

Approved Minutes of the Thursday August 20, 2020 meeting

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)

Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)

The Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) held a Special public meeting on Thursday, August 20, 2020, beginning at 10:00 a.m.

Per Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006, there was no physical location required for this teleconferenced meeting. Public comments by teleconference are welcome.

Teleconference number: Conference call 888-204-5984, access code 2799329#

Materials: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/PGS/>

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Roll Call, and Announcements

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chair Diane Thorkildson. Connie Lucido took roll call and a quorum of the Grants Management Advisory Committee was confirmed.

Members Present

Ali Caliendo
Amy Kelley
Leslie Bittleston
Amber Bosket
Christopher Linton
Diane Thorkildson
Fernando Serrano
Tom McCoy
Fred Schultz
Stacy York

Members Absent

Shirley Trummell
Shayla Holmes
Susan Lucia-Terry

Department of Health and Human Services, Grants Management Unit staff present

Connie Lucido, Chief
Tisa Coons
Julieta Mendoza
Katherine Dolan
Cyndee Joncas
Jennifer Hughes

Others Present

Christopher Croft, NCAA
Shannon McPeters
Laura Urban
Kelsey McCann-Navarro
Cheyenne Pasquale
Lisa Genafci, Catholic Charities

There were no additional announcements.

II. Public comment #1

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited public comment. There were no comments.

III. Summary of Current Projects Funded

(Discussion and Information) Connie Lucido

Connie Lucido discussed the handout entitled “Current Funding and Future Priorities”. This document provides a brief overview of the purpose of the funding from the previous request for proposal and the subrecipients that are being funded. The categories match the presentations for today including Nutrition/Wellness, Children Protection Services, Independent Living Services, Respite Services, and Positive Behavioral Support Services.

Ms. Thorkildson invited questions or comments. There were no questions or comments.

IV. Presentation- Food Security and Wellness

(Discussion and Information (Laura Urban, Food Security and Wellness Manager, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Office of Food Security)

Laura Urban discussed the handout “Food Insecurity in Nevada”. Food insecurity has been a focus for the State of Nevada since the end of the great recession with the creation of Nevada’s Plan for Action, the creation of both the Office of Food Security and the Nevada Council on Food Security.

Ms. Urban compared the National and State household food insecurity trends on slide three. The most current data is 2018. Due to COVID-19 it is projected that Nevada will have a higher food insecurity rate this year compared to 2013. A recent Feeding America report ranked Nevada as number three for states with the highest projected food insecurity rate between 2018 and 2020. Nevada is also projected to be number three with the highest rate of child food insecurity in the Nation.

Ms. Urban discussed the Funds for a Healthy Nevada subaward grant recipients’ efforts to serve the communities during these difficult times. All have passed their food distribution and service goals and objectives during year one.

The Office of Food Security recommends that the Funds for a Health Nevada continue to support initiatives that support self-sufficiency and food security. The future focus should be on enhancing program evaluation and data collection systems to help identify disparities State-wide.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited comments or questions. There were none.

V. Presentation – Child and Family Services (DCFS) – Child Protection

(Discussion and Information) Kelsey McCann-Navarro, Social Services Chief, Division of Child and Family Services

Kelsey McCann-Navarro discussed the “Funding Priorities for SFY 22 & 23” handout. The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) oversees the Children’s Trust Fund (CTF) and Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant funds. The CTF/CBCAP funding priorities include both primary and secondary prevention activities.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited comments or questions. There were none.

VI. Presentation – Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) – independent Living and Respite

(Discussion and Information) Cheyenne Pasquale, Planning Chief, Aging and Disability Services Division, Fund for Healthy Nevada

Cheyenne Pasquale discussed the handout “Fund for Healthy Nevada – ADSD SFY 2021”. The funds are awarded on a competitive 2-year cycle and are grouped in three categories: respite; transportation; and other in-home services. The total subaward amount funded for this cycle was just over 5 million dollars.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited comments or questions.

Ms. Lucido asked if during the last RFP/NOFO process there were a large number of requests received which could not be funded?

Ms. Pasquale replied yes, there were 30 million dollars in requests but only had 10 million dollars available to grant out.

Ms. Lucido asked if any particular category of service was left unfunded or less funded or were the funds divided in a balanced manner?

