator" require a degree of any sort?**

A13. No. Pursuant to RFP Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Activity 1.1.2, the Health Educator must have the following qualifications: 1) Experience providing culturally appropriate nutrition education and/or physical activity classes; 2) experience working in underserved communities; and 3) Bilingual in Spanish preferred.

**Q14. If we must truly hire someone specifically with an MPH or equivalent, can we apply for the grant without knowing who exactly that person may be?**

A14. Yes, you may submit a Bid (apply for the grant) without specifically knowing who the person with an MPH or equivalent will be. Pursuant to RFP Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Activity 1.1.1, the Project Coordinator must be hired within 30 days of Contract execution.

**Q15. Is this the only NEOP funding that is being offered to qualified agencies including school-based programs?**

A15. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.5.1, Availability of Funds, funding for the Champions for Change Initiative is made possible by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) program, and is administered through the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to local health departments. This is the only USDA SNAP-Ed funding under solicitation by DPH at this time.

**SECTION 3.0 – PROPOSER’S MINIMUM MANDATORY REQUIREMENT**

**Q16. If cities do not qualify for this RFP, can you please explain why they are being excluded from this particular RFP? It would seem that the minimum mandatory requirements unfairly disadvantage cities who are otherwise capable of meeting all SOW and contractual requirements.**

**Is non-profit status required for Application for Bid # 2016-003?**

A16. See Addendum Number 1, issued on April 11, 2016. Pursuant to Item 1.2., Proposer’s must qualify as one of the types of entities listed. Note: Cities that receive USDA SNAP-Ed funding directly from the state are ineligible to apply.

## **SECTION 5.0 - PROPOSER'S REQUIREMENTS AND CERTIFICATIONS**

**Q17. I understand that Proposers must be registered in Los Angeles County's WebVen. My agency is currently registered, but we have 12 different vendor numbers. Could you please advise if we should use one of these vendor numbers or if we should re-register and use a new vendor number?**

**When do we need to register on the LAC WebVen (RFP page 25)?**

A17. Pursuant to RFP Section, 5.3, Mandatory Requirement to Register on County's WebVen, "Prior to a contract award, all potential Contractors must register in the County's WebVen."

Please contact Vendor Relations at (323) 267-2725 for questions regarding your agency's registration(s) on the County's WebVen.

**Q18. 5.21.3 states that, prospective contractors certify either that they have determined that they do not now receive or raise charitable contributions regulated under the California Charitable Purposes Act, (including the Nonprofit Integrity Act) but will comply if they become subject to coverage of those laws during the term of a County contract. - This is confusing, can you please clarify regulations on fundraising?**

A18. Pursuant to RFP Section 5.21.1, Proposer's Charitable Contributions Compliance, Prospective Contractors should carefully read the Background and Resources: California Charities Regulations, Appendix N to determine if they receive or raise charitable contributions which subject them to the Charitable Purposes Act.

## **SECTION 7.0 – PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

**Q19. Will there be a bidder's conference regarding bid # 2016-003?**

A19. No, a bidder's conference will not be held.

**Q20. I used the link recommended in the RFP where an address can be entered to generate the Census Tract. Some tract numbers come out as decimals (ex. Tract 2091.03). Should the tract numbers generated from the link be converted to just ignoring the decimal when using the number to look up qualifications in Appendix P?**

A20. See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 6. RFP Appendix P, List of Qualifying Census Tracts, has been replaced in its entirety to clarify the identification of qualifying Census Tracts.

**Q21. I want to make sure we submit our Letter of Intent to apply for the Champions for Change-Healthy Communities Initiative Request for Proposals (RFP). How do I go about doing so?**

A21. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.7.4, Submission of the Mandatory Intent to Apply Form is to be submitted by e-mail transmission (PDF format only) to:

Jose C. Garcia  
Division of Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention  
Email address: [jsgarcia@ph.lacounty.gov](mailto:jsgarcia@ph.lacounty.gov)

**Q22. Please clarify the Mandatory and Optional categories on the “Intent to Apply” form (Appendix). Also, how much specificity are you looking for? The general category, or more specific?**

A22. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4, Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, “The Champions Initiative will include at least two (2) PSE strategies (DPH approved PSE strategy interventions are outlined in Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based PSE Strategies): one from the institutional layer and one from the environmental layer of the SEM, as indicated in Table 1.”

Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.7 Mandatory Intent to Apply, Proposers must identify the MANDATORY selected Institutional (i.e. Implement farm to-institution or Develop, expand, and/or implement healthy food/beverage policies...) and Environmental PSE (i.e. Conduct “market makeovers” or Build community edible gardens), and the anticipated location where the work will be conducted for each respective PSE.

Optional PSE’s may also be identified if Proposer so chooses.

**Q23. In section 7.8, number 2 found on page 36, the following is stated: "Submit six (6) DOUBLE-SIDED professionally bound copies of the original proposal package (including copies of all required forms and attachments)." What qualifies as "professionally bound"?**

A23. See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 2.2. Items need not be professionally bound. Professional binding includes, but is not limited to: comb, spiral coil, or twin loop wire binding.

**Q24. With reference to the statement, “Proposer must provide five (5) references where the same or similar scope of services was provided. References must be a contractual relationship, in which the Proposer received grants funding for services” (Proposal Submission Requirements, Page 39), a) would past grant agreements from funders, which specify the scope of work to be**

**completed, satisfy the “similar scope of services” criteria? b) Also, would a signed grant agreement meet the “contractual relationship” criteria? c) Can the “contractual relationships” referenced all come from the same source, but consist of grant agreements from different years (2013, 2014, 2015, etc.). d) Lastly, does “similar scope of services” consider the scale (number of sites) of previous contractual relationships?**

A24. See Addendum Number 1, issued on April 11, 2016. Pursuant to Item 3, RFP Sub-section 7.9.5 Proposer’s Qualifications, Sub-section B-i, Prospective Contractor References has been modified.

- a. Yes. Past grant agreements which specify the Scope of Work to be completed may satisfy “similar scope of services” criteria, if the services are the same or similar to those of this RFP.
- b. Yes. A signed grant agreement would meet the contractual relationship criteria.
- c. No. Proposer should provide five (5) different references.
- d. No. Similar scope of services does not consider scale (number of sites).

**Q25. (Section 7.9.5, B-2) In regard to the prospector contractor references, should the references be grantors (i.e. Foundations that funded our work)? Or should they be entities where we provided similar services for which we received funding?**

**In Section 7.9.5, Proposer’s Qualifications, under sub-section B.i. on page 39, it states that “Proposer must provide five (5) references.” Can a reference be obtained from DPH if the proposing organization is providing the same or similar scope of services to certain DPH departments under a contractual relationship?**

**We were previously awarded a grant under the Network for a Healthy CA/LFNEAC. May we use references from former managers or evaluators from that program?**

**We are unclear what types of references you are asking for here? Are these people who have funded us only with grants, and/or people who have hired us for services, the LAPD for instance, to run our programs for their populations? What specifically, would such contracts be? Again, if a non-profit or school has hired us, fee for service, does this count? Can you provide more examples of these "Public Entities"?**

A25. See Addendum Number 1, issued on April 11, 2016. Pursuant to Item 3, RFP Sub-section 7.9.5 Proposer’s Qualifications, Sub-section B-i, Prospective Contractor References has been modified. References must be a contractual relationship, in which the Proposer **was paid** for services.

