

**Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) Meeting
June 12, 2014**

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Locations (Video-conferenced):

Grant Sawyer Building, Room 4412, 500 E Washington Street, Las Vegas
Nevada State Legislature, Room 4100, 401 S Carson Street, Carson City
Great Basin College, High Tech Center Room 123, 5100 College Parkway, Elko

GMAC Members Present

Al Conklin
Cindy Roragen
Connie McMullen
Dan Musgrove
Deborah Campbell
Ina Dorman
Jeff Fontaine
Kevin Schiller
Michele Howser

GMAC Members Absent

Arthur De Joya
David Jensen
John Thurman
Marcia O'Malley
Pauline Salla

DHHS Staff Present

Amber Joiner, Deputy Director of Programs, DHHS
Laurie Olson, Chief, Grants Management Unit (GMU), DHHS
Angela Owings, Cindy Smith, Gary Gobelman, Gloria Sulhoff, Pat Petrie, DHHS GMU

I. Welcome and Call to Order

GMAC Chair Jeff Fontaine welcomed the members and called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was confirmed.

Laurie Olson, Chief of the Grants Management Unit, announced that long-time Department Director Mike Willden had been appointed as the Governor's new Chief of Staff. His last day as DHHS Director would be June 13, 2014. Romaine Gilliland has been appointed as the new Director. Mr. Gilliland has served as Administrator of the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. Ms. Olson also announced that, due to an oversight in not having identified agenda Item VI as an action item, the committee will not be able to vote on that item. Statute requires that all action items be clearly identified as such on the meeting notice and agenda, and prohibits action when that language is missing. Ms. Olson apologized for the oversight and suggested the committee move through the agenda item short of a vote, and schedule a teleconference for the purpose of voting on that item.

II. Public Comment

Lisa Bonnie, Executive Director of the Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living, a current grantee, reported that they met their first-year goal of completing maintenance on 13 ramps, at a cost of \$11,800. Replacement would have cost more than \$29,000, a savings of \$17,200. She thanked the GMAC and was looking forward to year two of the grant.

III. Approval of Minutes - GMAC Meeting March 13, 2014 and GMAC Needs Assessment Subcommittee Meeting June 2, 2014

Connie McMullen requested a correction to the minutes of the June 2, 2014 subcommittee meeting. Her public comment statement should be changed from “county commissioners listed” to “the report listed.”

Dan Musgrove pointed out an error in the minutes of the March 13, 2014 GMAC meeting. On the last page, he was twice incorrectly identified as Dan Thurman.

- Mr. Musgrove moved to approve both sets of minutes with changes as noted. The motion was seconded by Connie McMullen and carried unopposed.

IV. Report on 2014 Community Needs Assessment

Ms. Olson gave a brief review of the needs assessment report, noting that it had been reviewed extensively during the Needs Assessment Subcommittee meeting. Input from the nine public forums held across the state and the nearly 2,400 responses to an online and hard-copy survey resulted in the identification of the following top four service categories, ranked in the same order by both forum participants and survey respondents: 1) Health/Mental Health; 2) Family Support; 3) Food Security; and 4) Support for Persons with Disabilities and their Caregivers. The top four categories remained consistent when sorted by geographic area and by provider versus non-provider respondents, although their rankings varied somewhat.

The needs assessment report also included new ideas suggested by assessment participants; common threads that crossed all survey answers (lack of transportation, lack of information about available services, and the need for integration of services); a demographic analysis; a listing of all service categories cited by participants; highlights from the public forums; and recommendations from the 2012 needs assessment.

Angela Owings, Food Security Coordinator with the Office of Food Security, noted that the food security subcategories listed in the report – nutrition, children, SNAP, home-delivered meals, and WIC – also were identified as priorities in Nevada’s Plan for Action regarding food security. Available resources are being underutilized by those who qualify for the programs. Those who do not qualify for SNAP and other programs tend to utilize food pantries repeatedly. Subsequently, there has been a dramatic increase in the use of pantries. Transportation is also a concern; the GMU-funded “one-stop shops” are delivering food to local neighborhoods because clients lack transportation.

In response to a question regarding the broad category of “health/mental health and related services”, Ms. Olson stated that the most frequent survey response for needs in this category was “mental health,” followed by tobacco use, substance abuse, and suicide prevention.

V. GMAC 2014 Needs Assessment Subcommittee Recommendations

Dan Musgrove, chair of the Needs Assessment Subcommittee, reported that the subcommittee, which included GMAC members Al Conklin, Deborah Campbell and Marcia O’Malley, met on June 2, 2014 and reviewed the needs assessment report in detail.

The subcommittee considered the potential impact of Medicaid expansion through the Affordable Care Act (ACA) for people who previously had been uninsured and whether that would lessen the need for health services, allowing the GMAC to place dollars elsewhere. The group agreed it was too early to

determine the impact of the ACA. They also considered including secondary priorities that ranked lower than the top four, such as transportation, access to services, and information and referral. They concluded not to deviate from the assessment results, and supported the recommendations compiled by the Department, which were to prioritize the top four categories of Health/Mental Health, Family Support, Food Security, and Support for Persons with Disabilities. They felt all four categories were equally important, and did not assign priority rankings.

The subcommittee heard testimony from members of the public in Carson City, Las Vegas and Elko which supported the assessment findings. There was also public comment supporting the funding of tobacco prevention and cessation programs.

Ms. Campbell commented on the growing population in the rural areas and noted the low attendance at the public forums in those areas. She suggested reaching out to the rural population to identify any gaps in program services which might be addressed in the Request for Applications (RFA for FY16-17).

