I. Call to Order, Welcome Introductions and Announcements-
Mr. Feldman called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. All participants introduced themselves and a quorum was confirmed. Mr. Feldman stated that he wanted to thank Ms. O’Hare and Ms. Quirk for their leadership of this committee for the past several years. Mr. Feldman continued to state, he takes on this chairmanship with great seriousness but also very mindful of the fact that it was given to him in such great condition. Mr. Feldman concluded, he is also very thankful to both Ms. O’Hare and Ms. Quirk that they are still on the committee and he looks forward to working with both and the rest of the committee as everyone moves forward.

II. Public Comment #1-
Mr. Feldman stated there would be no action taken on anything discussed and asked for any comments.
  • No response.

Mr. Feldman noted that there are 2 committee positions open now. These both relate to people who have direct connections with problem gambling community. Mr. Feldman wants to encourage anyone who is listening and all of us on the committee who know people who might fit in this category to go through the application process. It would be a wonderful thing if we had a hard decision to make because we had some great candidates. Mr. Feldman stated he would like to see the committee filled out and these are particularly important voices, so asking that the committee members look at those
qualifications, if you know of anyone, please encourage them to apply. Mr. Feldman continued, we need to be clear that we understand the ACPG’s role in looking at candidates, that way we are not violating any rules and can make sure all responsibilities are met according to the bylaws.

- Ms. Garcia stated that it will be added to the next agenda.

Mr. Feldman thanked Ms. Garcia. Mr. Feldman proceeded to ask again if there was any comment.

- No response.

III. Approval February 21, 2109 ACPG Meeting Minutes-
Mr. Feldman called for the approval of the February 21, 2019 Meeting Minutes. Mr. Feldman asked if there was any discussion about the changes, corrections, or additions.

- Ms. Quirk motioned to table the minutes until the next ACPG meeting for corrections.
- Motion was seconded.

Mr. Feldman restated Ms. Quirk’s motion and asked for any further discussion.

- No response.
- Motion carried through unopposed.

IV. ACPG Workgroups Updates-
Mr. Feldman stated that Mr. Cabot was absent and asked Ms. Quirk to address the update.

- Ms. Quirk thanked Mr. Feldman and stated that Mr. Cabot would not be able to make it because he is teaching. Mr. Cabot relayed to Ms. Quirk that there isn’t much to report. We are still awaiting a bill draft from the LCB, they are significantly behind, and no hearings will be set till then. We also heard from Michael Lonzo and he is keeping his eye on what is going on and has nothing significant going on either.
- Ms. Garcia stated that we have a possible tentative budget closing date for May 3, that is very tentative, we do not have it in for sure.
- Ms. Layugan asked Ms. Quirk if she would mind defining LCB, as she was not familiar with that acronym.
- Ms. Quirk stated that LCB stood for Legislative Council Bureau.
- Ms. Layugan thanked Ms. Quirk.

Mr. Feldman stated, just to reinforce what Ms. Quirk said, they are quiet behind in the process at the moment. The other issue is the revenue projections are not yet in. At some point they are going to have to match up all these requests to the official revenue projections. Mr. Feldman concluded, we have a way to go here.

V. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)-

a) Discussion of Fiscal Reports:

- Mr. Milazzo thanked Mr. Feldman and stated there was not too much to report. We got our last round of reallocations done between this meeting and last meeting and right now we are left with about a $18,000 balance and Mr. Milazzo believes that is the earmark to do an amendment. Mr. Milazzo stated that they were $16 off, therefore to look at the transpose number they have but the general idea is $18,000.

- Discussion of Fiscal Reports

Mr. Feldman stated that this report was straight forward and asked for any further questions for Mr. Milazzo.

- No response.

b) Discussion of Program Updates:

- Ms. Garcia stated overall, we are 10% below the base line for the program but we will be doing the third quarter reallocation. Ms. Garcia stated she is waiting for the March
Ms. Garcia continued she did not want to do it too early because she is afraid that, making a further adjustment, they will have to do more options in June to make sure that our treatment providers and so forth can be reimburse. Ms. Garcia concluded, the program is working very well as Mr. Milazzo said we are looking at that unobligated $18,000. We are in the process of doing an amendment to problem solutions due to the increase of funding and building the contingency plan. If those funds go through, we will need addition funds for that. We are in the process of that contract amendment for about $16,800 that would use the unobligated funds, but it looks like we are about 10% under, meaning there will still be funds to reallocate for the treatment providers.