As applicable, DPH staff may serve as references.

**Q26. On Page 39, Section 7.8, Part B, subpart ii, it states: “Prospective Contractor List of Contracts, Appendix D, Required Forms, Exhibit 3: The listing must include all Public Entities contracts in Los Angeles County for the last five (5) years.” However, in Appendix D, Required Forms, Exhibit 3, under “Proposer’s Name,” it states “List of all public entities for which the Proposer has provided service within the last three (3) years.” Can you please clarify?**

A26. See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 3.

### **Proposed Budget and Budget Justification**

**Q27. Can you provide us with more information about the billing process? In Appendix C of the RFP, Page 1, there is a link to a document that provides SNAP-ed program guidance. Page 63 of that document states “The calculation of SNAP-Ed’s share of the total cost is based on the number of the likely SNAP-Ed low-income target audience that will receive the nutrition education and obesity prevention activities relative to the total population to be reached. For example, if a SNAP-Ed project will reach 100 persons and 20 of these persons are from the SNAP-Ed target audience, then 20 percent of the total costs may be counted as SNAP-Ed costs.” Given this, would our calculation be based on the percentage of individuals deemed SNAP eligible in the RFP by census tract? Or would it be our responsibility to calculate how many individuals served by our efforts are SNAP eligible? If it would be our responsibility, what proof of eligibility would we be required to produce for each billing cycle?**

A27. Pursuant to Sub-section 7.9.6, Section C-2, B. Eligible Sites and Target Audience, Proposer will qualify sites through census tract numbers, percentage of SNAP-Ed eligible individuals, and total number of SNAP-Ed individuals in the census tract(s). For a site to be eligible, at least 50% of the population in the census tract must have a household income at or below 185% of the Federal Poverty Level. Selected contractors will receive training regarding DPH Invoice submission processes.

**Q28. Are we able to cover the cost of the rental of canopies, tables and chairs using grant funds if our agency plans and conducts one of the 10 community events in Obj. 4.2.2?**

**Under the project can we pay a stipend to parent volunteers (using the peer to peer model) for conducting nutrition education classes obj. 2.3)?**

**Can we cover the cost of transportation (uber or bus tokens) for community representatives who will be attending project-related Coalition (4.2.3) or task force meetings or trainings?**

**Can we cover the cost of transportation (uber or bus tokens) for parents (Peer Model) who will be traveling to provide classes (Obj. 2.3) outside their usual site?**

**Can refreshments be purchased for participants in the nutrition education classes (Obj. 2.3)?**

**General: Can funds be used to purchase material supplies that are needed for implementation of PSE strategies?**

A28. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.9.7, Proposed Budget and Budget Justification, Number 4, budgets must be feasible and cost-effective for the required quantity and quality of activities in Appendices A-1, A-2, and A-3, Sample Scopes of Work, including staffing patterns, salary amounts and budgeted amounts consistent with the amount of work, type of activities to be performed and appropriate in terms of the scope of the project.

Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.9.7, Proposed Budget and Budget Justification, Number 5, Proposers must follow the Programmatic Budget Recommendations and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education Guidance on allowable and unallowable costs.

Per Federal SNAP-Ed guidance, canopies, tables and chairs are allowable.

Per Federal SNAP-Ed guidance, stipends for parent volunteers are unallowable.

Per Federal SNAP-Ed guidance, money, vouchers, or passes provided to SNAP-Ed recipients to offset personal costs incurred so that they may attend nutrition education and obesity prevention classes, e.g., for childcare and transportation expenses are unallowable.

Refreshments such as snacks are not allowable for participants. However, the cost of food for recipe/taste testing purposes is allowable.

Purchase of material supplies will be allowed, subject to DPH requirements and final approval. Proposers should include these items in their proposed budgets.

**Q29. On Page 49, Section 7.9.8, Proposer's Quality Control Plan, it requests the proposer to "Present a comprehensive Quality Control Plan," along with six bulleted points that should be factored into the plan. The page requirements for this section give a ½-page maximum, yet the requirements for what is in**

**the plan takes up more than a ½-page themselves. Given the page constraints, shouldn't the proposer only have to include a summary of the proposed plan, and not the plan itself, in this section?**

- A29. Proposer must provide a comprehensive Quality Control Plan that must include the factors outlined in Section 7.9.8, Proposer's Quality Control Plan. Any responses beyond the allotted page limits will not be read or scored. Sample monitoring forms are excluded from page limitations.

### **POLICY, SYSTEMS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE STRATEGIES**

- Q30. The table in section 1.3.4 (page 6) asks for a variety of strategies to be implemented at "10-15 qualifying sites." Should this be interpreted to mean that we are limited to 15 service sites?**

**Section 1, Sub-section 1.3.4, Table 1, pg 6 - In Table 1, the menu of evidence-based PSE change strategies targeting the Institutional Level, it states that implementation strategies must be in 10-15 qualifying sites. Can you please clarify whether this deliverable of 10-15 sites is over 1 grant period or over the entire 3 year grant period?**

**Is there a Minimum of 10 sites and a Maximum of 15 sites?**

- A30. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, at minimum proposers must select and implement at least one (1) institutional-level PSE strategy at 10-15 qualifying sites. Additional sites may be proposed, however the total contract award will not exceed \$300,000 annually.

PSE Strategies must be implemented at 10-15 sites over the initial one (1) year term and can continue should the county exercise its sole option to extend the Contract term for up to two (2) additional one (1) year terms.

- Q31. Do you have to deliver nutrition education to youth?**

- A31. No, delivery of nutrition education to youth is not required. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.1., Purpose, proposers will utilize nutrition education; physical activity promotion, and advancement of policy, systems, and environmental change strategies to reach low-income individuals and families in SNAP-Ed eligible locations and cities or communities. SNAP eligible is defined in Section 1.4, Terms and Definitions, number 21, as "persons eligible for SNAP because their income does not exceed 185 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL)".

**Q32. Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategies and Targeted Layers of the SEM. This asks for 10-15 qualifying sites, what are these sites?**

A32. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.2, Eligible Site and Target Audience, using census tracts data, free and reduced priced meal program data, or means-tested low-income assistance program data, Proposers will determine site eligibility of proposed project to ensure that the project is delivered to SNAP-Ed eligible communities.

**Q33. On 7.9.6, Section C-2, Subpart D, Section 1, it requests to “Identify the PSE strategy(ies) selected from Table 1: Menu of Evidence-Based PSE Strategies: Institutional layer” (page 45) and Subpart D, Section 1, “Identify the PSE strategy(ies) selected from Table 1: Menu of Evidence-Based PSE Strategies: Environmental layer” (page 46): If a proposing organization has already started working on a qualifying PSE, but had not completed it yet, can that PSE be chosen to be continued and completed under the new contract?**

A33. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4, Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, Proposers must select and implement at least one institutional level strategy and at least one environmental level strategy. Proposers must fulfill all deliverables identified in Appendix A, Scope of Work.

Pursuant to Appendix A, Scope of Work, PSE plan must be approved by DPH.

