

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)  
Director's Office – Grants Management Unit**

**Advisory Committee on Problem Gambling  
February 19, 2015 Meeting**

**Draft Minutes**

**Meeting Locations (Videoconferenced)**

Nevada Early Intervention Services (EIS)  
2667 Enterprise Road, East Side Conference Room, Reno NV

ADSD, Desert Regional Center  
1391 S Jones Boulevard, Training Room, Las Vegas NV

**Members Present**

Carol O'Hare  
Connie Jones  
Denise Quirk  
Jennifer Shatley  
Lynn Stilley  
Rick Heaney (via phone)  
Ted Hartwell

**Members Absent**

Tony Cabot

**Others Present**

Jeff Marotta, Problem Gambling Solutions (via phone)  
Debra Ridenour and Lana Robards, New Frontier Treatment Center  
Lori Flores, The Problem Gambling Center  
Sarah St. John, UNLV  
Stephanie Asteriadis, UNR/ CASAT  
Pat Petrie and Gloria Sulhoff, DHHS Grants Management Unit

**I. Welcome and Call to Order**

Committee Chair Carol O'Hare welcomed the members and called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM. Roll call was taken and a quorum confirmed. In anticipation of Agenda Item VII, Election of Officers, Ms. O'Hare said that she was honored to have served as Chair for several terms, but because the committee has been successful in bringing new people in, she has decided not to run for office again. She reminded the members that officers must represent both north and south Nevada.

**II. Public Comment**

None

**III. Approval of Minutes of November 20, 2014 and December 15, 2014**

- Denise Quirk moved to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2014 meeting and the December 15, 2014 teleconference meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Ted Hartwell and carried unanimously.

#### **IV. Legislative Update**

Pat Petrie reported that the DHHS Director's Office budget had been presented to the Legislature. There were some questions regarding Nevada 2-1-1 and the Food Security programs, but no questions or concerns about the problem gambling programs.

#### **V. Mid-Year Reallocation Plan**

Mr. Petrie reviewed the proposed mid-year reallocation plan document included in the handouts. The Department reviews each treatment grantee's utilization of grant awards mid-year to ensure that actual spending is on target with projections. The first table on the document shows, for each grantee, the grant award, amount spent as of 12/31/14, balance of grant funds remaining, and additional amount required if treatment continues at the same rate for the second half of the year.

The second table factors in any funds that the treatment grantees agreed to transfer from their Program Enhancement grant award towards Treatment. Because all treatment grantees were projected to be short, funds were not available to be redistributed between grantees. Instead, the plan proposes to allocate a percentage of reserves equivalent to the grantee's percentage of the total shortfall. This seemed more fair than dividing the funds equally among the grantees, since an equal share would fully fund some while others still come up short.

Rick Heaney asked where funds would be found to cover the shortfall. Mr. Petrie replied that there are no other funds; the grantees were all aware of the shortfall and they all said they would continue the work. This is not the first time we've come up short for the year.

Ms. O'Hare thought that using the percentage based distribution was a fair solution, because dollars don't equate to each program, but a percentage does.

- Rick Heaney motioned to approve the mid-year reallocation formula as presented. Jennifer Shatley seconded the motion, which carried unopposed with no abstentions.

#### **VI. SFY16-17 Request for Applications – Update**

Mr. Petrie referred to the handouts which included a timetable and separate scoring matrixes for Problem Gambling's Workforce Development, Prevention and Treatment RFAs. He reviewed key dates in the timeline, which already had been forwarded to current grantees so they could save the date for the mandatory orientation webinar.

- The scoring matrixes were provided per Nevada Administrative Code, which states that the scoring methodology must be approved by the ACPG. Individual RFAs will be issued for each program area and they all will be evaluated based on the same criteria:
  - All parts of each section are included and addressed
  - Descriptions and detail are clear, organized and understandable
  - Descriptions are responsive to the intent of the RFA objectives
  - The overall ability of the applicant, as judged by the evaluation committee, to successfully provide services in accordance with the Problem Gambling Prevention Guidelines/Treatment Strategic Plan (as applicable)
- Proposal content varies among the RFAs, but all content components are scored using the same scale depending on whether the proposal or capability is deemed superior/exceeds

expectations, satisfactory/meets expectations, unsatisfactory/numerous deficiencies, or not acceptable/not applicable. The Applicant Information, Executive Summary, Outcomes and Outputs, Additional Information (WFD and Prevention) and Populations to be Served (Treatment) components are not scored.

