Draft Minutes of the Thursday, February 25, 2021 meeting

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)

Director's Office, Grants Management Unit (DO-GMU)
Fund for a Healthy Nevada – **Independent Living** – Proposal Evaluation

Thursday, February 25, 2021, 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Video/Teleconference Information:
Per Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006, there will be no physical location required for this video/teleconferenced meeting. Public comments by teleconference are welcome.

Microsoft Teams meeting - Join on your computer or mobile app - Click here to join the meeting

Or call in (audio only) +1 775-321-6111 access number 274617285#

Materials: http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 by Connie Lucido. Ms. Lucido took roll call and established the attendance of the NOFO evaluators.

Evaluators Present:	Also Present:
Fred Schultz	Connie Lucido
Donna Coleman	Julieta Mendoza
Tom McCoy	Cyndee Joncas

II. Public Comment #1

Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.

There was no public comment.

III. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Independent Living – Evaluation Summary
(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido presented the rankings for the eight (8) proposals as a PDF on her shared screen.

Ms. Lucido directed the evaluators attention to the worksheet and explained the process and invited the evaluators to comment.

Fred Schultz made a general comment questioning what percentage of fund-raising money goes to national organizations.

Tom McCoy made a general comment that he felt he had been a bit more focused on form rather than substance because of the new review process. The repetition in the abstract and narrative makes for a lengthy evaluation process. Mr. McCoy said during the previous grant cycle there was a lot of confusion regarding the applicability of percentages. The current process clarified that, and his only negative comment was, again, the emphasis on the form rather than the substance of the application. The scoring matrix made the process fair because it reduced subjectivity by having consistent points to reference. Compliments to the GMU for bringing us forward from where we were.

Fred Schultz also felt the repeated information made for a lengthy process. Mr. Schultz made a general comment praising the GMU team and that he felt the process made the review much more objective and fair.

Donna Coleman made a general comment that information regarding unmet need would be helpful in the future. She added the process was a pleasant surprise and praised the format.

IV. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Independent Living - Proposal Evaluations and Reviews
(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Each proposal was reviewed by the evaluators using the questions listed in the worksheet. Comments were entered into the worksheet document included below.

Proposal 1:	**ALS Association Nevada Chapter**
Abstract:	Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) was first identified in 1869, and later named in 1939 after Lou Gehrig a famous baseball player who lost his life to the devastating disease. ALS is a progressive neurodegenerative disease that affects nerve cells in the brain and the spinal cord. When the motor neurons die, the ability of the brain to initiate and control muscle movement is lost and voluntary muscle action declines. This progressive degeneration of motor neurons eventually leads to paralysis and death. To help individuals facing ALS, the national ALS Association was established in 1985. ***The ALS Association Nevada Chapter, an affiliate of the national association, was founded in 2004; it is the only ALS related non-profit organization in Nevada.*** The mission of the ALS Association Nevada Chapter is to discover treatments and a cure for ALS, and to serve, advocate for, and empower Nevadans affected by ALS to live their lives to the fullest. To that end, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter provide multiple services state- wide for those living with ALS, often referred to as pALS, or People with ALS, and their families. The services provided by the ALS Association Nevada Chapter include providing comprehensive care service coordination; providing adaptive and durable medical equipment and aids for daily living; and coordinating respite and other types of pALS/caregiver community support. Overall, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter provides state-wide direct services to approximately 100 pALS and their families on an annual basis. The broad, diverse array of services currently offered by the ALS Association Nevada Chapter already incorporates many of the targeted programs, services, and activities that are supported by the Fund for Healthy Nevada. To that end, the ALS

	Association Nevada Chapter proposes to support/augment its delivery of Independent Living Services, specifically focusing on 1) Information and Referral Services (care service coordination) and 2) Transportation Services. Specifically, if awarded, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter would augment the following: • **Information and Referral Services:** The ALS Association Nevada Chapter provides comprehensive care coordination services for pALS and their caregivers. Care Service Coordinators are responsible for providing pALS and their caregivers with information about ALS, related resources, and disease management. Care Service Coordinators conduct initial assessments, in-home visits, and phone consultations to identify patient needs and refer to/coordinate support services. This proposal would fund an additional Care Service Coordinator. • **Transportation:** Transportation is critical in allowing pALS to remain independent and to actively engage in their communities. As the ALS disease progresses, accessing transportation that accommodates for pALS safely is often financially challenging. The ALS Association Nevada Chapter currently provides for/coordinates transportation as part of the service array offered for pALS. This includes either making arrangements and payment for vehicle rental directly or providing reimbursement to families for travel/transportation expenses incurred. This proposal includes an additional $10,000 in requested funds specifically to assist in better meeting the unmet demand for transportation related service requests. The total budget request for this proposal is $73,917, including the indirect rate (8%).
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Fred – project has been around for quite a while.
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Fred – not very many partners listed, scope of work objectives 1 and 2 are different but had same activities listed to accomplish those objectives. Donna – would like to have seen examples of families who were benefited by the program. Is program in the North and rural as well? (yes, statewide).
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Donna – average, would have liked to see more money going toward transportation.
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	no comments
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Donna – felt strongly it would be carried out. Tom – sensed it would be carried out, realistic approach.
Are there questions you	no questions

would like the GMU to clarify?	