**Q34. On pages 5 and 6 in section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategies and Targeted Layers of the SEM states, “Implement behavioral economic strategies that increase consumption of healthy food and beverages and decrease the consumption of unhealthy food and beverages by guiding healthier choices in the food environment at 10-15 qualifying sites. (SNAP-Ed allowable examples include: Smarter Lunchroom Movement; healthy marketing at corner stores, healthy vending machines).”**

a. **Can we implement a behavioral economics strategy that is not included in the list of examples referenced above? Specifically, can we work to create healthy checkout aisles at grocery stores as a way to increase consumption of healthy food and beverages and decrease the consumption of unhealthy food and beverages?**

A34. Yes. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation - Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategies and Targeted Layers of the SEM refer to the links in Institutional Strategy #2.

**Q35. Section 1, Sub-section 1.3.4 Table 1, pg 6,7 - CBPR methods dictate that the community is highly involved in eliciting ideas and methodology for change. Can you touch upon the amount of flexibility built into the proposers selection of areas from the SEM layers, particularly Environmental and Institutional, if the community identifies areas of change that are SNAP-Ed allowable but differ from what the organization originally proposed?**

A35. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, Proposers must select and implement at least one institutional level strategy and at least one environmental level strategy. Proposers must fulfill all deliverables identified in Appendix A, Scope of Work. Per Appendix A, Scope of Work, PSE plan must be approved by DPH.

**Q36. Section 1, Sub-section 1.4, #14, pg 11/ Section 1, Sub-section 1.3.4, Table 1, pg 6 - The RFP defines Market Match as a “Farm to Fork” program. Can you describe in what ways providing Market Match would qualify as an Institutional level strategy? For instance, if an organization is already providing Market Match at several sites, would those sites be considered as acceptable qualifying sites with the goals of increasing utilization and/or grant funding to support the match? Or rather, would the organization need to focus on implementation in places where Market Match is currently not provided?**

A36. Market Match does not qualify as an Institutional level strategy.

RFP Sub-section 1.5.2.4, provides the link below for SNAP-Ed Guidance:

<https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/Guidance/FinalFY2016SNAP-EDGuidance.pdf>

**Q37. Section 1, Sub-section 1.3.2-1.3.5, pg 4-9 - Currently, we provide SNAP-Ed programming to adults. We have found that many of our locations, particularly schools, would be interested in the provision of classes not only to parents but children as well. Would it be acceptable to include children in our delivery model for the Individual layer even if the Environmental and Institutional layer are utilizing the CBPR method with adults rather than utilization of the YPAR method with youth?**

A37. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, the selected PSEs must be aligned with selected nutrition education and physical activity promotion strategies, to create synergy across multiple layers of the SEM, in order to increase the likelihood of making the healthy choice an easy and preferred choice among low-income communities that are eligible for SNAP-Ed.

Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.9.6 Proposer's Approach to Provide Required Services, Section C-2 Proposed Program, Sub-section D.2.e. and E.2.e., proposers are required to describe how the selected PSEs are combined and coordinated across all SEM layers to create synergy and drive PSE adoption.

**Q38. Under Sub-Section 1.3.3. (Individual Layer of the SEM: Nutrition Education and Physical Activity Promotion), page 4, language states that, "Nutrition education and physical activity promotion represent core components of SNAP-Ed."**

**Agency X is considering various Nutrition/Physical Activity curricula, which include workshops comprised of a series of classes as well as a curriculum that is not attached to a series of classes. Is a series considered one class to meet activity numbers, or is each individual class in the series counted?**

A38. Each individual class is counted as one class. Pursuant to Appendix A, Scope of Work Deliverable 2.3, Activity 2.3.2., selected agencies are required to conduct a minimum of 150 nutrition education and physical activity classes at qualifying institutional sites per contract year.

**Q39. 1.3.4 Table 1, #1: Can you clarify what is meant by "implement strategies to facilitate?" Are trainings and relationship building considered implementation?**

A39. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based PSE Strategies #1, Farm to Fork or Farm to School, are examples of strategies selected proposers will implement to increase the SNAP-Ed eligible populations likelihood of making the healthy choice, an easy and preferred choice.

Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, the selected PSEs are aligned with selected nutrition education and physical activity promotion strategies, to create synergy across multiple layers of the SEM, in order to increase the likelihood of making the healthy choice an easy and preferred choice among low-income communities that are eligible for SNAP-Ed. Trainings and relationship building are among the activities that may support the implementation of a selected strategy.

**Q40. 1.3.4 Table 1, #2: are there any institutions other than corner stores or schools where behavioral economics strategies can be implemented? For example, would farmers markets or other food retail environments qualify?**

A40. Behavioral economics strategies proposed can be implemented at eligible sites/institutions, pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.2, Eligible Site and Target

Audience, “Selected agencies will be restricted to working in SNAP-Ed eligible locations and cities or communities with prevalence of obesity above the Los Angeles County (County) average of 23.0% for children and 23.9% for adults as listed in the report titled, Obesity and Related Mortality in Los Angeles County: A Cities and Communities Health Report, September 2011 (Appendix Q).”

**Q41. Who has to be brought into these policies/plans? Do they have to be supported by our Council District? Our city? Can they be institutional or supported by a neighborhood?**

A41. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.5, Stakeholder Engagement and Mobilization, Proposers must engage key stakeholders to identify priorities, resources, needs and solutions in the effort to foster change. Proposers will be tasked with forming (or leveraging) committees/taskforces (institutional layer PSE) and community coalitions (environmental layer PSE) to engage key stakeholders in order to successfully implement the selected strategies.

**Q42. On page 4, section 1.3.3 Individual Layer of the SEM: Nutrition Education and Physical Activity Promotion states that “Nutrition education and physical activity promotion must include a minimum of one or a combination of delivery models identified below. NOTE: To access approved materials/curricula, click on [link].”**

a. **Although this curriculum is not listed on the link provided, can we use the curriculum, Healthy Parenting Workshops? This curriculum was developed by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Division of Chronic Disease & Injury Prevention under the Early Childhood Obesity Prevention Initiative, Choose Health LA Kids Program. The content for this curriculum is based on the evidence-based curriculum developed by Wendelin Slusser, MD, MS, Health Sciences Clinical Professor of Pediatrics, UCLA Schools of Medicine and Public Health. This curriculum is unique in that it utilizes the Social Learning Theory, an evidence-based model for group learning, to incorporate not only nutrition and physical activity education, but also strategies to teach parents for establishing lifelong healthful habits during early childhood through parent skill-building activities.**

A42. No. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.3, Sub-section A, the list of approved materials/curricula can be accessed online at the following link:

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/NEOPB/Documents/NEOPBApprovedCurriculaListFFY16-2015-07-16.pdf>

**Q43. Can sites where PSE strategies are implemented receive funds as part of participating the project?**

A43. Proposers must follow the Programmatic Budget Recommendations and SNAP-Ed Guidance on allowable and unallowable costs (<https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/Guidance/FinalFY2016SNAP-EDGuidance.pdf>). Costs charged to SNAP-Ed must support activities described in approved plans and budgets by DPH. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 7.9.7 Proposed Budget and Budget Justification, budget cost must be feasible and cost-effective for the required quantity and quality of activities in Appendix A, Sample Scope of Work, including staffing patterns, salary amounts and budgeted amounts consistent with the amount of work, type of activities to be performed and appropriate in terms of the scope of the project.

