

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)
Fund for Healthy Nevada Disability Subcommittee**

**DRAFT Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2019**

Meeting Locations (Video conferenced)

Carson City: Division of Public and Behavioral Health, 4150 Technology Way, Room 303

Las Vegas: Division of Public and Behavioral Health, 4220 S. Maryland Pkwy, Bldg. D Ste. 810

Members Present

Leslie Bittleston
Stacy Gilbert
Tom McCoy

Members Absent

None

Department Staff Present

Connie Lucido, Chief, Cathy Council, Julieta Mendoza, Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG), DHHS Director's Office

Others Present

Amy Dewitt-Smith, Neighboring Network of Northern Nevada
Korine Viehweg, RAVE
Gene Payton, Blind Connect
Jane Gardner, University Nevada Reno (UNR)
Konnie Viehueg, Northern Nevada RAVE
Melanie Barkley, Nevada Rural counties RVP
Taylor Diamond, RAVE

I. Call to Order, Roll Call and Announcements.

Leslie Bittleston, Chair, called the Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC), Fund for Healthy Nevada Disability Subcommittee meeting to order at 1:00 PM. Ms. Bittleston took roll call and a quorum was confirmed.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Discussion of 2020-2021 Grant Award Request for Application (RFA) Reviews

Ms. Bittleston opened the meeting with the discussion of the Request for Application (RFA) and what she looked for in each application that was submitted. Ms. Bittleston stated she looked for the disability determination. Some applicants stated they would use the Sierra, Rural and Desert Regional Centers, for disability determination or use Social Security Administration documentation to determine disability. Ms. Bittleston stated she was not looking at how to define the disability, but how to determine how the participants are eligible for the services and how will the applicant addressed potential Medicaid eligibility due to Medicaid covered services to prevent duplicate services. Ms. Bittleston asked the other committee members for their responses.

- Tom McCoy stated this was his first time going through this process and thanked everyone for their applications. Mr. McCoy stated his overall observation was learning about non-profit services. As a member of the public, the community does not expose what the organizations are providing.
- Stacy Gilbert seconded what Mr. McCoy stated and added that the collaboration between partners are amazing.

Ms. Bittleston stated that the funds are not enough for all the applications that were received and what she will be looking and promoting is recovering services which is the direct services. Ms. Bittleston proposed ranking the applicants based off scores and funding at 100% until the funds run out, the second option would be to cut funding in every applicant and giving 70 to 75%, so more applicants can get funding or go into each budget and seeing where there can be cuts in operating costs compared to direct services areas.

- Mr. McCoy stated he would like to see something for everyone and would like to look at the who is providing direct services.
- Ms. Gilbert agrees with the direct services.

Ms. Bittleston asked Connie Lucido and Julieta Mendoza, how feasible it would be to have Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) staff to go back into each application and look at where the direct services verses operating costs are and rank from there?

- Ms. Lucido said that the recommendations on what direction to go for cutting need to come from the Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) Subcommittee and the staff could do that.

Ms. Bittleston responded that is understandable, and what she would consider direct services would be bus tickets, vouchers, staff that perform direct services such as respite or day care. Ms. Bittleston asked if there were comments from committee members.

- Ms. Gilbert responded that she agrees with direct services.
- Mr. McCoy responded there may be some basic operational costs that need to be addressed, because they can't provide the service without them.

Ms. Bittleston stated that may be a difficult task to do for staff because they would have to determine what service is needed just by looking at a basic budget and most of these applicants receive additional funding. Ms. Bittleston asked if Ms. Mendoza has a comment since she went through each budget detail.

- Ms. Mendoza responded that direct services could be differently defined by each person, and wouldn't want to put the applicants in the position where there are many definitions of direct services when it should be just one.

Ms. Bittleston replied she agrees and this may not be feasible. Ms. Bittleston suggested to fund by rank, which would be the fairest and the people who don't get funded can reapply next year. Ms. Bittleston asked for comment.