Proposal 2:	**Dignity Health, St. Rose Dominican, Helping Hands of Henderson**
Abstract:	Dignity Health – St. Rose Dominican's Helping Hands of Henderson Program will provide 125 unduplicated clients living in Henderson age 60 and over with 3,000 one-way rides to support their nutritional needs. We will transport them to food pantries, congregate meals at the City of Henderson Heritage Park Senior Facility and Downtown Senior Center, and grocery stores. Our proposed annual budget of $87,754 will cover the costs of personnel, gasoline, van maintenance and repairs, volunteer mileage reimbursement, and administration. Our volunteers and van drivers will provide the transportation services. By supporting seniors who are living at home and at risk of institutional placement, this cost-effective program will help them to maintain their independence and promote self-sufficiency. In addition to transportation, we will conduct reassurance calls to check on the seniors' well-being and to provide referrals for appropriate social services. We will also administer surveys at six months and one year and use the data to evaluate clients' needs and improve the program. Project performance goals include: 85% of clients reporting an increased level of perceived independence; 95% reduction in clients going without food due to lack of transportation; and 90% of clients rating themselves as "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the services provided. To avoid duplication and ensure program success, we will collaborate with providers throughout the community who offer both transportation and social services, including the Regional Transportation Commission, Helping Hands of Vegas Valley, Lend a Hand of Boulder City, Senior Life Line, City of Henderson, SNAP/EAP, Senior RX, as well as various local food pantries, assisted living facilities, and senior apartments.
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Tom – rated project high because application addressed each section sufficiently without going into over detail. Fred – rated high because of succinctness. Donna – excited to read description of activities, activities were clearly described.
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Donna – unclear qualifications for the riders.
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Donna – totally applicable, clear, and appropriate.
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	Tom – rated proposal high, historically this applicant has gone through this process before and has a good handle on what the budget needs to be, the applicability in terms of services they will provide, and how they will interact with other entities in the area.
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Fred – applicant appears to be familiar with how to do their work, has been around a while and has good results. Concerned regarding picking up clients and inherent problem with scheduling and picking up, time wasted if client not there, picking up clients may be excessive, problem/solutions not addressed. Donna – asked if referring to seniors? Fred – yes, has experience with this challenge. Donna – seems like seniors would be grateful and available.

Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify	What are the qualifications for the riders? How is picking up clients, time wasted if not present, addressed?

Proposal 3:	**Families for Effective Autism Treatment (FEAT) of Southern Nevada**
Abstract:	Families for Effective Autism Treatment (FEAT) of Southern Nevada serves approximately 7,500 individuals with Autism and their families per year. FEAT's service area includes Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson. FEAT proposes to enhance a current program which provides iPads to people with Autism in Southern Nevada. The enhancement will provide iPads plus assessment, instruction, and ongoing mentoring to iPad recipients. This will ensure that each person is using the iPad to its fullest capacity for communication, academics, and independent living skills. According to the Autism Spectrum Disorder Foundation (https://myasdf.org), iPads offer portability and flexibly that a traditional PC or laptop cannot provide to a person with Autism. Since iPads have customizable options and applications, the iPad can be tailored to each person and his/her specific needs. Although the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates school districts to provide needed assistive technology devices (ATD) to students, the Clark County School District, and many other school districts throughout the country, have fallen short in addressing the communication and academic needs of its students with Autism. Through a $60,750 grant from the Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN), FEAT plans to serve a minimum of 50 people with Autism These students and adults will benefit from the iPad for many years to come, and will be able to use it for academic skills, communication, independent living skills, employment skills, and social skills. The assessment will start with gathering baseline data by reviewing IEPs (for students), talking to team members, and direct observation. Once it is determined that an iPad is the correct ATD, there will be initial training on using the iPad for academics or communication. The AT consultant will continue to work with each person to master iPad applications that will teach the skills needed for independence. FEAT will partner with Victor Autism Resources (VARLV) to provide the initial assessment, initial iPad usage set-up and instruction, as well as ongoing mentoring to master academic, communication and independent living skills. While there are several other organizations that serve people with Autism in the Las Vegas area, only FEAT has an iPad scholarship program. If awarded this grant, FEAT with develop Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) that ensure that people with Autism seeking iPad technology will be referred to FEAT. Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) already exist between Autism organizations in Southern Nevada, so people looking for specific services are regularly referred between organizations. Data collection and ongoing project evaluation will inform the activities of the project. An example of data collection for the Proloquo2Go (communication app) will include number of vocabulary words, number of people with whom the person communicates and the ability to communicate increasingly complex thoughts. This data will be collected on spreadsheets as well as in case notes.
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	no comments

Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Donna – confused with the statement "many schools fall short", in what areas are the Clark County School District schools falling short, iPads/Laptops?
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Fred – asking for $60,750, will serve 50 clients, $1,215 per client, which includes iPad, academic skills, employment skills, independent living skills, communication skills, social skills, etc., seems high per client. Donna – felt the same way. Fred – if those skills will be taught in a group, a cluster of clients, $1,215 per client seems high. Tom – has lack of understanding regarding needs and cost of needs, if cost is realistic to move person to position to be more functional then it could be justified, perhaps need more info re: specific costs and how it fits into overall plan, does not have frame of reference for the cost.
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	Tom – questions effectiveness of apply x number of dollars per person, if reasonable then budget is applicable.
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Tom – feels project will be carried out.
Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify?	In what areas are the schools falling short? Is school district supplying iPads? More information re: specific costs for services needed.