Ms. Pasquale replied the funds were disbursed using established funding amounts for each of the seven funding categories. In every service category there were more requests than funds.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited comments or questions. There were none.

VII. Priority Determination

(Discussion and Possible Action) Diane Thorkildson

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked Ms. Lucido for suggestions in structuring the discussion.

Ms. Lucido suggested using the handout “Current Funding & Future Priorities” as the foundation for discussion and look at each of the funding projects separately. Because the funds are allocated in those programs, we need to fund those programs at that level, but the Committee can make recommendations such as particular delivery systems, purpose of funding, etc. Committee members have expertise in these topics and are invited to share information.

Nutrition/Wellness

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked if the Committee had additional thoughts in organizing the discussion.

Leslie Bittleston said the handout “Current Funding & Future Priorities” has some recommendations but some are missing. She asked if the recommended amount is left in the handout and the recommended amounts from the presentations are plugged in are there enough funds to fund everything?

Ms. Lucido pointed out the example of the Nutrition and Wellness dollars, currently the Fund for Healthy Nevada, we are asking the Governor to approve 2 million dollars for this project to be provided as sub-grant awards for the 21-23 fiscal year.

Ms. Bittleston asked if the 2 million dollars would be split up between the Children’s Trust Fund and Community Based Child Abuse Prevention?

Ms. Lucido replied that the 2 million dollars is strictly set aside for Nutrition and Wellness. Looking at page 2, the Children Protection Services funds were moved to the divisions who have the expertise. Child Protection Services funds was moved to DCFS. As stated on Kelsey McCann-Navarro’s presentation, the CTF funds are at \$950,000 and the CBCAP funds are at \$286,295. The purpose of funding information was taken from the last RFP. The question is whether or not to leave that the same and make that recommendation or to change it.

Amy Kelley asked if the focus of today’s presentations is how the framing is intended by the department and the outcomes they seek to meet? The work of the GMAC has been congruent with that. Are we to address the intentions of the staff as they have framed the outcomes?

Ms. Lucido directed attention back to the handout and used the 2 million dollars for Nutrition and Wellness as an example. The GMAC may decide whether or not to continue with the stated purpose of funding which includes addressing one of the five key principles of the DHHS Office of Food Security or may choose to change the direction of the funding.

Ms. Bittleston asked if feedback was desired regarding staff recommendations and past choices?

Ms. Lucido said yes, that is the purpose of today's meeting. The GMAC could decide to depart from Office of Food Security staff recommendations and recommend the funding go a different direction.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked if the Committee is comfortable moving forward category by category?

Ms. Bittleston thanked Ms. Lucido for the clarification and said going category by category was a satisfactory method.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson began with category Nutrition and Wellness and said the purpose is to either agree with the current purpose of funding and key principles or ask staff to do something different. As a member of the sub-committee she believes the work aligns with the Governor's Office and other operations dealing with food insecurity. Chair Ms. Thorkildson recalls from the last funding round some insecurity as a group regarding whether or not the money was spread equitably across the State. As an example, 70% of the State's population lives in the Clark County area but it was not clear if 70% of the funding was spent in the Clark County area. She asked if there are ways to address that question.

Ms. Lucido replied that the conversation or statement to ensure the percentage of dollars are in keeping with the population is definitely a recommendation that can be made by the GMAC and can be reflected in the NOFO.

Fernando Serrano agreed with that method.

Ms. Kelley commented the staff has put forward what are considered best practices and agreed that one issue is the equitable distribution across the State, including meeting the needs of the rural communities. Ms. Kelley said the staff had made the recommendations based on the needs in the field. Are the evaluations based on rigorous programs that are meeting needs and not just determining the most professional presentations as being the most worthy of funding. Are provisions made for organizational capacity?

Ms. Bittleston stated as there are not enough funds to meet all of the needs it is important to allocate the funds equitably. She supports putting fund distribution percentages based on population in the NOFO document.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson commented although including a percentage based on population in the NOFO is an interesting notion, it would need to be determined how to take into account operations who are based in one place but provide services in wide ranging areas.

Ms. Bittleston asked for a recommendation from GMU staff for respectfully wording the RFA to ensure needs of the State are addressed equitably.