- Mr. McCoy stated he was trying to go in whatever direction would maximize funding for the programs, and he was under the impression that DHHS (Department of Health and Human Services) would have a certain definition for direct and indirect services, asked Ms. Lucido if that is not correct.
- Ms. Lucido replied that in this funding it is not defined, but can be in the future. Ms. Lucido suggested that she would recommend the committee review starting by alphabetizing, listing strengths and weaknesses. Ms. Lucido added for example, maybe funding a car would not be direct, that is just an example.

Ms. Bittleston responded she agrees with doing that and moving to application number one (Accessible Space) is proposing services under the independent living category. Ms. Bittleston added they focus on individuals with traumatic brain injuries and physical disabilities, but one thing that stood out was great organizational chart and strategic plan. Ms. Bittleston continued that she scored them a little lower on collaboration due to no MOUs (Memorandum of Understanding). Ms. Bittleston added they do use CMS (Centers for Medicaid Services) standard for disability determination, they do have other funding sources and great outcomes for their patients. Ms. Bittleston asked for comment.

- Mr. McCoy stated his comments are similar and is aware of the reduction that happened with the changes to Medicaid, asked if they were talking about general rankings.

Ms. Bittleston responded yes and stated she scored them a 73.

- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them a 77.
- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them an 85.

Ms. Lucido stated the ranking spreadsheet will be up after the meeting.

Ms. Bittleston suggested to go on to applicant number two, Ms. Lucido asked to go over the Accessible Space budget quickly. Ms. Bittleston agreed.

Ms. Lucido stated they are requesting \$111,361 in salary costs, \$1,574 in travel costs, and operating or equipment costs they are not requesting funds for. Ms. Lucido added there is \$14,320 being requested for project workers that are not FTE (Full Time Employees) which equals a total budget of \$135,000 and some change. Ms. Lucido suggested the committee could consider some of those expenditures and identify what would be considered indirect and direct services by the committee.

Ms. Bittleston responded position number one is a life skills trainer, which she would consider a direct service. Position number two is also a life skills trainer, position number three is a coordinator supervisor which she is unsure. The fourth position is the administrator of accessible space which they are asking for 20% of the time, Ms. Bittleston added she understands that position is needed but can't define it as a direct service cost. Ms. Bittleston continued the next position is the accounts receivable biller which she would not define as a direct service, but the last one is an occupational therapist and she would define that as a direct service.

- Mr. McCoy agreed.
- Ms. Gilbert agreed.

Ms. Bittleston announced the next applicant is Blind Connect and they offer independent living service specifically for the blind. Ms. Bittleston added this is a great application because there isn't many services out there for the blind and they did a good job of tying their services together, however the strategic plan could have been better and most of their staff has less than 6 years of experience. Ms. Bittleston added that they have a great explanation of their service delivery, the cost of their services is well below market price, they use a lot of volunteers and overall they were a great evaluation piece which is why she scored them a 76.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them a 78.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at 80, and he fully agrees with Ms. Bittleston's comments. Mr. McCoy added he was very impressed with the fact that they are creatively making use of things for multiple purposes.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting 3,138 in travel expenses, \$33,000 for equipment purchases, \$46,905 in contractors (a program manager, a case manager, a daily life skills instructor, a mental health provider, a technology assistant, and two orientation mobility instructors.) Ms. Bittleston continued that travel costs are by her definition a direct service, the equipment costs only stated computers and computer related equipment which she would not categorize as a direct service, and for staff she would recommend that the instructors and mental health provider would be considered direct services.

- Mr. McCoy commented that perhaps the equipment to help with independence of the blind should be considered a direct service.

Ms. Bittleston responded that she believes it would depend on what it is exactly but that is something that staff could go back and analyze.

- Ms. Lucido confirmed that they would do so.