Mr. Feldman asked if there were any further questions for Ms. Garcia.

No response.

Mr. Feldman continued to thank both for the hard work put into preparing these reports.

VI. Discussion and Make Recommendations for SFY 2020-2021 Grant Awards-

• Ms. Garcia referred to the Problem Gambling SFY20-21 Award Recommendations

• Ms. Garcia explained that the awards received were from the RFA process that is being finalized, and it is based off scenario 1 and the strategic plan with the flat line budget. These items are for the treatment grantees, subject to change based on actual claims. Recommended funding represents the fiscal year 20 initial grant award and the estimate for fiscal year 21. Here we have indicated their average score of their applications, what their projected need is, and then the final column is the combined years. We will be doing a 2-year NOSA this year. Ms. Garcia continued, we do have a new treatment provider this year and theirs was based off the request of funding, how many clients they went to go see. Prevention was based off the RFA that went out that was based off the allocation percentages that we determined in a prior meeting. Workforce development, it does say to be determined because it is such a small amount, this is the amount we talked about ear marking for the state conference. There is possible new money there, if it is audited, there will possibly be an RFA that goes out before Workforce development. Ms. Garcia concluded, the UNLV IGI data collection, this is also based off the recommendations from the allocation and problem gambling solutions.

Mr. Feldman stated, as we think about work force development, wanting to be clear for the council planning purposes, that the money indicated here will be going to the state conference. If there is other money, we will then take up how those might be allocated for other work force development related projects. This is so the council can know what they have and can begin to plan accordingly. Mr. Feldman asked if that is the understanding.

• Ms. Garcia stated that is correct.

Mr. Feldman thanked Ms. Garcia and continued to ask if there were any further questions or comments on this topic.

• Ms. Layugan asked what the problem gambling solutions are exactly, what does the contract intel, and what services do they provide.

• Ms. Garcia asked Mr. Marotta if he wanted to speak on that behalf.

• Mr. Marotta stated that exact contract intel’s there are four tasks. The first one has to do with general technical institute and consulting. There are 3 groups. One is Health and Human Services, and another is the service to all the grantees. Another task is doing the program reviews that are specific to the treatment grants. There are on-site reviews conducted if the grantee is performing all the requirements within the standards and guild lines that are specified in the strategic plan of independence. The third task has to do with when we engage in strategic
planning with them. There are big projects that we do every 2 years where we go into a complete strategic plan. Every year what we do is we revisit the strategic to do some minor adjustments. Mr. Marotta concluded that was all he could remember, but that is the overall view of the contract.

- Ms. Layugan thanked Mr. Marotta for explaining the service committed to the contract.
- Ms. Quirk asked if there is anybody on the line or in the rooms from Finding Hope Therapy. Ms. Quirk continued to congratulate and welcome them and see if they could give a little description of their services.

Mr. Feldman asked if there was anyone from Finding Hope.

- Ms. Garcia stated that they are in Las Vegas and are not on the line.

Mr. Feldman asked Ms. Garcia if she would reach out to Finding Hope and have them on the call for the next meeting, that way their services could be explained to the committee.

- Ms. Garcia stated she would do so.

Mr. Feldman asked Ms. Garcia if this needed an approval from the committee.

- Ms. Garcia stated that it does.

Mr. Feldman asked, if there are no further comments, can we get a motion to approve the fiscal year 20/21 problem gambling award recommendations.

- Ms. Quirk motioned to approve.
- Ms. Jones seconded the motion.

  - Motion carried through unopposed.