VI. GMAC Recommendations on FY15-16 Funding Priority Recommendations

Discussion

Ms. McMullen stated that lack of transportation was the top concern in the Aging and Disability Services Division's (ADSD) needs assessment, and she would like to see that included under Support for Persons with Disabilities. Ms. Howser restated the importance of not duplicating State or Federal funding, and supported the results of the GMAC needs assessment as presented.

Ms. Olson was asked to describe the grant process after the GMAC submits their funding priority recommendations. She explained that the Department Director reviews the GMAC recommendations along with reports from the Commission on Aging (CoA) and the Commission on Services for Persons with Disabilities (CSPD). The Director will take all recommendations and other funding sources such as Medicaid and the ACA into consideration, and decide what to put forth in the next budget. The spending plan goes through an approval process by the Department of Administration, the Governor, and finally the Legislature. Ms. Olson added that the GMU will probably not directly administer mental health programs because the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) is better equipped to do so. GMU-administered funds would be better utilized by funding hunger projects, family support services and programs that support persons with disabilities and their caregivers. Ms. Olson said the grant process involves more than conducting an assessment and choosing funding priorities. The Department is also required to examine what is already in place and what is required by statute, and ensure that funds from FHN are not used to supplant State or Federal funds. Once the Department is fairly certain where the money is going, the RFA is developed for publication in January. GMAC subcommittees review the proposals that are submitted, and formulate funding recommendations to present to the GMAC at the May 2015 meeting. Once approved, the GMAC recommendations are forwarded to the Department Director who makes all final decisions for the next funding cycle beginning July 1, 2015.

Mr. Fontaine asked how Nevada 2-1-1 fits into the priorities and its funding history. Ms. Olson explained that statute requires the DHHS to establish and maintain a single information and referral number called 2-1-1, but does not identify a funding stream. It has been funded by cobbling together money from various sources including Title XX, FHN and the United Healthcare settlement. For FY14, a decision was made to continue funding the program at around \$500,000, all from FHN, to facilitate grant management and stability. The Department has not solicited for 2-1-1 funding, and because a working system is in place, there are no plans to solicit for it, but GMU staff are working to diversify the funding.

The GMAC discussed issues surrounding 2-1-1 and the public's lack of awareness of the program. Mr. Fontaine suggested tabling the discussion until the next meeting, at which time they might consider specific recommendations on how to diversify and enhance funding, and how to integrate 2-1-1 to ensure it is meeting the needs of constituents. He requested a full report at the next meeting.

Public Comment

Ms. Olson stated that the Department received written public comment from the Nevada Tobacco Prevention Coalition supporting tobacco control programs. The document was provided for the record.

Cherie Jamason, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, urged the GMAC to prioritize the State's plan to decrease hunger and stated that more food is needed, particularly in rural areas and in certain Las Vegas zip code areas. She stressed the importance of access to available resources, especially in areas that lack grocery stores, or for those who have money to purchase food but have no way to get to the store. She would like to map availability to need by neighborhood. The State Demographer has mapped poverty among all zip codes; this would facilitate the process of targeting where the needs are by income levels.

Paula Buckley, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, stated that she supports food security, but also encouraged the committee to review 2-1-1, adding that Nevada is the only state in the country that does not specifically designate funds for 2-1-1. The original proposal was to fund the program with five cents from every phone bill as a give-back to communities by the utilities. Now that the program is up and running, she thought that a request could be made for one or two cents to increase resources, noting that with consistent funding to support an advertising budget to get the word out, people would be more prone to keeping their information up to date in the system. She stated she would support funding 2-1-1 in the Legislature.

Judy Andréson, Family Resource Center (FRC) of Northeastern Nevada, spoke in support of increased funding for the FRCs, which are uniquely able to address all top four service categories. The FRCs have an amazing ability to accomplish a lot for the funding they receive and to collaborate with other agencies. People, especially in the rural areas, come to the FRC daily to connect with services.

Adoption

Mr. Fontaine stated that no action could be taken on this item, but the committee could discuss and formulate a recommendation to be voted on at a forthcoming meeting. Consideration would be given to adopting the recommendations that the subcommittee made under agenda item V to follow the priorities as listed in the needs assessment report and a recommendation regarding 2-1-1 funding enhancements. Mr. Musgrove asked that consideration also be given to ensure their recommendations do not duplicate dollars from other sources, and be as unique as possible to serve unmet needs.

VII. Public Comment

Judy Andréson asked if the GMAC would be ranking the four categories by priority. Mr. Musgrove replied that the subcommittee gave them equal weight, leaving that option at the discretion of the full committee, and the GMAC had not discussed that today.

Angela Phillips, Las Vegas North FRC, shared her discouragement at the lack of awareness regarding FRCs and the services they provide. Because the FRCs are funded through FHN, she encouraged the GMAC to take advantage of their programs. She also stated that she participated in one of the public forums where she spoke frankly about the challenges agencies have with 2-1-1.

Don Jackson, University of Reno, Center for Excellence, Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Nevada, asked about the amount of funding that will be available in the next cycle. Ms. Olson replied that information was not yet available, but once the FHN spending plan is in place, it will be made available to the public.

Cherie Jamason, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, urged the GMAC to support funding for the FRCs, adding that when people need food, they also need other resources because hunger and poverty are intertwined.

VIII. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

Having concluded all business, Mr. Fontaine adjourned the meeting at 10:50 a.m.