Ms. Bittleston moved on to the next applicant which is Churchill County Social Services which is a local government entity that provides wrap around services or services not covered by other government entities. Ms. Bittleston continued stating they have great collaboration with many community partners, also using the code of federal regulation to define disability, but is wondering what exactly wrap around services provide since it is not well defined. Ms. Bittleston added they do work in rural areas which is great but their outcomes were not as strong as some of the other applications.

Ms. Bittleston stated she scored this application a 72.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored this application a 94 because they are in rural areas which is where the wrap around services ties in, and she understood what they were trying to relay in that aspect and understands the importance of this factor in rural areas.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored this application an 81 and wanted to point out that the application proved to be very cost effective.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are also asking for 5% of an office assistants time, 7% of the book keepers time, \$1,152 in tribal assistance, and \$122,524 in operation costs would include services such as cell phones for staff members.

- Ms. Gilbert commented she could justify the cell phones for staff since they are going to be travelling.
- Mr. McCoy agreed as long as the cost is reasonable.

Ms. Bittleston added there is also project workers being requested.

Ms. Bittleston continued that the only thing she could see in this budget that isn't considered direct would be the book keeper and office manager, however, they are asking for such a small percentage of their time.

- Ms. Gilbert agreed that the percentage they are requesting would not make or break the budget.
- Ms. Lucido commented there are indirect charges as well.

Ms. Bittleston stated that they are a government entity so we are unsure if that is an appropriate charge and would like staff to verify if indirect is for government entities as well.

- Ms. Lucido responded that they would verify.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would move on to the next applicant which is Clark County Social Services and they are wanting to provide housing to homeless and case management services. Ms. Bittleston stated she scored them at a 75.

- Ms. Gilbert, she likes this proposal and scored them a 95.
- Mr. McCoy commented he had an issue with the cost effectiveness, and felt there was not as much direct service as there should have been so he scored them a 68.

Ms. Bittleston added the budget is mostly salary at \$100,196, \$3,470 for travel, funding 100% of an eligibility specialist serving as a client navigator and a housing navigator position. As well as \$62,400 in operating costs which is defined as program supplies and communications.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she would like to see more of a break down on "program supplies" and what that is.
- Ms. Mendoza responded that they have listed justification on the next page.

Ms. Bittleston thanked Ms. Mendoza and summarized that program supplies will include (but are not limited to) hygiene kits, move-in kits, bus passes, transportation support, food support, and support to supplement what is received from community resources which she believes those are all very much direct services.

- Ms. Mendoza added it is also listed that each employee would get one tablet and one cell phone to utilize while in the field.

Ms. Bittleston asked if these are new positions.

- Ms. Mendoza replied that FY18-19 Clark County received funding for these positions so they are new, and if the committee would like the staff to go back and see if these items were previously provided funding for they would do so.

Ms. Bittleston responded she would like them to do so, and asked if there were any other comments from committee members. No Response.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would move on to the next applicant which is DETR (Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation), which is a stated agency and they are proposing services for adaptive resources with a case manager component. Ms. Bittleston added that it looked like they would be purchasing assistive devices and train disabled individuals to use these devices, also they have very good outcomes with individuals who use their services. Ms. Bittleston stated that one thing she was confused on was their disability determination piece, and what criteria they would set. Ms. Bittleston continued that their strategic plan was very good, and she has scored them an 83.

- Ms. Gilbert replied that she scored them a 95 because she thought the collaboration was fantastic as well as the recycling the devices for use in the future, that is very cost effective.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them a 73.

