

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FOR THE TRUST FUND FOR PUBLIC HEALTH**

**Draft Minutes
April 20, 2007
Via Videoconference**

Washoe County District Health Department
Conference Room
1001 E. Ninth Street
Reno, NV

Southern Nevada Health District
Clemens Room
625 Shadow Lane
Las Vegas, NV

TRUSTEES PRESENT:

Robin Titus, MD
Mary Anderson, MD, MPH
Alex Haartz, MPH
Bradford Lee, MD
David Lupan, PhD
Carol Sala
Sally Jost for Walt Rulffes, PhD
Lawrence Sands, DO, MPH

TRUSTEES ABSENT:

Tyree Carr, MD
Terrence McGaw, MD
Jade Miller, DDS

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Karen Brumhall, Nevada Health Division
Cindy Pyzel, Attorney General's Office
Janice Wright, State Treasurer's Office
Leslie Elliott, Washoe Co. Health District/UNR
Larry Weis, UNR
David Fiore, UNSOM
Amber Hayes, UNSOM
Kathy Barlow, Saint Mary's
Marta Elliott, UNR
Rota Rosaschi, NV Public Health Foundation
Gil Gonzales, Washoe Tribe
Catherine Gerweck, UNSOM
Madeleine Sigman-Grant, UNR
Cyndy Ortiz Gustafson, St. Rose
Elissa Palmer, MD, UNSOM
Linda Lewis, UNSOM
Steve Hansen, NV Health Centers
Deborah Stephenson, AHEC of So NV
Laura Deitsch, Planned Parenthood of So NV
Liz Carrasco, PPSN
Colleen Morris, UNSOM/Lili Claire

Linda Costa, NV Health Centers
Terry Henner, UNSOM
Doina Kulick, UNR
Karen Spears, UNR
Barbara Kohlenberg, UNSOM
Dan Spogen, UNSOM
Susen Briganti, Saint Mary's
Patty Charles, AHEC
Larry Curley, Indian Health Board of NV
Freddy Rundlit, Washoe Tribe
Debra Wagler, Family Health Service
Catherine McCarthy, UNR
Healthier Millard, St. Rose
Mary Wilson, UNR
Sean McKnight, MD, UNSOM
Mary Goralsky, UNSOM
Rocio Flores-Zuniga, AHEC of So NV
Matt Tincani, UNLV
Charles Bernick, UNSOM
George McAlpine, UNSOM
Louise Helton, Communities in Schools

1. Call to Order

Dr. Titus, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. and a quorum was established.

2. Approval of the Minutes of January 12, 2007

MOTION: Mr. Haartz moved to approve the minutes of January 12, 2007

SECOND: Dr. Lupan

PASSED: Unanimously

3. Financial Statement Report of Trust Fund for Public Health Investments

Ms. Janice Wright from the State Treasurer's Office reported the current Trust Fund for Public Health financial status by reviewing the balance sheet provided to the Board. Ms. Wright stated at the end of June there would be an approximate \$1.4 million ending balance of unobligated funds.

The interest earnings of the past couple of years have been down to 2-3%, 4% in '06 and in '07 have increased with the first quarter to about 4.24%, second quarter about 4.69% and the third quarter about 5.18%. For fiscal '08 fairly conservative projections are in the 4% range. We're hoping to be able to revise that upward if the market conditions continue to stabilize.

Ms. Wright continued, the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) is something important I'd like to touch upon. Originally in 1999, WEFA, the international econometrics firm, provided projections of MSA payments. In 1999, they were projecting in excess of \$42 million for this year's payment. In 2004, we went to the company Bear and Stearns and they revised that projection down to around \$39 million. In 2005, Global Insight gave us their most recent information and their projection was around \$40 million. In 2007, Global revised their number and said the MSA would be closer to \$39 million. The actual payment this April was closer to \$37 million from all sources and we don't think there will be any other revenue for '07.

Alex Haartz requested Ms. Wright explain to the audience how the funds are distributed since the Trust Fund for Public Health does not receive the full \$37 million dollars.

Ms. Wright clarified, the MSA was reached in 1999, and yearly provides additional monies to the State of Nevada from tobacco manufacturers. The legislature and the governor worked to make sure the distribution of the tobacco funds were going to meet future needs in the State. 40% of the MSA payment goes to fund the program Millennium Scholarships; 50% goes to fund the Healthy Nevada Task Force; and 10% goes to fund the Trust Fund for Public Health. The monies that are received by the TFPH are placed into a nonexpendable trust fund. This Board doesn't have the authority to spend the principal in the fund; it is only entitled to the interest earnings to utilize in making yearly grant awards.