Ms. Lucido thanked everyone for their feedback and agreed with equitable distribution. The GMAC can make a recommendation and with the input of staff and the approval of the Director it would be possible to ensure equitable distribution. Ms. Lucido asked if the Committee would like to define

specific percentages. The format of the new NOFO and those issues can be addressed in both the application, the review, and the subsequent recommendations.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson hesitates to be black and white where the percentages must be spent because those specifications come with possible consequences that may limit the GMAC's capacity to be flexible and forward thinking with the funding. She does support equitable distribution but does not recommend a flat rule approach.

Tom McCoy commented that population numbers alone do not necessarily determine levels of need. Other factors should be considered such as poverty levels, etc.

Ali Caliendo agrees and considers the equitable distribution as a piece of decision-making process which includes what exists outside these other funding streams and what might be happening in the communities. To put a hard number on it may not include the whole picture and may be limiting.

Ms. Kelley asked the GMAC what a good framework would be to give the GMAC support without being too rigid. Last round of funding included many compelling proposals that met needs. The GMAC was not sure what criteria was to be used. What she is hearing is not choosing a ridged hood such as a specific percentage and asked what other criteria could be explored to help with the decision-making process. Examples include percentages of population living in poverty. It is necessary to be able to articulate to the proposal writers, the grantees, and the community at large why each proposal was chosen.

Ms. Caliendo commented each of the three categories might have different drivers. Right now, it states evidence based or evidence informed programs and she would like the direction to move toward evidence-based programs.

Ms. Bittleston agrees with previous comments and commented on the previous struggle of deciding which of the great programs to fund with the limited funds available. As an example, poverty or unemployment levels could be looked at as a deciding factor. The criteria would help determine the areas of highest need.

Ms. Lucido asked if Ms. Urban could talk about food insecurity percentages for the State?

Laura Urban has requested Feeding America's projection data for 2020 by zip code. She will put that data into a user- friendly document and make it publicly available. That information could be included in the applications to ensure they are targeting those zip codes with the most need. The GMAC could also use the data when reviewing applications.

Ms. Lucido said the evaluation could also weight those providing services in the most food insecure areas as well.

Ms. Kelley suggested having caution about limiting grantees to evidence based because some grantees have small shops with limited capacity and may not be able to afford expensive evidence-based programs. Communities would be able to create culturally competent and respectful programs to meet the unique needs of the community.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson wants to keep the discussions focused on the categories and acknowledged the Committee members comments regarding evidence-based practices. Ms. Thorkildson asked if the applicants for the Nutrition and Wellness funding are directed to review and address the food insecurity data would that help the GMAC make equitable funding decisions?

Amber Bosket asked if the key principles would be reviewed and recommendations sought from the Committee today?

Chair Ms. Thorkildson replied yes, the Committee can discuss and make any recommendations they want.

Ms. Bittleston suggested adding language to the Nutrition and Wellness key principle number five toward nutritional analysis education. By adding language to the key principles, it helps identify what a strong proposal should include.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson restated the two suggestions; 1) get food insecurity data by zip code; and 2) expand key principle number five to include education in food nutrition. She asked if the Committee is comfortable asking the staff to put in the NOFO a question around community need especially using the data that Ms. Urban suggested.

Ms. Bittleston proposed a motion to accept the funding recommended (2 million dollars) by staff and have the NOFO include the food insecurity data by zip code.

Ms. Bosket asked if the 2 million dollars can be discussed in light of the information presented by Ms. Urban? Is it possible to increase the funding amount?

Ms. Lucido replied unfortunately as a result of COVID-19 and the special legislative sessions the DHHS was asked to submit flat budgets.

Ms. Bosket 2nd Ms. Bittleston's motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion.

Ms. Urban added there is other data that could be considered as well such as poverty and unemployment by county, meal gap and meal cost by county.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked if Ms. Bittleston would like to amend her motion.

Ms. Bittleston amended her motion to: accept the recommendation by staff for the funding category and require applicants to include a section regarding the data Ms. Urban recommended such as poverty by county, level of need by zip code to help formulate funding decisions.

Ms. Bosket 2nd the motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion. There was no further discussion or comments and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson directed the discussion to Key Principle number five.

Ms. Bosket suggested adding nutrition education to Key Principle number five. “Provide education to ensure that participants understand how to prepare fresh foods, including cooking methods and nutritional analysis for food distributed.”

Ms. Lucido commented that the principles were taken from the DHHS Office of Food Security and questioned the possibility of changing the principles. The education piece can be added to the NOFO with no issues.