Ms. Bittleston continued that this applicants request is 100% for equipment, \$161,250 to purchase assistive devices however they do not list the type of equipment. Ms. Bittleston also added that the application did talk about using these funds for a federal match, which she is not sure if that is a direct service and asked Ms. Mendoza if she could look further into this definition and if there were any additional comments. There was no response from the committee.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to the next applicant which is Dignity Health, a component of St. Rose Hospital in the Las Vegas area. Ms. Bittleston added they have a wonderful board of directors, and an extremely comprehensive strategic plan. Added they have good collaboration and a waiting list for their services, as well as noted that the hospital covers all the administrative costs. Ms. Bittleston continued that she believes the weakest part of this application was the outcomes, but overall she scored this application as an 88.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored this application as a 92 and agrees with everything Ms. Bittleston stated.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored this application as an 86.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$39,765 for administrative costs, \$11,021 for operating costs including gas and repairs for transportation, \$61,956 for mileage reimbursement. Ms. Bittleston commented in her opinion the gas and mileage is direct service but they are requesting other positions such as a Program Supervisor, Intake Coordinator, a Scheduler, and four Driver positions.

- Ms. Lucido agrees there is some indirect costs in this proposal as well, so they will provide some better details on these in the next meeting.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would go to the next applicant, which is Neighbor Network and they have two separate budget proposals. Ms. Bittleston stated they would go over the respite program first, where they do not use a voucher system, instead they go by age guidelines. Ms. Bittleston continued the staff has good qualifications, their strategic plan is excellent, good collaboration, their service is below market price, and utilize volunteers. Ms. Bittleston added they provide at-home respite, and one thing that stood out to her about this application is they stated a lot of home health agencies lack person-centered approaches, which she does not agree with. Ms. Bittleston continued that they talked about the ability to hire a friend or family member to be a respite provider and provide training to those people which she thinks is great. Ms. Bittleston concluded that she scored them an 81 overall.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them an 86 and like the training of family members element they outlined.
- Mr. McCoy noted that they are listed as a pilot program, so he scored them at 68.

Ms. Bittleston stated the budget for Neighbor Network is requesting \$74,145 for salaries, including positions such as an Executive Director for 50%, a Project Coordinator for 50%, Community Care Partners for 37.5%, which provide respite care services to family. Ms. Bittleston asked for comment from the other committee members.

- Ms. Gilbert asked if there was a different salary percentage being requested on the other application they were submitting.

Ms. Bittleston responded the other grant proposal lists 50%, so they would be covering 100% between both grants. Ms. Bittleston stated she doesn't really see the Executive Director position as direct service, but the other positions she does.

Ms. Bittleston stated they would be moving on to the second grant proposal which is for Transportation Service, and they have provided the same application. Ms. Bittleston added they are only offering 68 participants and from what she can see it would be offering those participants a 75% discount on services. Ms. Bittleston stated she scored them as an 81.

- Ms. Gilbert noted that she scored them at an 85 because they listed they would be partnering with Lyft and she thinks there would be other ways to utilize funding that would be more cost effective.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored this application at a 75.
- Ms. Lucido asked Mr. McCoy what his score was for their previous application, for respite.
- Mr. McCoy responded 68.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting 50% of salary for the Executive Director, 50% of the Project Coordinator, a Van Driver at 100%, two after-hours ride dispatchers at 100%, for a total of \$88,705. Added that they are requesting operating costs of \$3,600, and "other" expenses for \$83,330. Ms. Bittleston explained the other category is defined as insurance for the vehicle, gas mileage, background checks for employees, first aid classes, preventative maintenance, a match for a new wheelchair accessible van, accounting and payroll services, vehicle repairs, and \$48,960 on Lyft tickets. Ms. Bittleston asked for comment.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she would agree with the insurance being direct.
- Mr. McCoy noted that he was very impressed that NDOT donated vehicles to be utilized instead of putting them up for auction for a tiny amount of money to be received.

Ms. Bittleston agreed and proposed that the Van Driver at 100% is absolutely a direct service but wasn't sure about the two afterhours dispatchers at 100%.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would go on to the next applicant Nevada Rural Counties which has two applications, and they would start with the Independent Living proposal. Ms. Bittleston stated she liked this application because it talked about providing services to fourteen rural counties, they utilize volunteers, and they have good collaboration. Ms. Bittleston continued they provided their mileage and number of trips they have completed, volunteer time is in-kind, drivers provide a monthly status report. Ms. Bittleston stated she scored them an 88 overall.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them a 94 due to the transportation in the rural counties.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them an 84.