**Q44. 1.3.4 Table 1: If more than one Institutional SEM layer is chosen, can we work at 10-15 qualifying sites TOTAL, or do we need to have 10-15 per layer? For instance, if we are doing both gardens and smarter lunchrooms (#4 and #2), can we do these activities at 10-15 sites combined, or do we need to do a total of 20-30?**

A44. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation, proposers must select at least one strategy from the institutional layer and one from the environmental layer, as indicated in Table 1.

If a proposer chooses to implement more than one institutional PSE strategy, the selected strategies can be implemented at the same 10-15 sites. However, the selected strategies must align to create synergy within and across multiple layers of the SEM, in order to increase the likelihood of making the healthy choice an easy and preferred choice among low-income communities that are eligible for SNAP-Ed.

#### **ELIGIBLE SERVICE SITES/SPAS**

**Q45. When selecting our Service Sites do we need to reference the SPA number/location?**

A45. Yes. Proposers must identify eligible sites within the SPA they are proposing to work in.

**Q46. Page 1, Section 1.1: “Selected agencies will be restricted to working in SNAP-Ed eligible locations and cities or communities with prevalence of obesity above the Los Angeles County (County) average of 23.0% for children and 23.9% for adults as listed in the report titled, Obesity and Related Mortality in Los Angeles County: A Cities and Communities Health Report, September 2011 (Appendix Q).”**

- a. Question: Our service area includes Lawndale, Hawthorne, Lennox, and Inglewood. In regards to obesity percentages, should we aggregate the data provided in Obesity and Related Mortality in Los Angeles?**

A46. No. Pursuant to RFP, Sub-section 1.3.2, Eligible Site and Target Audience, "Selected agencies will be restricted to working in SNAP-Ed eligible locations and cities or communities with prevalence of obesity above the Los Angeles County (County) average of 23.0% for children and 23.9% for adults . . ." The report is based on individual cities and should not be aggregated.

**Q47. On pages 3 and 4, section 1.3.2 Eligible Site and Target Audience states that "selected agencies will be restricted to working in SNAP-Ed eligible locations and cities or communities with prevalence of obesity above Los Angeles County (County) average of 23.0% for children and 23.9% for adults as listed in the report titled, Obesity and Related Mortality in Los Angeles County: A Cities and Communities Health Report, September 2011."**

- a. Can we use another source to determine obesity rate, such as the California Health Interview Survey? The intention behind this question is that the report mentioned above does not list all communities or account for all zip codes throughout Los Angeles County. For example, it does not provide information on the community/zip code in which our agency is located, Pico Union/90007. Pico Union is included in District 1, however, District 1 spans both SPA 4 and SPA 6 and as such this statistic does provide the required data. The California Health Interview Survey is one example of a source that provides obesity rates by zip code.**

A47. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.2 Eligible Sites and Target Audience, proposers must utilize Appendix Q to identify cities in which obesity rates are above the County average. Per RFP Sub-section 7.9.6 Proposer's Approach to Provide Required Services, Section C-2 Proposed Program, Sub-section B-1, other relevant data sources may be used to demonstrate the need for obesity prevention interventions.

## **PARTNERSHIPS**

**Q48. Can we partner with other organizations on the proposal to deliver programming to youth?**

A48. Yes. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.3.6, Partnerships, it is the responsibility of each Proposer to determine whether partners are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected PSE strategies. Partners may be identified and included in the proposal at the time of submission or added at a later date. Proposers that determine that no partnerships from outside organizations are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected PSE strategies must justify their decision in their response.

**Q49. Section 65 under Additional Provisions, pg 78 - We would be interested in expanding of model of service that we currently provide under different programing where we have a California Farmer come to present and provide locally sourced produce to schools. It appears that the Farmer could be hired as a subcontractor with approval. Is this correct and if so, under which line item would this expense need to go? If this is not correct, how would you propose to build this type position into the budget?**

A49. See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 1. Subcontracting is not allowed under the Champions Initiative.

**Q50. 1.3.6: Can you clarify what qualifies as a strategic partnership as opposed to a project site?**

A50. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.6 Partnerships, partnerships may be identified if Proposers determine that they are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected PSE strategies. Partnerships from outside organizations may or may not be necessary in order to provide access to an eligible site. For example, a school district may not need a strategic partnership to provide nutrition education and physical activity classes at their qualifying site, but may need a partnership outside of their institution to assist with an Environmental Layer PSE strategy within a qualifying jurisdiction (Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategies and Targeted Layers of the SEM). It is the responsibility of each Proposer to determine whether partners are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work and selected PSE strategies.

**Q51. 1.3.6: Do you expect that strategic partners will receive a portion of grant funds or can partners be unfunded, or receive incentives in the form of TA from the project, or other program improvements as the results of participating?**

A51. See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 1. Subcontracting is not allowed under the Champions Initiative.

Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.6 Partnerships, it is the responsibility of each Proposer to determine whether partners are needed in order to complete the Scope of Work including selected PSE strategies. Per Sub-section 7.9.7, Proposed Budget and Budget Justification, proposers must follow the Programmatic Budget Recommendations and SNAP Ed Guidance on allowable and unallowable costs (<https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/Guidance/FinalFY2016SNAP-EDGuidance.pdf>). Costs charged to SNAP-Ed must support activities described in approved plans and budgets by DPH.

**Q52. In Section D.2.D found on pages 45-46, the following is stated: "Describe any external partners that will be required in order to successfully implement each selected Institutional layer PSE strategy." Are any partner letters or supporting documents (i.e. MOUs, letters of intent, etc.) needed in addition to the description?**

A52. No. Pursuant to Appendix A, Sample Scope of Work, Activities 1.2.4, if applicable, selected agencies will be required to obtain commitment from leadership of qualifying sites in the form of MOUs/LOAs within 45 days of Contact execution.

### **APPENDIX A SAMPLE SCOPE OF WORK**

**Q53. What types of data will we need to collect, are there recommended instruments to measure and collect data.**

A53. Pursuant to Appendix A, Sample Scope of Work, Activities 2.4.1, 3.1.1, 4.1.1, proposers will work with DPH to select approved assessment tools appropriate to collect and measure data needed.

**Q54. Page 35, Section 7.7.3: "b) The MANDATORY selected Institutional and Environmental PSE and the anticipated location where the work will be conducted (Qualifying Census tract, etc.)"**

**Do we need to list the organization or all locations being served, and how they qualify on the Mandatory Intent to Apply (e.g. Lawndale Elementary School District vs. all 8 schools in the district)? If we have to list all locations being served our list may exceed the space provided: LESD – 8 schools, TRF Head Start – 15 schools, Lennox SD – 3 schools, The Castle, Richstone Family Center, Inglewood Library, Lennox Library, Lawndale Community Center...total sites 31.**

A54. All locations should be listed.

See Part 1 of this Addendum, Item 7. RFP Appendix S, Mandatory Intent to Apply Form, has been replaced in its entirety to add additional space for entering selected locations.

**Q55. If focus groups are selected as part of the formative research, how many focus groups would be required? (Objective 2.1.1)**

A55. Focus groups are one example of formative research that may satisfy Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Objective 2, Activity 2.1.1. DPH will work closely with selected agencies to determine appropriate assessment tools and strategies based on selected activities.