Ms. Kelley asked if the request for criteria to be asked of applicant for every program?

Ms. Bosket commented the current language states applicants must address at least one of the five principles and it would be good to add the education piece to one of the key principles.

Ms. Lucido asked if it would cause any problems if the wording “Office of Food Security” was removed?

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked if the Office of Food Security principles would be adopted and modified to remove their title and edit to add the education information.

Ms. Lucido replied that the Five Key Principles were adopted from the Office of Food Security, proposals must address one of the five key principles, and then modify number five to include the education language. Ms. Lucido asked Ms. Urban if the Key Principle was stated correctly?

Ms. Urban replied it looks correct and that the principles were created about six years ago and should be fluid.

Ms. Lucido asked if the changes are made as changes would anyone be upset.

Ms. Urban replied no one would be upset especially since the Office of Food Security works with the Office of Nutrition which promotes nutrition education.

Ms. Bosket motioned “Provide education to ensure that participants understand how to prepare fresh foods, including cooking methods and nutritional analysis for food distributed.”

Ms. Bittleston 2nd the motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion. There was no further discussion or comments and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked if there were any other changes desired for the Nutrition and Wellness category? Hearing none the Committee moved to the second category, Children Protection Services, Parent Education and Training.

Ms. Kelley said we are looking at a similar framework, it would be good to look at stable criteria, she is on the subcommittee and has an enormous number of applications and great proposals, how or what is the next level of criteria is what we are looking at? As with the increase of food insecurity as a consequence of COVID, this might relate to the block funding conversation later on like holding some funds in reserve, which was contentious but was also helpful to be able to pull from another bucket at some point. What we are going to see, and certainly we don't have data but we have anecdotal data, and some trends now, we are going to see communities across the board with higher rates of allegations of abuse and neglect. We have to be careful when selecting the criteria that, we need some criteria, we could look at poverty rates, although that may not be as relevant as for food insecurity. We are looking at communities with allegations of abuse and neglect, we are looking at those hot spots, and we are correlating those with zip codes, if they do indeed exist, and we are looking to fund those communities. I would look to staff to say what data will we have that is similar to nutrition that we can use?

Ms. Lucido asked if Ms. McCann-Navarro could make recommendations for need indicators similar to the food insecurity percentages?

Ms. McCann-Navarro replied she should be able to provide a break-down of need information at a later date.

Mr. Serrano commented the need information will be really important and thanked Ms. McCann-Navarro in advance. During the last grant process there was approximately 1.5 million dollars in available funding to allocate and there was just over 7 million in funds. The Parent Education and Training is key in self-protection. Abuse rates per county would be an objective way to make determinations and looking at what services are available in rural counties who may not have the infrastructure that urban counties do.

Ms. Bittleston stated that maybe some of the data available from Ms. Urban can be used to narrow down the need areas. Poverty is one factor in abuse and neglect. Also, as an employee of DCFS, it seems possibly for future grant cycles information regarding child abuse and neglect prevalence by zip could be determined. The DCFS has a data team who could possibly pull information to help with decision making.

Ms. Caliendo suggested looking at other indicators of abuse and neglect such as overdose rates, substance abuse treatment sought out, mental health treatment, the percentage of children living with

neither parent. There are 33,000 children in Nevada living in non-parental care, potentially even more. Looking at those numbers and the distribution may give insight to areas of highest need. Ms. Caliendo asked Ms. McCann-Navarro how much she is hoping this grant cycle, either now or into the future, will help the State prepare to adopt the Families First Act? The Families First Act is supportive of prevention services but does require the evidence base. Is there any conversation at the State level as to how these things might work together?

Ms. McCann-Navarro there are ongoing conversations regarding the Families First Act. It has been a huge legislation chain and they are currently working with the Families Program Office, the Grant Management Unit, the Child Welfare agencies Statewide to try and formulate a prevention plan. The nice thing about the Children's Trust Fund and the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention funding is it is the first prevention that is provided to families prior to them being directed to Child Protective Services. This funding will have a huge impact on prevention efforts.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson reiterated there were a couple of suggestions about the need for data and asked if anyone was prepared to make a motion or if more discussion was needed.