Ms. Bittleston stated their budget is asking \$52,187 for staff, 30% of time for their Transportation Coordinator, 30% of the time their Program Director, 10% of the time for the Mileage Checker. Ms. Bittleston added she isn't sure how much of these are direct service.

- Ms. Gilbert responded that the Mileage Checker doesn't sound very direct and asked does the Program Director position have a description listed.

Ms. Bittleston responded the description for this position is “manages the transportation program including volunteer and client recruitment, field and staff supervision, compliance and mileage reimbursement.”

- Ms. Gilbert stated she is now wondering what the Transportation Coordinator does.

Ms. Bittleston responded the description for that position is almost the same, one exception being that the Transportation Coordinator collects surveys which she would think is not very high up on the direct service list. Ms. Bittleston stated they were also asking for operating costs of \$728 for postage, \$3,000 for two computers and four monitors for staff, and \$52,500 for drivers and mileage. Ms. Bittleston stated she believes that the “other” category would be considered direct service in her opinion.

- Ms. Gilbert and Mr. McCoy agreed.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to the next applicant which is Nevada RSVP Rural Respite, and she believes that their application was good because it’s in the rural community and they had great collaboration. Ms. Bittleston stated that the cost effectiveness was not the best but they had great outcomes so she scored them at a 79.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them an 84.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at 84 as well.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are asking for \$72,400 in personnel, 50% of the time for the Respite Manager, 50% of the time for the Respite Coordinator, 10% of the time for the Controller, and 50% of the time for the Program Director. Ms. Bittleston added she isn’t sure how much of these positions would be considered direct. Ms. Bittleston continued they are also asking for travel expenses of \$4,178, \$2,400 for office supplies and postage, which they are not very specific on what kind of office supplies but she can understand the travel expenses because they are doing rural areas. and “other” expenses for \$132,450 that is defined as cell phones tablets and newspaper adds. Ms. Bittleston stated she can understand the need for the cell phones and tablets but doesn’t know if she can agree with the advertising, and asked for thoughts from the other committee members.

- Ms. Gilbert responded she would understand advertising for rural communities but even so it is not a direct service so should not be considered.
- Mr. McCoy responded that there must be some sort of outreach to make people aware of a service but isn’t sure how that ties into direct service either.

Ms. Bittleston added they are also asking a small amount for back ground checks which she assumes is for the drivers, and she can tie that to direct service.

- Ms. Mendoza stated they were funded for FY18-19 they were funded for advertising.

Ms. Bittleston responded that she doesn’t think it is a bad cost but looking at direct services she believes that should be removed.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would move on to the next applicant which is Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living. Ms. Bittleston continued this is another program for the blind and impaired vision which serves youth up to 22 years of age. Ms. Bittleston stated this application did not have a robust strategic plan and the back-ground information was lacking. Ms. Bittleston added that she scored this application a 64.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them at 88 but noticed that there was not any MOUs (Memorandum of Understandings) in place.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at a 78 because he believes that the services for the blind and vision impaired in these areas are vital. Mr. McCoy also noted that they listed they are going from part time to full time.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$18,720 for 50% of a part time Blindness Advocacy and Resource Officer, \$4,867 for travel, \$2,120 in operating which is defined as brail paper and cell phones. Ms. Bittleston continued they are also requesting \$2,900 for equipment which is defined as new software and a new laptop. Ms. Bittleston added they are also requesting \$1,450 for “other” expenses

which is defined as safety vests, and Information materials such as brochures. Ms. Bittleston stated as far as direct expenses she can justify the travel but isn't sure about the Blindness Advocacy Officer, and asked for comment on the equipment requested.

- Mr. McCoy responded he believes it can be justified as part of the overall goal of the service.

Ms. Bittleston stated moving on to the other category, they may need more information on the safety vests before deciding whether it is direct or indirect, also the brochures as well.