4. Selection of Grantees for 2007-2008, in accordance with RFP R0006

Dr. Titus requested comments from the Board members on how they would like to proceed with the selections.

Ms. Brumhall summarized in this year's solicitation, 45 proposals were received and of those five were rejected for technical reasons; 21 proposals were marked focus area #1; 7 applications were marked focus are #2; and 12 proposals were marked focus are #3. This RFP was the first offering funding for two year projects. \$3,991,712 was the amount requested for year 1; \$2,821,845 was requested for year 2; and the total requested was \$6,813,557 for both years.

The amount the Trust Fund has available for 07-08 grants is \$1.4 million. Board members have lists giving the rankings of the 40 eligible applicants. As in the past the scores have been considered confidential but ranking may be discussed.

Dr. Titus indicated that an explanation of the three groups/focus areas would be helpful for the audience.

Ms. Brumhall stated focus area #1 is the promotion of public health and programs for the prevention of disease or illness; focus area #2 is research on issues related to public health; and focus area #3 is provision of direct health care services to children and senior citizens. The applicants were asked to choose one of the focus areas to define their proposals.

Dr. Titus asked also for an explanation of why the five proposals were rejected.

Ms. Brumhall indicated the proposals were rejected for technical reasons such as directions not being followed; requested elements not being included; inadequately developed content; and budgets having errors beyond simple math errors. A checklist of content and format points has to be verified before the application goes on to the second phase of evaluation. Three committees, composed of the board members and representing the three focus areas, carefully review and score each of the proposals.

Dr. Titus clarified, for those whose proposals were rejected it was not a statement of the quality or the purpose of the request that was rejected, rather with so many requests we have to make sure, at the very least, the applications are properly filed. So, for those rejected for technicalities it's not a judgment of the quality and perhaps they might reapply next year.

Clearly we have 40 good applications requesting more money than we have to offer. We need to choose which ones we'd like to award this year. A list provided to us has rankings and we could choose to look at them based on the top ranked and go down and discuss each one individually. We have people here who are willing to discuss their programs, if we have questions for them. Also, we could choose to draw a line as the ranking goes down to where the money ends and award on that basis.

I'm open to suggestions. Hearing none, I'm going to suggest we look at the programs starting from one to the limit of the amount to be awarded, #15. If anyone would like to look at those 15 and suggest we consider awarding those please do so, and if anyone on the Board has questions there are people in the audience to answer them. Or, we can go down the list one at a time.

Dr. Lupan asked, in coming up with the ranked list has there been any consideration for the proportion of applicants in relation to the ranked list? By that I mean, if 50 % of the applications are in category one does that mean 50% of the awards represent category one?

Ms. Brumhall replied, the awards have always come from averaging the scores of each application and then ranking those scores, highest to lowest, to determine which proposals will be funded, regardless of which category they were in.

Dr. Titus added, of the top 15 each of the categories is represented. Let's look at the top 15 for acceptance and if there's not any objection, let's have a motion to that effect.

MOTION: Dr. Anderson moves to accept the first 15 proposals for funding
SECOND: Dr. Lee

Mr. Haartz asked, at what point in the process are we going to announce the 15?

Dr. Titus stated, I can read them down now as a motion to accept the top 15.

- * NV Pregnancy/Diabetes Research Study, UNR
- * AHEC BodyWorks Project, AHEC So NV
- * Preventing Osteoporosis among NV Women: A Randomized Clinical Trial of a Novel Physical Activity, UNR
- * Evaluation of the Obseogenic Built Environment in NV, UNR
- * Effectiveness of NV Clean Indoor Air Act, UNR
- * Promotion of Resources for Elko/Rural Children with Special Health Care Needs, Family Resource Centers of NE NV
- * Students to Senior Connection for Health Information, UNR
- * Evaluation Innovative Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Education Intervention: A Pilot Study, Lili Claire UNLV Skills Center
- * Near-Lethal Suicide Attempts: Analysis/Recommendations, UNR
- * A Comparison of Interventions to Promote Exercise in Patients Presenting to UNR Health and Family Medicine Clinics, UNR
- * Communities in Schools Service Expansion to Rural NE NV, Communities in Schools So NV
- * Center for Pediatric Immunodeficiencies, UNR
- * Saint Mary's Oral Health as Prevention of Low Birthweight and Premature Births, Saint Mary's Foundation
- * NV Advanced Life Support for Obstetrics Training Program, UNR
- * Teen Council on Dating Violence, S.A.F.E. House

Mr. Haartz stated on #8, Lili Claire UNLV Skills Center, staff has added a note that the Legislature has a bill before it concerning funding for diagnostic clinics for fetal alcohol syndrome. That is bill SB411 and it's an exempt bill, which means it has the full length of the session to be considered. It is proposing to provide the State Health Division to contract through to UNLV to the School of Medicine to provide 25 diagnostic clinics. I don't know how these two, the grant proposal and the bill, overlap. Can this be clarified?