VII. Discussion of Contingency Planning for Legislative Increased Funding-

Mr. Feldman stated in support of what Mr. Marotta just talked about, his scope. His scope has been extensive, and we put a lot of pressure on it because we needed to do some heavy lifting toward the end of the strategic planning process relative to the request for new funding. The rest of the committee needs to understand how invaluable Mr. Marotta’s work was in getting that to where we are. Mr. Feldman continued, we do not know the outcome yet and that is the whole purpose of this agenda item because we don’t know if there will be any increase in funding and if so, how much. We are in a position today that we were not in the past, a lot of people in the committee have been helpful, but I do want to highlight Mr. Marotta’s work in bringing all that to life. Mr. Feldman concluded, we are not sure if we will have an increase in our budget yet, but we certainly do need to have a process to figure out how to spend it if it does come. Mr. Marotta has done a wonderful job laying out this contingency plan and now this will be turned over to him to walk us through it.

- Mr. Marotta thanked Mr. Feldman for the acknowledgment. We put together this contingency plan to deal with any potential budget increase. It is broken into 3 general phases. The first phase is the planning one, after the idea of getting out and collecting as much information as possible from state holders. State holders include the current and future grantees; it involves people within the department especially within the Bureau of Behavioral Health and Wellness. Mr. Marotta continued, now we are not starting from a blank slate. We have a strategic plan and in the strategic plan there is a series of actions that are recommended. Part of that is in there to demonstrate how that additional money would be utilized. If you look closely at the way the strategic plan is laid out, the propose spending, their more general actions therefore it doesn’t fit into the kind of detail that is necessary. Where it says activate workgroups, webinars and roundtable discussions, this isn’t specifically to ACPG workgroups. It is referring to the collection of information. Part of that is to revise the strategic plan because there are some things that we would be able to do immediately beginning of July 1. Those are things that changed the caps on the benefits for treatments and changed the reimbursement rate for treatment. Those are areas that can be done relatively quickly, it is just going through a process
revising the strategic plan. The second phase is procurement. One of the things that studied, was the end of the strategic plan that ACPG recommended and it found its way into our planning documents. It would be going out and seeing what kind of options we have available and that would be as ambitious as having the highest priorities.

- Contingency Plan for Problem Gambling

- Ms. Jones asked Mr. Marotta if he had an idea of how much prevalence studies for the state would cost?

- Mr. Marotta stated, with prevalence studies, the estimates per doing the actual study can vary dramatically. It depends greatly on methodology. It could be in the millions. Mr. Marotta continued, if we look at what Massachusetts is doing, with some of their work there is a sort of longitudinal base line study, they have planned tests. Other studies where internet data collection is mainly used, those are much less expensive.

- Ms. Jones thanked Mr. Marotta for his response.

- Mr. Marotta stated there is an additional estimate within the strategic plan for looking at allocating that money. The strategic plan is considered a living document, so we use it as base for work, conversations and for planning. Mr. Marotta continued, the other thing that is going to be happening, is that the program is going into the office of Public and Behavioral Health. It really provides them the opportunities for integration and service components. We are envisioned spending some time in July or August looking for other opportunities. Mr. Marotta concluded, the last phase is integration and petition. It is getting the sense of executing the grants. These time lines are important. It’s important to have bench marks, they are considered guide lines. There are some things that are out of control.

Mr. Feldman thanked Mr. Marotta.

Mr. Feldman stated when we activate workgroups, webinars or roundtable discussions, it would be nice to see the subjects listed there matching the strategic plan. The identified regions of deficiency, research being one of the. I am forgetting whether Awareness had its own specific category, or if they were combined. Mr. Feldman continued, this is a wonderful chart that showed in each of those category’s where budget deficiency existed. It is very important, as we consider prevalence, as the department considers putting out a request for proposal on prevalence studies or under an existing contract that may exist, that we initiate a prevalence study. Mr. Feldman concluded, Massachusetts went for the broadest perspective that included many different areas. They didn’t go into depth. For Nevada, the perspective should be more tightly focused, but go deep in certain areas. Age and ethnicity should be the areas of depth we focus on. Set them distinct from the general population because of prevalence or the way they approach services.

Mr. Feldman asked for any further comments, questions, or incite.