- Ms. Mendoza responded that the safety vests would account for only \$200 of the whole budget, and that she missed Ms. Bittleston's first comment regarding the position requested.

Ms. Bittleston responded the position is unclear whether it is direct or not and they would like more clarification.

- Ms. Mendoza stated she understood

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to Northern Nevada RAVE and they provide in home respite care for Reno, Carson City, and Elko. Ms. Bittleston continued they have youth volunteers, a great board, a great collaboration, are utilizing a FRC (Family Resource Center) for a respite site, and have a new site in Sparks called the Rock Church. Ms. Bittleston added they described well their disability definition and they have a physician that determines the client's disability. Ms. Bittleston stated their service delivery was good and below market pricing, and provided great historical data for their services provided in the past. Ms. Bittleston stated she has scored them at 84.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them at 90.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at an 84 as well.

Ms. Bittleston stated they have requested \$180,898 in personnel costs for a Respite Coordinator at 55%, a Family Coordinator for 60%, a Respite Service Provider for 60%. Ms. Bittleston added these are part time positions that work under the direction of the Volunteer Respite Coordinator and provide the direct services. Ms. Bittleston stated they are also requesting 75% of the time for Respite Service Providers in Carson City and Elko, 18% of the time for the Executive Director. Ms. Bittleston commented as far as direct services, she believes the Respite Service Providers would be direct service but the others are more administrative. Ms. Bittleston stated in addition to that they are requesting \$2,000 for travel, \$70,196 in operating costs, \$3,444 for office supplies. Ms. Bittleston continued she believes some of this is direct but some is not. Ms. Bittleston stated volunteer staff training and back ground checks should be considered direct but rent utilities and office supplies should not. Ms. Bittleston added they are requesting \$16,539 in "other" expenses which is defined as audit costs, insurance, scholarships, and advertising. Ms. Bittleston asked if they need to have an audit.

- Ms. Mendoza responded that most them should have an audit.

Ms. Bittleston stated she isn't sure what type of insurance they are referencing so that should be looked at. Ms. Bittleston continued we would need more information on the scholarships but she is sure the advertising would not be direct.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to Nevada Outreach Training Organization which is a Pahrump FRC in Nye County and they have a good board and bylaws. Ms. Bittleston added they have been in existence for a long time, have good collaboration, utilize volunteers, and many different funding sources. Ms. Bittleston noted that their weak area she believes is their outcomes and has scored them at 76.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them at 89.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at 74.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$35,800 in staff, 85% of the Independent Living Program Manager, and 10% of the time for the Executive Director. Ms. Bittleston added she would consider the first position direct but not the second. Ms. Bittleston continued they are requesting \$10,666 in travel, which she could justify since they are taking care of rural areas. Ms. Bittleston continued they are requesting \$2,858 in operating, which is defined as phone, internet, and office supplies and she would

define those as administrative. Ms. Bittleston added \$27,485 in “other” costs which is defined as printing services, utilities, AmeriCorps posting fee, audit, and housing utility which she would define as non-direct services.

- Ms. Gilbert noted the AmeriCorps fees could be for volunteers so that may be direct service.

Ms. Bittleston asked staff to get clarification on that fact.

- Ms. Mendoza commented that some of the rent and utilities may fall under direct service if the clients are coming into the office.

Ms. Bittleston responded she could understand that and was looking at this more as a rural county service so assumed there would be more travelling out but if clients are coming in she would agree it would be a direct service.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be going on to the next applicant which is Positively Kids and they provide respite for special needs youth from ages 0-18, in home or center. Ms. Bittleston added they are in Clark County and are costing \$26 an hour but was left with questions around the collaboration and sustainability area. Ms. Bittleston stated she scored them at 59.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them at 41 because she struggled with the application as well.

