

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

**Draft Minutes
October 5, 2007
Via Videoconference**

Legislative Building
Room 3137
401 S. Carson Street
Carson City, NV

Grant Sawyer Building
Room 4412
555 E. Washington Avenue
Las Vegas, NV

TRUSTEES PRESENT:

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

TRUSTEES ABSENT:

Tyree Carr, MD
Jade Miller, DDS

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Cindy Pyzel, Attorney General's Office
Karen Brumhall, Nevada Health Division

1. Call to Order

Dr. Titus, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. and a quorum was established.

2. Approval of the July 13, 2007 Minutes

MOTION: Dr. Anderson moved to approve the minutes of July 13, 2007

SECOND: Carol Sala

PASSED: Unanimously

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

Karen Brumhall, staff for the Trust Fund for Public Health, reported that Janice Wright of the State Treasurer's Office retired. She stated that the financial report had been revised to give a clearer picture of the Trust Fund monies and if the Board was comfortable with her reporting she would continue to do so for the next meeting.

Ms. Brumhall read through the report line item by line item giving explanations as needed.

Attached to the financial report was a memo from the Office of the Treasurer concerning the MSA tobacco revenue projections for Fiscal Year 2008. The expectation is for a 10% decrease in revenue with an approximate total of \$44.5 million for the State of Nevada. Of that, the Trust Fund for Public Health receives 10%.

Ms. Sala asked for clarification about roll-back funds to the Trust Fund. Is this what the grantees did not spend for their grants, so it's deobligated money?

Ms. Brumhall responded, yes, it's what the grantees did not spend and is returned to the Trust Fund.

Dr. Titus inquired if the actual unencumbered amount for 2008 is \$85,000 plus the approximate \$25,000 not spent by the 06-07 grantees? She also asked if the amount (\$1,225,163) for the already submitted second year grants was for the proposals from last year that were approved but still need to go through a second awarding process?

Ms. Brumhall replied yes, but a second year is contingent upon approval and funds being available. She added that thirteen of the current fifteen grants asked for second year funding.

Dr. Titus questioned, so when we send out the RFP in the spring, do we say we have \$85,000 to award? How are we doing to do that?

Ms. Brumhall answered, that's a major question.

Ms. Sala stated the TFPH went to the two year cycle so that grantees had the flexibility of putting in for either a one or two year grant since a lot of the projects are long term. Also the Board was not necessarily going to have to go through the RFP process every year and grantees could have a longer cycle.

Dr. Titus agreed that was part of it, but the Trust Fund will still have \$85,000 for granting in this upcoming cycle. She went on to say she doesn't know what the Board is obligated by the Legislature to award and does it have to be on an annual basis?

Ms. Brumhall affirmed yes, annual is specified in the wording of the NRS.

Ms. Sala suggested asking counsel for clarification since the approval of second year funding is based on available funds, would that approval constitute granting for the year? Also, since \$85,000 isn't a lot would the statute allow carrying it forward? Is it necessary to spend down to zero each year?

Dr. Lupan noted the projected interest earnings are less in the future than they were in 2007 even though the principal will be growing by more than \$4 million. The figures are coming from the State Treasurer and they anticipate less interest for the Trust Fund.

Ms. Brumhall answered she didn't know why the interest is less but she certainly will ask the Treasurer's Office.

Dr. Lupan commented that it would seem that funding programs in the second year would honor the legislative intent of annually spending the interest from the Fund. The bigger question is was this the right thing to do? As we look at the RFP for 2008 we need not feel

guilty because some of those same individuals who will be getting a year two award will have likely been applicants for the award that year anyway. We do need to be judicious about giving year two awards. It's not an automatic assumption that simply because a project received a one year award that they would automatically get a second year. The Board has already put in a review process and we'll be looking at accomplishment in relationship to the year two funding. Given the fact that there's so little new money, I think we need to be fairly guarded about whether or not we automatically award year two funding.

Where concern arises is in the new release of the RFP in January with the wording for how much funding will be available. It may be \$100,000 but we could put in a proviso sentence saying we anticipate making new awards in FY 08 but we don't yet know exactly what the amount will be.

Dr. Anderson stated that as the Board moves forward in subsequent years perhaps some kind of allotment for two year proposals as well as one year proposals could be offered so that there is some kind of overlap. That might prevent the cyclical \$1 million, \$100,000, \$1 million, \$100,000 Fund balance. Maybe that would give applicants more opportunity to apply annually rather than every other year.

Dr. Titus agreed that was a good suggestion.

Ms. Pyzel reported she'd had an opportunity to look at the statute. She went on to say that Dr. Anderson basically points out what the Board was trying to accomplish in building some flexibility into the process and still meet the language of the law which requires an annual revisiting by the Board. This would give the flexibility of weeding out grantees who weren't performing or who weren't cooperative and to reallocate those funds.