- Ms. O’Hare stated, to pick up on what Mr. Feldman said about what he is referring to in figure 6, the strategic plan that laid out the budget needs and the funding gaps has been such a strong visual and useful piece of information in the legislative process. Ms. O’Hare continued to agree with Mr. Feldman, anyway we can have a continuation of this thought process that we can tie to when new money becomes available. It is obvious that the need for us to be able to demonstrate how we proceed with that money, potential to be back in the legislative session every 2 years. It would be great to build our case going forward and build our story. Timing will allow us to make it clear that not everything can be accomplished all at once, but we will be able to better prioritize and justify why we aren’t moving as quickly in certain areas. On the issue of the prevalence study, it would be interesting to make sure, when that conversation begins
between everyone, that we all get a little primer frame work on what has or has not been happening in their area prevalence. Ms. O’Hare concluded, anything that can be done throughout the committee, and with technical assistance from Mr. Marotta, everyone should get a primer about a prevalence study.

Mr. Feldman added, the original prevalence study was intended to be a base line and a base line is only an effective tool of measurement if you follow it up. Because we have not followed it up, what we have now is ancient information. It isn’t that it’s not important, but we aren’t going to be able to track the progress of the state. Depends on how one defines that process anyways. Mr. Feldman concluded, the delta between when that study was done to today, makes it almost incomparable.

- Ms. O’Hare stated that was her point. We do have great historical data but, the committee and others, need to create our own.
- Ms. Jones stated, in the last prevalence study, we legalized sport betting in the state.
- Ms. Quirk stated that Mr. Marotta should help us decide how to quickly embark in meetings, workshops, webinars and roundtable discussions. It makes sense that we do that immediately and regularly, that way the ideas coming out of the quarterly meetings can be applied. Ms. Quirk concluded with thanking Mr. Feldman for accepting the nomination for chair, and everything he has done to help the gambling community.

Mr. Feldman thanked everyone for their comments and asked if there were any further comments or questions for Mr. Marotta on the contingency plan. Mr. Feldman stated that he appreciated the discussion.

VIII. Public Comment #2-
Mr. Feldman stated there would be no action taken on anything discussed and asked for any comments.

- Ms. Smith stated she just wanted to take this time to thank the committee for allowing us to serve the last 2 years for gambling treatment under the gambling grant. Right now, we decided not to renew under the grant, but we will continue to provide services for problem gamblers and their family members at the Las Vegas Office. Ms. Smith again thanked the committee for allowing them to serve the public these past couple years.

Mr. Feldman and Ms. Quirk thanked Ms. Smith for her comment.
Mr. Feldman asked for any other comments.

- No response.

IX. Additional Announcements and Adjournment-
Mr. Feldman stated that the committee should briefly talk about the next meetings. Mr. Feldman continued, it would be my recommendation to the committee that we should move the August meeting to June. By the time June comes around, we should know where our budget stands.

Mr. Feldman thanked Mr. Milazzo.

- Mr. Milazzo stated that was correct, the closing does occur in early June.

Mr. Feldman asked Ms. Garcia or Ms. Council what serves their purposes best. Mr. Feldman asked Ms. Garcia and Ms. Council if they wanted to try and discuss in August or June.

- Ms. Council stated that she would send out a pole.

Mr. Feldman stated, for planning purposes, that the committee anticipate a June and August meeting because if there is success in the Legislature, we are going to have work to do in the ladder part of this year.

- Ms. Garcia asked Mr. Feldman to verify that the June meeting was a special meeting and the August meeting is the original date.
- Ms. O’Hare stated that is correct.
Mr. Feldman reiterated that June was a special meeting and August is the original meeting.
  • Ms. Garcia stated the other announcement is that 4 of the committee members are expiring as of June. We want to make sure you are renewing your application and the waiver on the board’s website.

Mr. Feldman stated that majority of the committee’s memberships were expiring. Mr. Feldman continued to list Ms. Jones, Ms. Layugan, Ms. O’Hare, Ms. Quirk and himself as those who need to renew their application and waiver.

Mr. Feldman asked for any further announcements.
  • No response.

Mr. Feldman asked for a motion to adjourn.
  • Ms. O’Hare moved to adjourn the meeting.
  • Ms. Jones seconded the motion.
    • Meeting was adjourned.