- Mr. McCoy stated he scored it a 62 with similar issues as the other committee members.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$92,919 for personnel costs, 20% of a RN (Registered Nurse) who provides care coordination, 100% of a LPN (Licensed Practical Nurse) in a full-time daycare setting, 100% of a LPN for individual respite, a CAN (unknown definition) for 100% respite care. Ms. Bittleston noted that she believes the LPNs and CAN would be considered direct service but believes the RN may be more supervisory and asked that the staff gather more information on that.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to Southern Nevada CHIPS (Community Health Improvement Program), who is a respite program. Ms. Bittleston commented she noticed they have a very small board and being in the nonprofit field she knows how important a good board is so she put that as a weakness on this application. Ms. Bittleston added they have great collaboration, but is curious to the applicants comment in the application that states their services will reduce the use of 9-1-1. Ms. Bittleston added she would have liked to see more services and less staff on this application which goes toward the cost effectiveness category, and their outcome data was okay. Ms. Bittleston stated she scored this application at 59.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them at 93.

- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at 76, and the 9-1-1 comment he thinks is to discourage using it for services that they themselves can provide.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$207,546 in personnel costs, 55% of their Program Manager’s time, 72% of a Social Worker that does case management for assessment, 100% of a Case Worker, 55% of Support Staff, and 100% of Case Management Referral and Assessment. Ms. Bittleston noted that this is one of the reasons she scored them lower because most of their funds would go to staff. Ms.

Bittleston continued they are requesting \$3,030 in travel, \$8,000 in operating which is defined as office supplies and communication. Ms. Bittleston asked for comment from the committee on what they are requesting for personnel costs.

- Ms. Gilbert responded that she can see the Case Worker positions as direct.

- Mr. McCoy agreed.

Ms. Bittleston stated to staff that they are defining the two Case Worker positions as direct service.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to the next applicant which is the UNR (University of Nevada Reno) Path to Independence Program, whom offers a certificate program to students with intellectual disabilities which provides them college experience. Ms. Bittleston stated they do paid student employment, unpaid student internships, workshops, and overall to give the children college experience. Ms. Bittleston added they have good collaboration but noted that they will not serve a high number of children, maybe 3-6 a year. Ms. Bittleston stated she scored this application at 86.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she scored them at 92.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at 83 and he isn't surprised at the small number of students they are able to take in because it is very costly.

Ms. Bittleston stated the only request they have is scholarships for 3 students per year coming out to \$10,680 and she very much considers that a direct service.

Ms. Bittleston announced they would be moving on to the last applicant which is UNR Positive Behavior Support and they cover all Behavioral Analyst work such as workshops and therapy sessions. Ms. Bittleston continued they have a great strategic background but to her it was a very hard application to read just because of the service. Ms. Bittleston noted they have great collaboration with Washoe Clark and Rural counties, they're serving those with developmental disabilities through workshops, they're using applied behavior analysis as their foundation of service, they do workshops as well as in-home sessions. Ms. Bittleston added they included a great description of the workshops and the quality of life after the workshops, however she got confused on how these are being paid. Ms. Bittleston concluded that she scored this application at 76.

- Ms. Gilbert responded that she scored them at an 86 because their collaboration seemed broad.
- Mr. McCoy stated he scored them at a 76.

Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$267,053 in personnel costs, 10% of the Project Director, 25% of the Administrative Assistant, 100% of the Clinical Supervisor, 50% of the Northwest Coordinator, 60% of the time of the Behavioral Analyst Trainer, 50% of the time of the Southern Coordinator, 100% of the time of the Southern Trainer, 40% of the time of the Northwest Coordinator, and 100% of the Trainer. Ms. Bittleston stated they are requesting \$11,850 in travel, and 8% of indirect cost. Ms. Bittleston stated they have a lot of personnel requests, but she believes the highest profile position of the Clinical Supervisor which has a salary of over \$100,000 would be administrative. Ms. Bittleston stated she would prefer to fund the Region Trainers over the Region Coordinators as they provide more of a direct service. Ms. Bittleston stated the travel expenses of course she would define as direct.