Ms. Bittleston made a motion: "fund Children's Trust Fund and the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention at the levels recommended by staff, ensure the Advisory Committee has access to the Families First Prevention Plan when available as well as additional need indicator data."

Mr. Serrano 2nd the motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited comments or discussion.

Ms. Caliendo said in the first motion there was a mention of having access to the Families First Prevention Plan that the State would be submitted to the Children's Bureau and would like to include that if possible.

Ms. Bittleston made a revised motion: "fund Children's Trust Fund and the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention at staff recommended levels, to allow the Advisory Committee access to additional data to include the Families First Prevention Plan when available when reviewing applications."

Mr. Serrano 2nd the revised motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion. There was no further discussion or comments and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Lucido asked if Ms. Bittleston's motion applied to all three sub-categories: Parent Education and Training, Crisis Intervention Programs, and Child Self-Protection Training?

Ms. Bittleston replied yes.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked anything other was desired in the Parent Education and Training subcategory? There was none. Crisis Intervention Programs, and Child Self-Protection Training? There was nothing additional. The discussion moved to the Independent Living Services category.

Ms. Bittleston commented as the Chair of the Independent Living Services sub-committee the number of applications received has exceeded the available funding. She asked other members of the sub-committee if they have any ideas on how to make better determinations. Last cycle there was not enough funding to support all of the needs and the attempt was made to fund direct services.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked if there were specific areas where the group was getting stuck?

Ms. Bittleston replied they wanted to provide the most funding to the most grantees as possible and started to get into the minutia of looking at direct services vs. administrative costs. That view may not be the best as the sub-committee are not the experts on how organization runs their business. Possibly there is better data or maybe the information provided by Ms. Urban regarding the poverty levels will be helpful.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson asked Ms. Lucido if limits on indirect services is addressed in the NOFO?

Ms. Lucido replied yes, better instructions about direct and indirect costs has been included in the NOFO. It will be included in budget instructions. Data regarding the disabled population can be provided as part of the NOFO to help inform the need. Ms. Lucido asked if anyone knows of additional information which would be useful during the NOFO process to please let her know.

Cheyenne Pasquale said she would discuss the topic further and provide whatever is needed.

Ms. Lucido asked Ms. Pasquale if there was specific data requested from their sub-recipients during the last round of proposals.

Ms. Pasquale replied that within the grant application there is a section called the projected output measures with information such as number of clients, number of units of service, and some demographic information. There is also a targeting plan component. She will share their NOFO and application with the GMU.

Ms. Bittleston motioned: “Fund the Independent Living and Respite Services at recommended funding from staff and also include additional data like number of recipients and service amounts as Ms. Pasquale outlined to help better determine or score the applications.”

Tom McCoy 2nd the motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion and clarified Ms. Bittleston’s motion crossed categories to include Independent Living and Respite.

Ms. Bittleston said yes, her sub-committee does both, so she lumped the two together.

There was no further discussion or comments and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson moved the discussion to the Positive Behavioral Support category and put on the record that she would abstain from voting in this category as she works very closely with this program in her job at UNR.

Ms. Bittleston commented Positive Behavioral Supports are also within her sub-committee and as of now there is only one sub-grantee. She added from reading their application from last time it was very well done and included a lot of data so she motioned: "Fund Positive Behavioral Support at the recommended funding of the committee, no changes are needed."

Stacy York 2nd the motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion. There was no further discussion or comments and the motion passed with Chair Ms. Thorkildson abstaining.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson moved the discussion to the Social Service Block Grant (Title XX) and asked Ms. Lucido if this was an area where there is more flexibility.

Ms. Lucido replied that is correct and that each area of funding would have their own Notice of Funding Opportunity. The recommendation sought from the Committee is how to disburse the Social Service Block Grant and the Title XX money? There will be approximately 1.3 million dollars annually that can be dedicated to this particular process. The Title XX money has a requirement to address specific goals which are listed in the handout. In the past money has been taken from this funding and placed it in other categories because as you can see it very nicely fits into those other activities. The possibilities include taking the 1.3 million dollars and determining how to allocate it across the other programs or alternatively create a stand-alone program.

Ms. Kelley asked if the Block Grant funding was used during the last funding cycle to fund some of the projects left over after the initial distribution?

Ms. Lucido replied yes, that is what happened, and the Committee may choose that route again.