**Q56. If we provided class enrollment tickets for our eligible parents to attend physical activity classes at a community site, would the site need to be a “qualifying institutional site” if we are only counting the SNAP-Ed eligible parents who attend? (There may be other individuals in the class that we are not counting). (Obj. 2.3.2). What are the guidelines for a physical activity class?**

A56. Pursuant to Appendix A, Scope of Work, Activity 2.3.2, proposers must **conduct** a minimum of 150 nutrition education and physical activity classes at qualifying institutions. All programming for SNAP-Ed that encourages physical activity should focus on promotion of healthy eating behaviors to the SNAP-Ed eligible audience, utilizing approved materials/curricula (<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/NEOPB/Documents/NEOPB-ApprovedCurriculaListFFY16-2015-07-16.pdf>). See RFP Section 1.4 Terms and Definitions, number 6, Direct Education. A structured nutrition education experience, which can include associated physical activity classes, that lasts a minimum of 30 minutes is considered direct education. Per Appendix A, Scope of Work, the nutrition education and physical activity plan must be approved by DPH.

**Q57. Are we allowed to take one lesson out of an approved curriculum as a stand-alone class? (Obj. 2.3.2)**

A57. No. Pursuant to Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, selected agencies will develop a Nutrition Education and Physical Activity Plan, to be submitted and approved by DPH. In addition, per Activity 1.3.1, selected agencies are required to participate in trainings including nutrition education and physical activity promotion.

**Q58. Are the pre-and post-tests required only for selected classes for the 100 matched pairs? (Obj. 2.4.)**

A58. Pursuant to Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Deliverable 2.4, selected agencies will develop an Impact/Outcome evaluation plan. DPH staff will work closely with selected contractors to complete an IOE plan.

**Q59. What is the minimum number of participants for a “class”? (Obj. 2.3.2). Since we often have late arrivals to classes or meetings, if we (or trained peers) are able to provide the same curricula on an individual basis, would it be allowable, for example, for 3 – 5 individual lessons to count as a class?**

**On page 4 of Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Deliverable 2.3 Activity 2.3.2 states, “Conduct a minimum of 150 nutrition education and physical activity classes at qualifying institutional sites.” Does the 150 classes refer to 150 series of classes or 150 individual classes? For example, if we conduct 25 cycles of 6 classes each, does this meet the requirement of conducting 150 classes?**

A59. The suggested number of participants for a nutrition education and physical activity promotion class is 10-20 depending on the selected curriculum and planned activities.

Pursuant to Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Deliverable 2.1, selected agencies will conduct nutrition education and physical activity promotion assessments among the target population that will inform program delivery. Pursuant to Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work, Activity 2.3.2., selected agencies are required to conduct a minimum of 150 nutrition education and physical activity classes at qualifying institutional sites per contract year.

**Q60. Are we allowed to create our own survey tools as part of the Impact/Outcome Evaluation if we have the capacity to do so? (Objective 2.4.1a)**

A60. Pursuant to Appendix A, Sample Scope of Work, Activity 2.4.1, selected proposers will work with DPH to complete an IOE plan. Proposers will utilize Impact/Outcome Evaluation pre-developed survey tools that are standardized for all SNAP-Ed contractors in California, and that are appropriate for their identified target audience.

**Q61. In Objective 3.4.1 the Documentation/Tracking measures to be kept on file refer to an “Activities log and a summary of participation to be kept on file”. We also see reference to a “Tracker” (2.3.3) Please describe these logs/forms further.**

A61. The Activity Tracking Form identified in Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work activity 2.3.3 is an online tool provided for all SNAP-Ed contractors in California. Selected agencies will receive training on utilizing this online tool. The Activities Log identified in Scope of Work activity 3.4.1 will be provided for use by selected agencies to track event participation.

**Q62. Our agency does not actively use Facebook or Twitter. What types of social media does DPH suggest we use (obj. 4.3.1 and 4.3.2) and how can we document reaching a min. of 1,000 contacts?**

A62. Pursuant to Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work activity 1.3.1, selected agencies will be provided with media training. Per activity 4.3.2, selected agencies are required to create and maintain a social media presence, and a record of social media communication is to be kept on file.

**Q63. Is the RE-AIM tool as part of Obj. 5.1.1 required starting in year one or year 2?**

A63. Pursuant to Appendix A-1, Sample Scope of Work Activity 5.1.1, selected agencies are required to develop a PSE evaluation plan including RE-AIM indicators beginning in year 1.

**Q64. Will the Healthy Parenting Workshop curriculum currently used by DPH CHLAK projects be included on the approved list of curricula for the classes referred to in objective 2.3?**

A64. Pursuant to RFP Sub-section 1.3.3, Individual Layer of the SEM: Nutrition Education and Physical Activity Promotion Section A, the list of approved materials/curricula can be accessed online at the following link:

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/NEOPB/Documents/NEOPBApprovedCurriculaListFFY16-2015-07-16.pdf>

**Q65. Can the Env. PSE strategy focus (Obj. 4.1) be to promote healthier children's menus at local restaurants?**

A65. Please refer to RFP Sub-section 1.3.4 Institutional and Environmental Layers: Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategy Implementation - Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Strategies and Targeted Layers of the SEM. This could be an activity that supports an Institutional PSE strategy.

**Q66. Several types of outreach/recruitment/marketing contacts are described in Obj. 3.4.1, 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. Is it allowable for some of these different types of outreach, recruitment, and marketing to occur at the same community event?**

A66. No. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.3, Goals and Objectives, selected proposers will be required to complete required activities for each objective found in Appendices A-1, A-2, and A-3, Sample Scopes of Work (SOW).

**Q67. Appendix A-1 2.3.2: The SOW states that 150 nutrition edu/pa classes are required in one year. This seems like a really large number of classes, and would require teaching a class roughly 2 out of every 3 work days. Can you clarify what is considered a "class" and how you anticipate that agencies will be able to complete 150?**

A67. Pursuant to RFP Section 1.4 Terms and Definitions, number 6, Direct Education, is a structured nutrition education experience, provided as a one-time event or series of classes that lasts a minimum of 30 minutes. Examples include cooking demonstrations and taste testing, grocery store and farmer's market tours, and physical activities. Selected agencies can ensure completion of the 150 nutrition education and physical activity class requirement (SOW, Appendix A-1 2.3.2), by hiring additional/needed staff to support the implementation of program activities, including delivery of classes (SOW, Appendix A-1.1.3).

Addendum Number 2

April 21, 2016

Page 27 of 27

Pursuant to RFP, Section 4.0, COUNTY'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, Sub-section 4.3, County's Right to Amend Request for Proposals, Addendum Number 2 has been posted on the Department of Public Health Contracts and Grants website at: <http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/cg/index.htm> and on the County's website at: <http://camisvr.co.la.ca.us/lacobids/BidLookUp/BidLookUpFrm.asp>.

Thank you for your interest in contracting with the County of Los Angeles. Except for the revisions contained in Addendum Number 1 and 2, there are no other revisions to the RFP. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain in full force and effect.

REQUIRED FORMS - EXHIBIT 1  
PROPOSER'S ORGANIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE/AFFIDAVIT

Proposer's/Agency Name:
-------------------------

Please complete, date and sign this form and place it as the first page of your proposal. The person signing the form must be authorized to sign on behalf of the Proposer and to bind the applicant in a Contract.