Dr. Morris from Lili Claire summarized, funding for one is for diagnostics and the other is for treatment, so there is no overlap.

Dr. Titus commented, she would like to clarify that most of these proposals are for two years, but

the second year request would be based on availability of funds and performance from the first year.

Ms. Brumhall confirmed, yes, careful monitoring will occur during year one and a decision will be made as to whether or not a second year will be funded.

Dr. Lupan stated because a number of the proposals are from the University, he'd abstain from voting.

Dr. Titus stated, the motion has been made and seconded that we accept the top 15 ranked applicants.

PASSED: Unanimously

5. Consideration and direction concerning Nevada Health Centers' plan for purchase of dental equipment as outlined in 3/5/07 letter

Ms. Brumhall indicated a letter to the Board members was received from Nevada Health Centers because the current project was not moving along as quickly as had been outlined in the timeline and some of the equipment yet to be purchased was to be directed to an area that was not the intent of the grant. Mr. Hansen, the director of Nevada Health Centers, was asked by TFPH staff to direct a letter to the Board of Trustees so the members could understand what was happening and decide if they wanted to continue the grant with the new proposal.

Mr. Haartz requested staff to clarify if the original grant was to provide all the funding to the facility and program 100% for Elko and NE NV and if the letter and proposal from Mr. Hansen now reflects providing benefit to NE NV as well as Las Vegas?

Ms. Brumhall answered, the original proposal was for the Las Vegas Eastern facility only and there is not a change in the location within the state, the change is for the location of the equipment to be used in other facilities within the Las Vegas area.

Dr. Titus asked, is this within what we've done traditionally, to make these allowances?

Ms. Brumhall replied this is a first. Here in the audience from Nevada Health Centers is Linda Costa and she might be able to answer questions.

Mr. Haartz requested staff to clarify what about this is a first.

Ms. Brumhall stated the TFPH has never had a project ask that what was proposed in the grant be delayed until the subgrantee could finish a building in order to install equipment. Former grants have begun when scheduled and have usually ended within the one year time frame.

Dr. Titus stated so basically we're looking at not disbursing these funds at this time and delaying for a time?

Ms. Brumhall indicated yes, unless Nevada Health Centers has gone ahead and purchased the equipment and are going to warehouse it now or move it to other locations as was suggested in the letter.

Mr. Hansen, Nevada Health Centers, stated the delay in this building was because the transition from the former owners took a lot longer than expected and the architects and builders also took longer than expected. We intend to purchase and use this equipment for dental services at other locations in Las Vegas and not wait until the building is completed. Once the building is completed, the equipment purchased with this money will be moved to the Eastern site.

Ms. Costa, Nevada Health Centers, added the original intent was to purchase the dental equipment for the Eastern site. We want to start providing dental services much faster, so our request is to purchase portable equipment which can be set up at two different sites in Las Vegas and then when the building is complete, take that equipment out of those temporary sites and put it in the Eastern location. The intent is still to fulfill the grant by providing dental service but at temporary sites. We will purchase all the equipment by June.

Dr. Lee inquired, just to be clear, you said you're changing from permanent equipment to portable equipment? So it's different equipment from what was requested in the grant?

Ms. Costa replied, right.

Dr. Lee asked, is the price different?

Ms. Costa stated it will work out to the same dollar value. This equipment is more flexible and gives us more versatility.

Dr. Lee clarified, in effect you'll fulfill the grant requirements just as you promised, just a little later than expected?

Ms. Costa replied yes.

MOTION: Dr. Lupan stated, I see no change in the scope of the project. **I move for approval of the request.**

SECOND: Dr. Lee

PASSED: Unanimously

Dr. Lee stated, we distinguish this from other subgrantees we have penalized because they have either changed the scope or the deliverables and this subgrantee didn't do that. In the future we may have other subgrantees who try and compare to this particular situation.

Dr. Titus commented we do get requests and we want to be consistent and fair.

6. Election of Chairperson to serve May 2007 through April 2008

Mr. Haartz inquired of legal counsel, does the law proscribe who can or can not serve as chair?

Ms. Pyzel replied, not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Haartz then asked Dr. Titus how long had she served as chair?

Dr. Titus stated this was her second term.