- Ms. Mendoza commented she wanted to point out that this is the only application for Positive Behavioral Support.

Ms. Bittleston responded this applicant asked for the maximum amount the committee could award in this category.

Ms. Bittleston asked now that they are through all applications, does the committee want to recommend to the GMAC (Grants Management and Analysis Committee) to fund direct services first based on ranking and does staff want to let them know what the ranking is as of now.

- Ms. Lucido requested a five-minute break to put that together.

Ms. Bittleston granted the break.

IV. Approve Grant Award Recommendations

Coming back from the break, Ms. Bittleston announced that Ms. Lucido will now read the ranks and then the committee would make their recommendations.

- Ms. Lucido stated the rankings are as follows: #1 Dignity Healthy and #2 Nevada RSVP Independent Living are tied, #3 is UNR Path to Independence, #4 is Northern Nevada RAVE, #5 is Nevada RSVP Respite, #6 is DETR, #7 is Churchill County, #8 is Neighbor Network Independent Living, #9 is Nevada Outreach Training Organization, #10 Clark County Services for Independent Living, #11 is UNR Positive Behavioral Support, #12 is Accessible Space, #13 is Neighbor Network Respite, #14 is Blind Connect, #15 is Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living, #16 is Northern Nevada CHIP, and #17 is Positively Kids.

Ms. Bittleston stated that her recommendation to the committee is to recommend to the GMAC that the staff contact each applicant to negotiate what is direct and indirect with them to come up with a new dollar amount based on only direct services, then fund based on the committee's ranking.

- Ms. Gilbert stated she agrees.
- Mr. McCoy asked if they approach it this way and at the end there is left over funds, what will their approach be to spending the left overs?

Ms. Bittleston answered she seriously doubts there will be left over funds but if there is the committee can regather and decide what to do with those.

Ms. Bittleston moved to recommend to the GMAC that OCPG (Office of Community Partnerships and Grants) staff reach out to all grantees and negotiate direct services cost, and provide funding based on the ranking set this day.

- Ms. Gilbert seconded the motion.

The motion carried through unopposed.

V. Public Comment #2

Las Vegas-

- Gene Payton with Blind Connect stated she didn't hear them in the rankings and wondered if they could reiterate that to her.

Ms. Bittleston responded that they were #13.

Carson -

- Korine Viehweg, Northern Nevada RAVE, stated first that she believes the money should be broken down into the three categories; Respite, Independent Living, and Positive Behavior. Ms. Viehweg stated secondly, they have over 320 high school student volunteers so when talking about a Coordinator for Volunteers it is a lot of direct service. Ms. Viehweg continued that in the last 6 years the organization has grown by almost 400% and could not serve the families that they serve without having a Family Coordinator, and concluded that she believes all her personnel besides herself (the Executive Director) should be considered 100% direct service. Ms. Viehweg stated that in her position she has also had to pick up a lot of extra duties and provide a lot of direct service and would like that to be considered as well. Ms. Viehweg added that operating expenses are not paid for by small grants as well so when the State cuts those out of the grant it puts the program in a place that it may not survive because they do not have the community support.
- Jane Gardner, UNR, stated she has people who call their organization and are desperate because they have behavioral or sensory challenges with their children, and everyone she works with is a Licensed Behavioral Analyst and all do training. Ms. Gardner added that she believes they help a lot of State of Nevada families with important issues for children with developmental disabilities and she just wanted to state that to the committee.
- Amy Dewitt-Smith, Neighbor Network of Northern Nevada, stated she supports Ms. Viehweg in her concerns about talk of direct services and hope they will reconsider covering the operational costs.

VI. Additional Announcements and Adjournment.

Ms. Bittleston stated she enjoyed reading everyone's application and feels that everyone is needed; to the applicants, please be honest with costs, so that DHHS staff can have good recommendations.

Meeting adjourned at 2:54 PM.