- Prevention applications can achieve a maximum score of 100. Those scoring 60 or lower may be excluded. Ms. Shatley pointed out a discrepancy on the page; Mr. Petrie acknowledged that the second sentence on the page should read, "Proposals with an average score *lower than 60*, rather than *60 or lower*, may be excluded from further consideration."
  - Workforce development applications are similar to prevention. The minimum score noted on the matrix should be corrected to read "lower than 60" as in the Prevention matrix.
  - Treatment applications are different; the grant award is based on fee for service so applicants will not be requesting a specific amount of money. The minimum score noted on the matrix should be corrected to read "lower than 70". The point scale for rating the proposal components does not apply to treatment because these programs are black and white; evaluating prevention programs is a more subjective process.
  - Mr. Petrie and Dr. Marotta were working on identifying reviewers. The ACPG members will not score any proposals. Ms. Quirk was concerned that outside reviews understand the unique culture of Nevada. Dr. Marotta responded that while understanding Nevada's culture is important, it is not the main element. Reviewers will be focusing on the technical aspects of the proposal, and if outside reviewers are used, their input will be tempered by Nevada reviewers.
  - The Department will compile and present the recommendations to the ACPG at its May meeting. This year there will be no applicant interviews with the committee, but there will be an opportunity for applicants to answer questions the committee may have for purposes of clarification.
  - Once the recommendation process is complete, applicants may request a copy of reviewer comments.
- Connie Jones moved to approve the three scoring matrices, with the aforementioned correction. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Shatley and carried unopposed.

## **VII. Election of Officers**

Prior to the call for nominations, Ms. O'Hare reminded the members that ACPG bylaws stipulate officers shall not be from the same geographic area. Lynn Stillely suggested that we confirm that current members with expiring terms intend to ask for reappointment. All four members with terms expiring June 30, 2015, Connie Jones, Jennifer Shatley, Denise Quirk, and Carol O'Hare, stated they do intend to reapply.

Ms. Jones nominated Ted Hartley for Chair of the ACPG. Mr. Hartley graciously declined the nomination in deference to more seasoned committee members, stating he would consider the office of Vice Chair.

- Ms. Shatley nominated Denise Quirk for the office of Chairperson of the ACPG. There being no other nominations, Ted Hartwell seconded, and the nomination carried unanimously.

- Ms. Jones nominated Ted Hartwell for the office of Vice Chair of the ACPG. There being no other nominations, Lynn Stilley seconded, and the nomination carried unanimously.

### **VIII. ACPG Committee Vacancy**

Mr. Petrie stated that the committee has one vacant seat, for a regular member who represents an organization for veterans. The Governor's Office has not received any applications, and he asked the committee members for suggestions. With regard to those members whose terms are ending, he stated that the reappointment process is much easier than the initial appointment, requiring only an application form and a cover letter. He offered to forward the appropriate website link to the four members with expiring terms.

### **IX. Public Comment**

- Stephanie Asteradis asked for reviewer comments from the last RFA.
- Mr. Hartwell announced that a preliminary public outreach survey conducted by Desert Research Institute in tribal communities was close to completion. The survey covers attitudes and impacts and an initial test case. He expected to have the full data in a couple of weeks.
- Denise Quirk wished to publicly recognize and thank Carol O'Hare not only for her many years serving on the committee and as Chair of the committee, but also for the care she has shown the ACPG, the grantees, and Nevada regarding problem gambling. The attendees gave Ms. O'Hare a standing ovation for her years of service.
- Ms. O'Hare shared details of the 2015 State Conference on Problem Gambling. Registration is only \$40 for Nevada residents. The NCPG has travel funds of up to \$500 to cover airfare and hotel for attendees traveling from outside of Clark County. She noted that the travel funds are not available to current PG grantees with funds in their budget. The conference will include the survey data just described by Mr. Hartwell; a KNPR smart phone app developed at UCLA; CEUs in ethics and supervision; and a number of presenters enabling breakout sessions.

### **X. Adjournment**

- With no further announcements or comments, Ms. Jones moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hartwell and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:03 AM.