Mr. Haartz questioned, not interested in a third?

Dr. Titus answered, it's not that she's not interested but she'd be open to anyone else who would be interested in serving as chair. She stated she had been on the committee since its inception and doesn't have any conflicts most of the time, and she'd be happy to serve another term, but only at the discretion of the Board.

MOTION: Mr. Haartz moved to nominate Dr. Titus for a third annual term as chair of the Trust Fund for Public Health.

SECOND: Dr. Lee

PASSED: Unanimously

7. Staff Report on TFPH Activities

Ms. Brumhall stated this is the end of the third quarter for the present grantees. All the third quarter reports have been submitted by the projects. There are no major problems at this time.

Dr. Titus thanked Ms. Brumhall for her hard work.

8. Direction to Staff

Dr. Lupan stated a point of discussion for the Board to consider needs to be looking at the proposal budgets a little more closely next year. In our individual groups some attention was paid to the budgets and the needs of the projects and in some instances cuts were considered but in others cuts were not. A concern with the blanket approval is that some projects got resources that they really shouldn't have received. Short of each member reviewing every proposal, and recognizing the time that would take, the Board might have been able to fund more projects with the same dollars had the review of the budgets been a little more meticulous. In next year's review we need to pay particular attention to the budgets and in the assignment of scores recognize that budgets might be inflated. We need to look at that as closely as we look at the value of the project itself so that we stretch our funds as far as we possibly can.

Dr. Anderson remarked she didn't know how others scored their individual assignments but when she looked at a budget and saw that it appeared to be excessive that lowered her appraisal of the total project. Perhaps the Board could look at budgets in a more uniform way.

Ms. Sala commented she is concerned with having three separate entities reviewing the applications from the three focus areas and when looking at the numbers seeing some disparity because one person scores more stringently than others.

Proposals submitted in focus area #2, the research area, have a tendency to have overall tighter proposals and that's why they scored higher. Perhaps they are more used to writing grant applications and are better able to elucidate their needs and goals and their methods of evaluation

than those who are less used to this kind of application process. That may have handicapped some of the less sophisticated proposals.

Dr. Titus stated that when the proposals are reviewed all of those things are considered. The Board looks at the quality, the need, the cost/budgets and each one is discussed. The Board can look at the current format being used before next year's reviews and perhaps answer questions and solve some of the problems.

Also, because a lot of these are two year requests, we will thoroughly look at the budgets before we award the second year. We will see if the requests were appropriately used and scrutinize at the end of the first year.

Dr. Lupan commented, we are very fair even though we score differently. We need some balance between the awards that are given. The entire Board needs to come together to deal with the group bias so there is equity across the distribution. You're probably correct, the science/research ones are going to be tighter proposals.

Dr. Titus asked has it been the policy of this Board to look at equally distributing the funds between the three groups? We have never said it should be a third, a third, a third; that has never been the focus. We look at the individual merits of the application.

Dr. Anderson suggested looking at the top three in each group down to some limiting score and then pick up additional ones from the different groups depending upon what the score cut offs are. That would give a little more fair distribution among the different categories.

Dr. Titus clarified the three are areas of interest, but legal staff can tell us what the statutes say. We do not have to give 30% to each group and if we take the top three of each group we may miss ones that are better quality.

Ms. Pyzel stated the statutes that create and provide for the TFPH and the Board do not delineate for the distribution of funds.

Dr. Titus suggested placing on July's agenda the review of the current scoring sheets to see if the Board can come up with something it is more comfortable with.

Ms. Brumhall added there are also a number of questions that came up in the review committees which need to be addressed such as the types of projects the Trust Fund does or does not fund, for example capital campaigns or expansion of curriculum in educational institutions.

Mr. Haartz commented, some of the proposals reviewed in focus area #3 had to do with funds ending so the program would have to stop direct service if other funding was not located. It appeared to be cost shifting and was written in such a way it was clear no new services were going to be provided and the proposal was just an attempt to find another source of funding.

Further discussion for the Board as a whole would be helpful to review after the subcommittees have met but can we do this in a closed work session or are these discussions open and frank to the public? We need to talk and let the subcommittees explain how they arrived at some of the scores and what the issues and concerns are.

Dr. Titus remarked that this was the forum in which to do that. This was the time and the opportunity to address these issues and concerns. For the next meeting we'll add an agenda item regarding the forms we're using and look at things for the next application process. There's room for self-review and improvement.

9. Confirmation of next meeting date: July 13, 2007

10. Public Comment

Terri Clark from Elko, Communities in Schools, stated several of us from Elko were funded and we just want to thank you.

11. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.