The Board is supposed to spend down as much as it can but with the varying and fluctuating kinds of amounts that are available, prudence dictates the course that's taken in terms of keeping a little bit of a resource for the unexpected and for the investments that aren't performing as well as were anticipated and not meeting projections.

Dr. Titus commented she would like someone from the State Treasurer's Office to attend meetings because there are questions about the Trust Fund which need to be answered.

Ms. Brumhall replied she will request someone to attend.

Dr. Anderson asked if the Board could get the percentage of interest so there would be a better idea of how the Fund is growing and also what types of investments are involved.

Mr. Haartz responded that if for some reason the Treasurer's Office is unable to attend, at the very least wherever there are projected interest earnings, the Board should have a percentage rate which can be included on the financial form.

The attached memo says that a projected 10% decrease is forecast but that would give the Trust Fund \$4.4 million which is an increase over this year's \$3.6 million. I'm not sure how we're losing, so having the Treasurer's Office here would be most helpful.

Dr. Titus remarked, so when we do the RFP in the spring we will have approximately \$100,000 to spend and then in the future limit the obligations by staggering awards so we have a decent

sum each time. \$100,000 will change who applies and that's not necessarily a bad thing, but it will limit the number of proposals to look at. We want to be able to award both large and small funds as we have in the past.

Ms. Sala asked for clarification of the process. Karen's role is support for the grants, so will she be going out and evaluating their performance this first year and then bringing that information back to the Board with recommendations for the second year of funding? Is this the process? What's the mechanism for evaluating to determine continued funding?

Ms. Brumhall pointed out that is item number five on the agenda.

Dr. Titus directed moving to item four on the agenda.

4. Request from UNR, NV Advanced Life Support for Obstetrics Training Program, 7/1/07-6/30/08, to modify budget by moving monies from Personnel category to Consultant/Contract category in order to employ staff through the University's practice plan; this is not a request for additional monies

Ms. Brumhall said the UNR project, NV Advanced Life Support for Obstetrics Training Program, wants to modify the budget by moving \$22,225 from the Personnel category to the Consultant/Contract category. The project specialist/coordinator needs to be employed through the University's School of Medicine practice plan. This is not a request for more funding rather a change in budget categories.

Dr. Titus confirmed, the precedent has been set that as long as the monies are used for the same purpose the Board is comfortable with allowing changes in categories.

MOTION: Dr. Anderson moved to approve the request from UNR

SECOND: Dr. Lupan

PASSED: Unanimously

5. Discussion and recommendations for evaluating grants requesting a 2nd year of funding, pursuant to the 2007 RFP: information summary from other funders via phone conversations

Ms. Brumhall reported, this item is about the evaluation for the second year of funding. The methods she was able to get information about came from other granting agencies and it appears that the third quarter report is the determiner for future funding. That report is evaluated to see if the grantees are meeting the goals and objectives of the grant and are progressing as they proposed in their applications.

For the TFPH there are some timing issues. The Trust Fund's 3rd quarter report is due April 15. The Board meets earlier in April, so unless the report due date is changed or the Board meeting date is changed that information would not be available in time to make a funding decision. Also, April is traditionally the grant selection meeting which would conflict with making the 2nd year funding decisions, and that has to be done before knowing how much money would be available to fund new proposals. Both the method and the timing need discussion for the 2nd year funding.

Dr. Titus responded, our next meeting is scheduled for January 11, and then the following one is the 2nd week of April. Perhaps we could move the meetings or do some of the reviews in January.

Ms. Sala explained, this process is similar to what is done in Aging Services. From their experience it is sometimes hard for grantees to get up to full speed until after six months and they usually need until the 3rd quarter. A possible solution would be to push the April meeting back to sometime in May and then make the second year funding decisions at that time. That would tighten the timeframe because the grant becomes effective July 1 for the next cycle but it would be doable since it's a continuation of an established project.

Dr. Anderson presented the alternate possibility of having the grantees turn in the 3rd quarter report on April 1 rather than April 15. She asked if that would give enough time.

Ms. Brumhall replied, it depends upon how the Board wants to look at the reports. Does the Board want staff to evaluate or does the Board want to do it?

Dr. Titus summarized, the grants are awarded in April. Perhaps we could meet in February and May. The January, April, July, October meetings have been arbitrarily set; we are only mandated to meet four times a year. We can certainly change that. It's up to us and if we want to change when we meet we can.

Ms. Brumhall said she had to echo what Ms. Sala had said, that it does usually take until the 3rd quarter for projects to be fully engaged in whatever they are supposed to be accomplishing, so maybe a later date to evaluate would be better.

Dr. Titus suggested meeting in May as opposed to earlier in April so the projects would have the 3rd quarter reports in by April 15 and the Board would have a chance to look them over and evaluate for the May meeting.