1. If your firm is a corporation or limited liability company (LLC), state its legal name (as found in your Articles of Incorporation) and State of incorporation:

_____	_____	_____
Name	State	Year Inc.

2. If your firm is a limited partnership or a sole proprietorship, state the name of the proprietor or managing partner:

\_\_\_\_\_

3. If your firm is doing business under one or more DBA's, please list all DBA's and the County(s) of registration:

Name	County of Registration	Year became DBA
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

4. Is your firm wholly or majority owned by, or a subsidiary of, another firm? \_\_\_\_ If yes,

Name of parent firm: \_\_\_\_\_

State of incorporation or registration of parent firm: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Please list any other names your firm has done business as within the last five (5) years.

Name	Year of Name Change
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. Indicate if your firm is involved in any pending acquisition/merger, including the associated company name. If not applicable, so indicate below.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH  
CHAMPIONS FOR CHANGE- HEALTHY COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE RFP 2016-003**

Proposer acknowledges and certifies that it meets and will comply with all of the Minimum Mandatory Requirements listed in Paragraph 3.0 - Minimum Mandatory Requirements, of this Request for Proposal, as listed below.

1. Proposer must:

Yes  No Complete and submit the Mandatory Intent to Apply Form (Appendix S) by the deadline described in Section 7.2 – RFP Timetable.

2. Proposer must be one of the following:

- Yes  No **City\***; or
- Yes  No California, non-profit organization with 501(c)(3) status that has been in business for a minimum of two years; or
- Yes  No Non-profit without 501(c)(3) status that has been in business for a minimum of two years and applying through a credible fiscal sponsor; or
- Yes  No HeadStart and/or state preschools(s); or
- Yes  No School District; or
- Yes  No Faith-based organization

3. Proposers must have:

Yes  No **A service site within the geographical boundaries of the Service Planning Area (SPA) where the initiative will take place.**

4. Proposers must have a minimum of two (2) years of experience within the last (10) years working on:

- Yes  No Nutrition education; or
- Yes  No Physical activity promotion; or
- Yes  No Policy, systems, and environmental changes to improve public health.

5.  Yes  No Complete and submit a Certification of Non-Acceptance of Tobacco Funds (Appendix R) certifying to the best of their ability that it does not accept funds from nor have an affiliation or contractual relationship with a tobacco company, any of its subsidiaries or parent company for the direct sale and/or marketing of tobacco products.

6.  Yes  No Proposers can only submit one (1) proposal for services to be provided in one (1) SPA only. Any and all multiple proposals from one agency or proposals to provide services in more than one (1) SPA will be deemed non-responsive and disqualified.

**\* Note: Cities who receive USDA SNAP-Ed Funding directly from the state are ineligible to apply**

Proposer further acknowledges that if any false, misleading, incomplete, or deceptively unresponsive statements in connection with this proposal are made, the proposal may be rejected. The evaluation and determination in this area shall be at the Director’s sole judgment and his/her judgment shall be final.

**On behalf of Proposer and as the Proposer’s authorized representative, certify that the information contained in this Proposer’s Organization Questionnaire/Affidavit is true and correct to the best of my information and belief.**

Name:		Title:	
Email:		Fax #:	Phone #:
Mailing Address:		City, State, Zip Code:	
County WebVen Number:			
Internal Revenue Service Employee Identification Number		California Business License Number	
Signature (blue ink):			Date of Signature:

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

SAMPLE:

1. Visit <http://egis1.lacounty.gov/districtlocator/> and enter the addresses of proposed sites to determine the census tract number(s).
2. Sample Address: 3530 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles CA 90010
3. Website provides the following Census Tract: **2124.10**
4. Note that the 06037 in the "Census Tract" Column identifies the County of Los Angeles.
5. Search for **2124.10** in the "Census Tract" column under the **BOLD NUMBERS** *ignoring the decimal point*.