Ms. Kelley said during the last funding cycle she felt relieved the Block Grant funds were available to draw from for the projects left over at the end of the distribution from the other categories.

Ms. Lucido said it has been of assistance when trying to ensure equitable distribution, especially in the Child Protective category which includes Crisis Intervention Parent Education and Training services throughout the State. The current NOFO should remove some of the headaches that the Committee had previously felt.

Ms. Bittleston asked if the funds will be used for overflow for programs that can't be funded with the allotted funds do we need to go as far to say perhaps 1/3 will be allocated to food nutrition, 1/3 to abuse and neglect and 1/3 to independent living and respite. Or can it just be an overall motion that says the Block Grant money will be used for the overflow of applications that the Committee deems worthy but doesn't have the money in certain areas to fund?

Ms. Bosket said if a specification such as that was to be made it should be divided by percentage to match the percentages of funds each program is receiving.

Ms. Kelley said we don't have hard data right now to know, and maybe the need will be proportionate, if that makes sense, and again I'm reluctant not to have super clear criteria on this, but if we don't have data telling us where the deep need is going to be, for example, let's say we are able to fund 80% of the nutrition applications or proposals that come in and then 20% don't get funded, and yet we've allotted 1/3 of this extra pot of funds to that, and truly the 20% don't get funded because they are, number one, they don't meet the standards of the other applicants, or number two, they are superfluous. I know it's hard to say we've met all the needs, but we don't know what we don't know. I know it puts us in a precarious situation to say well, let's see, but we don't really know where we will feel urgency about programs that haven't been funded.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson commented there were competing notions on the table including concrete division of the money or letting it be a little looser due to not knowing where the need will fall out.

Ms. Bittleston suggested maybe making a recommendation to use the entire 1.3 million dollars as overflow and then make another motion and vote later with more information about needs. Ms. Bittleston asked Ms. Lucido for her thoughts.

Ms. Lucido agreed it is not necessarily known where that need it going to be. The straight allocation could potentially cause issues down the line. The proposed process is NOFOs will go out, the proposals are received, the technical review is performed, then to evaluators for their scoring and then back to the GMU and then the evaluators would meet for an in-person meeting to view the rankings and discuss if those are the recommendations to be made to the GMAC for their consideration. After that the GMU will look to see if there is equitable geographic distribution, if the rural areas are being represented appropriately and the GMU could highlight potential direction for Title XX money to make up for needs and then bring that to the GMAC for their consideration. Rather than trying to decide at this time where the needs might be. As we are at this point just under a year for the start of the programs it is difficult to know where the needs will be.

Ms. Bittleston said she motions: "Use the 1.3 million dollars Social Services Block Grant as overflow for the applications that come in and then after the application process is completed have the staff come back to the Committee with those areas that need to be funded for a future breakdown at that time".

Ms. Kelley 2nd the motion.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited discussion. There was no further discussion or comments and the motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Public Comment #2

Chair Ms. Thorkildson invited public comments or questions.

Jenny Yeager, Director of Programs and Community Engagement, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, commented they have been the beneficiaries of funding through the GMAC for the Food Prescriptions program for several cycles and it is much appreciated. She asked in addition to what was discussed as a committee, from the Wellness and Nutrition standpoint to consider a holistic approach where funded grants resources are going to children, families, and seniors. Looking at comprehensive plans vs. individual groups.

Daniele Staple, Executive Director, Rape Crisis Center of Las Vegas, commented they have also been fortunate to receive funding from the Child Self Protection training area. There is little funding available in the State for prevention work. While the funds under the GMU's direction are specifically targeted for child abuse prevention there are other pots of money that are specifically targeted for children that have already suffered some sort of abuse. There are far fewer funds for true prevention work. Ms. Staple suggested considering a cap on the application amount within that category as during the last cycle there were a lot of applications who did not receive any funding and a few very large applications that were funded at a very high amount.

Marcia Blake, Executive Director, Helping Hands of Vegas Valley, thanked the Committee for the collaboration with Money Management and they look forward to the opportunity to apply for the next cycle.

IX. Additional Announcements and Adjournment

(Discussion and Information) Diane Thorkildson

Ms. Lucido reminded the members of the next GMAC meeting, which is scheduled for Thursday, October 22, 2020, at 10:00 a.m. and the draft NOFOs will be available for review.

Chair Ms. Thorkildson adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.m.