Dr. Sands agreed, nine months is needed on a new project to see where they're going. He would support having the meeting in May and then the Board could talk about how to deal with reviewing the new applicants.

Dr. Lupan remarked that maybe rather than settling the meeting time right now, perhaps the Board should be talking about the process because the process of review might dictate the amount of time needed. The Board may realize that the process for deciding 2nd year funding will take as much time as evaluating new proposals. Perhaps the submission by April 15 for the 3rd quarter report and then the evaluation of those reports should precede the evaluation of the new applications for funding.

Dr. Lupan indicated he would like to be involved in the process of doing the quarterly reviews to make the determinations for continued funding. I think I'd like to see the 2nd quarter report as well as the 3rd quarter report. I want to know if there's been progress and seeing a single report may not be enough. The 2nd quarter report should give an indication of whether or not they've truly started the project and by looking at that and comparing with the 3rd this would give a better sense of whether or not there's progress. Staff needs to consider that as part of the overall package and even though that adds to the paperwork it may also add to the review.

Ms. Sala noted the Aging Services process for 2nd year funding involves the grant analysts, who do the technical assistance with the grantees during the entire grant period, evaluating the progress to date and then summarizing the project to be presented to staff to make the decision for 2nd year funding. The actual quarterly reports can be a part of that summary. Ms. Sala would suggest that Karen's role, since she's the one working with the grantees, would be to provide the Board with summaries and how the grantees are doing and the Board could make a decision on 2nd year funding.

Dr. Titus stated having Karen do the reviews and summaries for the Board would be very helpful.

Mr. Haartz commented that counsel reminded him that there's nothing that precludes the Board from meeting more than four times a year so maybe there is a need for another meeting. Look at what is to be accomplished between January and July 1, and figure out if another meeting is needed to accomplish a specific task.

Dr. Titus indicated that at this point Karen is going to review the 3rd quarter reports for 2nd year awards and give the Board a synopsis. The Board can certainly ask for more information and then can decide if another meeting is needed based on what is heard. In January the Board can assess again and decide if additional meetings will be needed.

Ms. Jost directed everyone's attention to the arrival of a new Board member in Las Vegas.

Dr. Beverly Neyland introduced herself and said she represents the Maternal and Child Advisory Board, replacing Dr. McGaw.

Dr. Titus expressed welcome and asked the Board members to introduce themselves to Dr. Neyland.

6. Review and discussion of the Trust Fund for Public Health Draft RFP (Request for Proposal) for the 2008-2009 funding cycle

Dr. Lupan requested going back to talk about items five and six and maybe four. He said with respect to the schedule and the evaluation process maybe it would be appropriate that the April meeting be a review of the renewal of the 2nd year proposals and at that meeting make the decisions of whether or not they will be funded. That then gives us a true assessment for the pool of money that will be available for funding for new proposals in 2008. Then we have a June meeting to consider the awarding of the new proposals beginning July 1, 2008.

He continued, what I'd also like to suggest is if there is a pool of individuals whose proposals are not automatically funded, not granted the year two funds, that those individuals become candidates for new funding in the 08 pool. I say that because it's going to leave individuals who if suddenly are notified their funding is canceled in April for July, in a very awkward position. Number one, they can't respond to a grant application in that cycle but they'll automatically know that their project will be considered for funding competitively with everyone else. They won't automatically be rejected for their year two funding. They're not getting it but they have an opportunity to get new funds in year two. You accomplish kind of two goals at the same time. So we will know in June what the pool is, based on the decisions we make in April, whereas right now I don't think we're going to have any idea what that pool of money will be.

Dr. Titus asked Ms. Brumhall was there was anything specific in item six that had not already been covered?

Ms. Brumhall responded no, other than dates for the RFP.

Dr. Anderson stated in thinking about the logistics of this, if we went with the small amount of money that's available this year and just say that's what it is, we can make this the year we readjust our cycle by only awarding the \$100,000 and then we could look at the 2nd year awards as our main business for this session.

Mr. Haartz pointed out the Board's concern over the last several years about performance by grantees and unless there are performance and outcomes from the first year there shouldn't be awards for the second year.

Dr. Anderson replied yes, we still need to assess whether or not the performance of the grantees is adequate and decide whether or not they will have second year funding. But, because we do not know what the amount will be to award for the following fiscal year starting July 1, 2008, if we decide not to award the second year for two or three of the grantees that money goes back into the pool and it's not awarded.

Dr. Titus confirmed that as her interpretation also. The grantees would absolutely be held accountable. In this next cycle we will have approximately \$100,000 to award, clear and simple. There may be more for next year, but for this cycle for new monies what we have is approximately \$100,000.