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>101210</b>	53.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104105</b>	58.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104108</b>	57.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104203</b>	65.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104310</b>	51.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104320</b>	55.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104403</b>	54.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104404</b>	58.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104610</b>	50.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104701</b>	82.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104703</b>	66.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104821</b>	74.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>104822</b>	61.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>106114</b>	51.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>106407</b>	61.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>106408</b>	62.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>106648</b>	56.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>113421</b>	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>115302</b>	56.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>115403</b>	52.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>115404</b>	57.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117201</b>	60.8%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117405</b>	79.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117407</b>	76.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117408</b>	72.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117510</b>	64.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117520</b>	69.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>117530</b>	63.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>119320</b>	54.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>119340</b>	77.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>119341</b>	56.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>119342</b>	60.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120010</b>	53.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120020</b>	73.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120030</b>	82.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120103</b>	80.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120104</b>	64.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120105</b>	64.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120106</b>	64.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120107</b>	78.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120108</b>	66.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>120400</b>	51.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>121101</b>	50.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>121222</b>	57.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>121801</b>	55.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>122120</b>	52.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>122122</b>	63.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>122410</b>	71.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>122420</b>	56.2%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123010</b>	57.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123203</b>	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123204</b>	52.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123205</b>	53.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123206</b>	56.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123304</b>	56.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123410</b>	55.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123420</b>	56.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>123520</b>	57.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>124103</b>	64.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>124104</b>	57.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>124105</b>	57.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>124203</b>	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>124204</b>	61.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127102</b>	50.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127103</b>	60.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127220</b>	64.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127400</b>	56.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127520</b>	66.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127603</b>	50.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127604</b>	56.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127605</b>	56.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127712</b>	60.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127803</b>	54.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127805</b>	59.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127806</b>	53.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>127910</b>	60.4%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>128102</b>	56.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>128210</b>	70.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>128302</b>	73.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>128303</b>	79.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>128601</b>	52.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>131010</b>	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>132300</b>	52.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>132700</b>	61.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>134001</b>	54.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>134305</b>	66.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>134520</b>	56.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>134521</b>	58.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>134522</b>	60.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>134710</b>	56.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>183520</b>	53.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>183610</b>	62.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>183620</b>	52.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>183810</b>	59.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>183820</b>	66.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>185203</b>	51.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>185310</b>	56.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>185320</b>	53.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>186301</b>	60.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>186401</b>	55.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>186404</b>	53.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>187200</b>	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190201</b>	65.1%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190202</b>	51.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190301</b>	51.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190402</b>	61.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190510</b>	57.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190520</b>	64.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190700</b>	55.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190801</b>	62.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190901</b>	64.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>190902</b>	60.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191000</b>	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191110</b>	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191120</b>	57.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191201</b>	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191203</b>	52.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191204</b>	54.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191301</b>	53.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191302</b>	50.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191410</b>	62.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191420</b>	60.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191500</b>	59.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191610</b>	51.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191620</b>	62.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191710</b>	57.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191720</b>	61.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>191810</b>	63.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>192510</b>	53.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>192520</b>	66.1%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>192610</b>	68.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>192620</b>	59.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>192700</b>	60.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>195710</b>	61.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>195802</b>	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>195901</b>	50.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>197700</b>	62.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199000</b>	65.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199120</b>	65.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199201</b>	56.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199202</b>	55.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199400</b>	60.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199700</b>	64.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199800</b>	56.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>199900</b>	66.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>201120</b>	53.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>201200</b>	60.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>201301</b>	61.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>201503</b>	58.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>201504</b>	51.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203100</b>	74.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203200</b>	61.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203500</b>	54.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203600</b>	63.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203710</b>	62.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203720</b>	79.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>203800</b>	64.0%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 203900	61.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204110	64.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204120	54.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204200	63.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204300	72.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204410	76.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204420	73.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204600	69.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204700	55.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204810	63.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204910	69.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 204920	52.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 205110	80.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 205120	70.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 206010	68.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 206032	69.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 206050	66.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 206200	73.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 206300	93.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 207101	71.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 207102	79.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 207103	73.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 207301	51.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 207400	96.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 207502	50.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 208000	63.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 208301	62.6%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208302</b>	60.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208401</b>	78.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208402</b>	54.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208502</b>	73.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208610</b>	51.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208620</b>	55.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208720</b>	79.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208801</b>	75.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208802</b>	62.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208902</b>	82.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208903</b>	77.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>208904</b>	91.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209102</b>	79.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209103</b>	90.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209104</b>	83.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209200</b>	63.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209300</b>	65.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209401</b>	80.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209402</b>	78.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209403</b>	88.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209510</b>	65.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209520</b>	76.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209810</b>	74.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>209820</b>	76.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>210010</b>	69.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>211122</b>	56.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>211201</b>	67.6%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 211202	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 211310	72.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 211320	54.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 211703	58.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 211803	54.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 211910	64.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 211922	59.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212102	66.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212202	73.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212203	75.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212204	78.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212303	62.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212304	64.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212305	74.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212306	61.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212410	52.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212420	68.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212501	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212620	53.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212800	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 212900	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 213100	52.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 213201	70.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 213202	66.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 213310	67.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 213320	67.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 213401	71.1%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>213402</b>	59.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218120</b>	55.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218210</b>	66.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218220</b>	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218300</b>	50.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218400</b>	52.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218800</b>	51.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>218900</b>	66.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>219020</b>	59.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>219300</b>	70.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>219800</b>	55.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>219901</b>	71.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>219902</b>	50.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>220000</b>	57.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221110</b>	75.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221120</b>	63.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221210</b>	59.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221220</b>	57.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221302</b>	80.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221303</b>	73.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221304</b>	68.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221401</b>	61.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221402</b>	52.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221500</b>	62.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221601</b>	54.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221602</b>	70.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221710</b>	56.2%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221810</b>	81.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221820</b>	78.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>221900</b>	77.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>222002</b>	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>222200</b>	64.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>222500</b>	68.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>222600</b>	67.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>222700</b>	88.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224010</b>	84.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224020</b>	61.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224200</b>	66.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224310</b>	83.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224320</b>	75.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224410</b>	66.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224420</b>	72.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224600</b>	70.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>224700</b>	88.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>226001</b>	74.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>226002</b>	64.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>226410</b>	67.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>226420</b>	77.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>226700</b>	75.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>227010</b>	85.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>227020</b>	69.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228100</b>	77.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228210</b>	69.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228220</b>	75.4%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228310</b>	74.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228320</b>	74.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228410</b>	72.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228420</b>	70.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228500</b>	72.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228600</b>	81.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228710</b>	68.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228720</b>	68.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228800</b>	73.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>228900</b>	81.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>229100</b>	64.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>229200</b>	66.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>229300</b>	87.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>229410</b>	82.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>229420</b>	66.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231100</b>	79.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231210</b>	67.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231220</b>	67.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231300</b>	69.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231400</b>	63.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231600</b>	70.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231710</b>	84.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231720</b>	69.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231800</b>	74.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>231900</b>	73.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232110</b>	67.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232120</b>	72.3%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232200</b>	65.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232300</b>	59.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232400</b>	65.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232500</b>	55.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232600</b>	65.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232700</b>	69.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>232800</b>	69.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>234300</b>	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>234600</b>	52.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>234901</b>	82.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>234902</b>	55.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>235202</b>	62.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>236202</b>	69.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>236203</b>	63.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>236204</b>	67.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237101</b>	70.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237102</b>	63.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237201</b>	64.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237401</b>	52.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237402</b>	56.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237500</b>	63.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237600</b>	63.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237710</b>	57.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237720</b>	76.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>237800</b>	51.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>238200</b>	56.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>238310</b>	78.5%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>238320</b>	68.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239201</b>	77.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239202</b>	72.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239310</b>	63.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239320</b>	64.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239330</b>	67.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239501</b>	67.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239502</b>	60.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239601</b>	78.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239602</b>	74.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239701</b>	77.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239702</b>	65.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239801</b>	80.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>239802</b>	78.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240010</b>	67.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240020</b>	56.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240200</b>	69.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240300</b>	62.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240401</b>	61.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240402</b>	67.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240500</b>	75.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240600</b>	65.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240700</b>	60.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240800</b>	67.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>240900</b>	70.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241001</b>	64.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241002</b>	60.5%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241110</b>	65.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241120</b>	75.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241201</b>	52.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241202</b>	61.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241300</b>	55.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>241400</b>	62.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>242000</b>	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>242100</b>	86.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>242200</b>	68.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>242300</b>	59.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>242600</b>	80.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>242700</b>	76.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>243000</b>	68.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>243100</b>	65.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>265303</b>	85.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>265304</b>	87.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>265305</b>	68.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>269601</b>	57.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>275102</b>	53.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>275500</b>	59.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>291120</b>	61.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>291210</b>	53.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>293202</b>	64.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294302</b>	56.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294421</b>	51.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294510</b>	55.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294610</b>	57.0%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294701</b>	63.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294810</b>	76.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294820</b>	74.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294830</b>	66.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>294900</b>	67.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>296210</b>	61.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>296220</b>	71.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>296500</b>	53.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>296600</b>	61.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>297110</b>	59.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>301502</b>	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302103</b>	52.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302201</b>	55.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302202</b>	51.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302302</b>	50.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302401</b>	53.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302503</b>	51.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302504</b>	51.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>302505</b>	62.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>320201</b>	57.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>320300</b>	56.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>400604</b>	50.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>402303</b>	65.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>402304</b>	73.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>402406</b>	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>402501</b>	62.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>402502</b>	56.7%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 402600	50.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 402702	70.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 402801	74.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 402803	61.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 402804	68.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 402902	50.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 402903	55.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 403200	69.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 404201	69.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 404301	52.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 404702	55.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 404703	55.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 405101	51.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 405102	53.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 407701	56.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 408138	56.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 408139	68.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 408211	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 408724	56.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 408800	70.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 432201	58.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 432401	58.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 432402	58.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 432700	51.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 432801	52.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 432802	55.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433102	60.3%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 433200	54.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433302	68.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433304	55.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433305	66.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433306	71.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433402	70.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433403	63.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433501	69.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433503	70.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433504	60.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433602	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433801	68.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433901	66.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 433902	52.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 434001	60.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 434003	55.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 434004	54.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 461502	53.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 461600	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 462001	53.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 462002	60.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 462201	54.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 481711	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 481712	51.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 481714	53.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 482303	51.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 482304	55.2%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>482502</b>	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>482503</b>	52.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>500500</b>	52.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>501400</b>	54.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>501803</b>	60.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>501804</b>	55.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>502302</b>	63.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>502902</b>	58.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>503000</b>	54.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>530500</b>	58.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>530601</b>	50.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>530602</b>	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>530700</b>	52.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>530801</b>	58.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>530902</b>	76.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531101</b>	64.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531102</b>	53.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531201</b>	67.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531202</b>	58.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531301</b>	66.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531302</b>	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531502</b>	59.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531503</b>	61.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531504</b>	68.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531602</b>	62.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531603</b>	50.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>531604</b>	73.5%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 531701	56.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 531702	56.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 531800	53.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 531901	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532001	51.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532002	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532101	55.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532200	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532302	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532304	53.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532400	62.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532500	52.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532603	69.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532604	54.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532605	71.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532606	73.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532700	61.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532800	75.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 532900	76.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533001	69.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533002	54.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533103	74.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533104	85.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533105	76.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533106	65.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533107	55.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533201	68.9%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 533203	55.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533300	57.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533401	55.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533402	54.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533403	58.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533501	62.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533503	55.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533601	65.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533602	59.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533603	62.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533701	60.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533702	61.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533703	61.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533803	58.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533804	55.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533805	56.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533806	58.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533901	64.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 533902	66.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534001	63.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534101	70.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534102	66.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534201	70.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534202	68.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534203	67.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534301	62.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 534302	62.3%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534403</b>	50.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534404</b>	60.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534405</b>	59.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534406</b>	66.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534501</b>	57.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534502</b>	58.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534803</b>	58.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534804</b>	62.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>534900</b>	59.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535001</b>	60.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535002</b>	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535101</b>	56.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535102</b>	57.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535200</b>	76.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535300</b>	61.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535400</b>	76.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535501</b>	65.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535503</b>	76.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535603</b>	53.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535604</b>	66.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535605</b>	50.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535606</b>	68.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535702</b>	59.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>535803</b>	65.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>540000</b>	52.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>540201</b>	67.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>540202</b>	68.9%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 540203	58.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540300	54.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540400	76.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540501	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540502	56.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540600	66.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540700	59.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 540901	52.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541001	51.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541300	50.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541400	70.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541500	62.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541603	70.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541604	74.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541605	62.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541606	66.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541700	50.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541801	60.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 541802	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542000	53.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542103	58.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542105	61.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542106	68.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542200	56.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542501	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542502	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542601	65.1%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 542602	56.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 542700	57.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 543201	56.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 543202	53.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 550000	54.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 551101	53.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 551102	51.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553502	51.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553504	52.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553602	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553701	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553702	55.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553801	50.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553802	61.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 553902	57.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 554101	66.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 554105	52.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 554204	62.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 554403	55.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 554404	58.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 555211	61.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 555212	61.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 570204	51.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 570303	58.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 570304	54.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 570403	51.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 570603	64.1%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 571600	85.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 572500	67.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 572800	89.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 572900	56.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 573002	68.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 573004	63.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 573201	53.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 573202	64.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 573300	70.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 574700	100.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575101	57.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575102	69.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575103	50.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575201	61.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575202	57.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575300	75.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575401	71.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575402	65.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575500	66.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575801	83.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575802	74.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575803	63.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575901	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 575902	57.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576200	53.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576301	58.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576302	57.9%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 576401	78.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576402	63.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576403	69.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576502	57.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576503	50.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576801	56.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576901	69.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576903	59.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 576904	50.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 600100	68.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 600201	57.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 600202	63.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 600303	52.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 600304	68.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 600602	69.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601001	56.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601100	64.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601202	53.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601211	66.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601212	56.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601303	52.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601501	68.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601502	59.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601700	59.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601801	65.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601802	57.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 601900	60.2%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602003</b>	60.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602104</b>	54.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602105</b>	51.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602504</b>	53.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602505</b>	62.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602507</b>	52.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602801</b>	71.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>602900</b>	51.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>603704</b>	53.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>604001</b>	54.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>700102</b>	50.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>701100</b>	90.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900102</b>	73.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900103</b>	54.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900104</b>	59.5%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900501</b>	55.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900505</b>	52.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900506</b>	50.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900602</b>	65.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900605</b>	50.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900606</b>	60.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900607</b>	61.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900609</b>	52.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900701</b>	59.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900703</b>	50.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900704</b>	55.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 <b>900804</b>	61.9%	YES

LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS  
American Community Survey 2010-2014

County	Census Tract	All Races Prop. < 185% FPL	Eligible All Races < 185% FPL
Los Angeles	06037 900806	73.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 901010	51.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910001	54.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910002	52.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910101	52.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910402	71.6%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910403	82.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910404	57.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910501	86.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910502	68.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910504	70.1%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910601	69.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910602	61.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910603	51.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910605	51.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910606	64.2%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910711	59.8%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910713	58.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 910714	56.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 920336	53.9%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 920337	52.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 980004	100.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 980008	60.7%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 980010	88.0%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 980014	68.3%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 980015	59.4%	YES
Los Angeles	06037 980023	100.0%	YES

**LIST OF QUALIFYING CENSUS TRACTS**  
**American Community Survey 2010-2014**

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH  
CHAMPIONS FOR CHANGE – HEALTHY COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE RFP 2016-003  
MANDATORY INTENT TO APPLY FORM

Proposer's/Agency Name:
-------------------------

Proposers **must** complete and submit Appendix S (Mandatory Intent to Apply Form) by the due date and time specified in Section 7.2 – RFP Timetable by e-mail transmission (PDF format only) to the County's representative identified below in order for the proposal to be eligible for review. The submission of the form is a Proposer Minimum Mandatory Requirement, as outlined in RFP Section 3.0 (Proposer's Minimum Mandatory Requirements).

Proposer shall be solely responsible for verifying his/her form was received with the County representative below. All verifications **must** be requested via e-mail transmission.

Jose C. Garcia  
E-mail: [jsgarcia@ph.lacounty.gov](mailto:jsgarcia@ph.lacounty.gov)

By submitting this form, the Proposer understands that each form is a non-binding commitment, but merely serves to provide DPH with the Proposer's interests in the RFP for planning and evaluation purposes.

**SECTION A: PROPOSAL INFORMATION** (The County of Los Angeles understands that the information provided in this section is tentative and that the Proposer may choose to revise upon submission of their proposal)

Indicate the PSE strategies selected for the Initiative. At least two (2) PSE strategies (DPH-approved PSE strategy interventions are outlined in RFP Table 1: Menu of Evidence-based PSE Strategies): <b>one from the institutional layer and one from the environmental layer of the SEM:</b>	MANDATORY Selected <b>Institutional</b> PSE:  _____	MANDATORY Selected <b>Environmental</b> PSE:  _____
	Location* (Qualifying Census Tract, etc.):  _____	Location* (Qualifying Census Tract, etc.):  _____
	OPTIONAL <b>Institutional</b> PSE(s): 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____	OPTIONAL <b>Environmental</b> PSE(s): 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

\* Enter additional Location\*(Qualifying Census Tract, etc.) on page 2.

**SECTION B: PROPOSER'S RFP CONTACT REPRESENTATIVE** (Identify the person who will be the County's point of contact in relation to all notifications related to this RFP.)

Name:	Title:
Email:	Phone #:

**SECTION C: PROPOSER'S AUTHORIZED PERSON AND SIGNATURE** (Identify the person authorized to sign on behalf of the Proposer and to bind the applicant in the Contract.)

Name:	Title:	
Email:	Fax #:	Phone #:
Mailing Address:	City, State, Zip Code:	
Signature (blue ink):	Date of Signature:	