Ms. Sala said that again the month of April, for deciding the second year of funding, seems to be the sticking point because we still wouldn't have the third quarter reports. She suggests first of all putting out the RFP with \$100,000 as the available funding. Then reviewing and ranking the applications and then making the decisions for the \$100,000 in April. In May, the evaluations for the 2nd year of funding can be made and if some of the grantees aren't performing and the decision is made not to fund again the Board will have additional monies. At that time the Board can look at the ranked list of new proposals (below the cutoff point for the \$100,000) and see if the funds not used for second year granting could be used for additional grants.

Dr. Titus agreed that's a good point because the Board has actually done that in the past when there has been extra money available after the initial grant process.

Dr. Titus added, this is new territory for the Trust Fund and we're struggling with this because this last year was the first time for awarding two year grants. We're working on how to approach this process of assessing for another year of funding. Also, we're struggling with evaluating proposals in the RFP process.

7. Discussion and recommendations for the RFP evaluation process to select proposals for funding with examples from other funders: Grants Management Unit for Fund for Health NV and Mental Health and Development Services

Dr. Titus asked everyone to look at the actual form the TFPH has used in the past to assess the proposals which have been submitted. Each proposal is given a number based on the criteria

listed on the form. Since this numbering process has been difficult for some members, looking at some alternatives from other agencies for ideas for the TFPH form may help.

Ms. Brumhall explained she was able to obtain evaluation forms from the Fund for Healthy NV and Mental Health. The form from Healthy NV uses a point system based on the degree of development of certain parts of the RFP, whereas Mental Health's form has statements concerning program criteria and the reviewer determines possible points for each.

Dr. Anderson stated that the Trust Fund form was the least developed in terms of any categorical explanation and that's what is needed for increased uniformity in grading things as a committee.

Dr. Titus confirmed the TFPH form is just a broad statement of adequacies of proposed evaluations but it doesn't really define what is meant by each. She stated that was the thing she appreciated on the Mental Health form where it says this is what we mean by that, although that is subject to interpretation.

DR. Anderson directed a look at the form from Fund for Healthy NV and the section "Meeting the Unmet Needs of Those to be Served". There are some good ideas there as well as in some of the other areas. Maybe in the January meeting we should have this as an agenda item where we try to come together with a different and better form.

Ms. Sala commented that in comparing the forms, the Fund for Healthy NV has a range of points which makes it a little more defined, although some of the descriptions may not be pertinent to the TFPH. The areas might not be titled as the Trust Fund needs but it certainly makes clear that there are points for the degrees of development which makes it a lot more succinct for the reviewer to score a proposal more fairly.

Dr. Titus indicated her agreement and said a form could be developed using the other agencies' forms as examples with some of the same types of criteria. In the Trust Fund form it's not so important the size of the community but rather how many people will be reached.

Dr. Sands asked a question about the forms, wanting to know if the form was the actual form the evaluators use or was it a form used to screen the applications as they were submitted to make sure they met the technical requirements.

Ms. Brumhall replied the forms were for the evaluators.

Mr. Haartz stated that the goal was to provide staff with some direction in coming up with a revised form for the Trust Fund, and since there were good elements on both maybe a form that encompassed everything the Board had talked about could be brought back to the next meeting.

Dr. Titus agreed but clarified that on the Trust Fund's form the areas used for evaluation in the past are appropriate areas, so the issue would be adding a breakdown of descriptors with assigned points for each.

Mr. Haartz indicated that the areas the Trust Fund presently uses for evaluating proposals are good but what needs to be done is to use the example forms as a basis for beefing-up the TFPH form.

Dr. Titus directed staff to produce a form which could be emailed and assessed by the Board members prior to the January meeting. That would give time for comments and suggestions.

Ms. Jost commented that seeing a draft and getting some feedback to staff by the next meeting will likely bring something closer to what the Board wants.

8. Staff Report on TFPH Activities

Ms. Brumhall reported visiting with the Reno projects. All of the projects are fully engaged in their grant activities and at this point there are no major concerns. Las Vegas will be the next trip for site visits to the grantees in that area. Also, the Trust Fund for Public Health website has been updated with the current information about all the new projects. The Annual Report has been prepared and is ready for the members to look at for the January meeting.

9. Direction to Staff

Mr. Haartz responded that it would be helpful if staff checked with the Treasurer's Office before the next meeting and the release of the RFP to have the various questions the Board raised such as interest and the total estimated interest earnings clarified so the members have a better sense of how much money is available and the RFP can be prepared with correct information.

10. Confirmation of next meeting date, time, location: January 11, 2008, 9:30 a.m., Legislative Buildings

Dr. Titus stated she would not be here for the January 11 meeting and asked Dr. Lupan to chair.

Ms. Brumhall asked for clarification on proceeding with the evaluation for the second year funding and the RFP, as well as the timing for granting activities.

Dr. Titus reviewed: the new form developed by January; the Board meeting in January with updates on processes and decisions on whether there is a need to meet other than April and when that would be.

11. Public Comment

No public comment.

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.