Proposal 4:	**Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), University of Nevada Reno (UNR), Path to Independence**
Abstract:	Path to Independence is an inclusive, two-year, non-degree postsecondary education certificate program for students with intellectual disabilities (ID) at the University of Nevada Reno (UNR). In its eighth year of operation, it is housed at the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED) in the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD). P2I had 15 students with ID in the program for the 2019-2020 school year. Three of them had their tuition paid by a similar Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN) grant and will be graduating with a certificate in Community & Career Studies in May. Upon graduation, P2I's employment coordinator will assist them in finding competitive, integrated employment in the community. Without the previous grant funding these three students would not have been able to afford college and most likely would be working in a sheltered workshop for sub-minimum wages. P2I has three main components: • Academic & Social: Students take a maximum of 8 credit hours of classes from the UNR catalog (based on person-centered plan) per semester. Educational coaches attend classes

	and host study sessions with the students, as needed. Mentors participate in social events on campus and in the community. They model appropriate communication and behavior for the P2I students. • Independent living: Students take one Independent Living (IL) program-specific class, and one Student Success lab per semester. IL classes include: Nutrition & Cooking, Relationships & Sexuality, Self-Advocacy & Self Determination, and Money Matters. P2I also assists families in developing resources if their student wants to explore living independently. The Student Success lab works with each student to master computer skills needed for a successful college experience, such as Web Campus and MyNevada. In addition, for the first time, P2I students will be supported to live independently in the Identity apartments, close to campus. • Employment: Students learn pre-employment skills (pre-ETS) and have extensive work experiences (paid student employment, internships, volunteer) in semester 2-4. They work with the employment coordinator and other UNR campus employment services. The P2I Scholarship Project seeks funding to provide tuition and fees to five students with ID who do not have the financial resources to attend. These will be students who do not qualify for dual enrollment (Washoe and Lyon County School Districts have MOU arrangements with P2I and pay tuition and fees for students with ID who have current IEPs and have been accepted into the program). The approximate cost is $11,000/year, and this proposal seeks scholarships for 5 students, for a total of $55,000 (no indirect charged). • Think College ,the national coordinating center for postsecondary education programs for students with ID. • College of Education and Human Development, • Office of Service Learning to get interns for P2I; • UNR departments to set up paid student employment and internships for P2I students. • Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) for employment activities; • Lyon and Washoe County School Districts for dual enrollment funds • Sierra Regional Center (SRC) provides funding for educational coaches.
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Tom – has an adopted granddaughter (no conflict of interest, lives out of state), she is an example of a person who would get lots from a program such as this, program could change life outcomes for the students who receive the benefits, appears to be an effective program re: socialization, education, rated proposal high. Donna – likes the program
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Donna – is curious to know if there are any other programs like this that don't cost anything such as Medicaid, what is the unmet need for those students, would have liked to see some examples of success stories of previous students who have gone through the program. Tom – would have been helpful to identify anonymous background information of a student going through the program and how it changed their placement in society, promoted their independence.
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Tom – looked at what was been awarded in the past and the cost of education, did not find it unreasonable but did not have a basis of comparison, would have been helpful to have information re: how does this dollar amount compare to the costs for an average student?

	Donna – how many credit hours can they earn? Budget seemed high but does not have a strong basis for comparison.
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	Fred – asked if this money takes care of 5 students, yet page 6 says "we expect to be sustainable for 2 years", how are they sustainable after this period of time? Tom – does that have to do with Washoe and Lyon County pending that was referenced? Fred – doesn't know, collaborations mentioned, overall project is good, sustainability income source not clear. Donna – sustainability didn't seem clear.
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Tom – scope presented is simple, saw no issues.
Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify?	How many credit hours can they earn? How will sustainability be accomplished?

Proposal 5:	**Lyon County Human Services, Independent Living Services**
Abstract:	Lyon County is a unique rural county in Northern Nevada that spans over 2,000 square miles with five distinct communities that include Dayton , Silver Springs, Fernley, Yerington, and Smith Valley/Wellington. Lyon County's population is growing quickly with an average of 4% increase each year and with a disproportionally large number of people aged 55 or older for an area of its size. According to the census quick facts, 14.5% of Lyon County residents under the age of 65 have a disability. The mission of Lyon County Human Services is to enhance the well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan. The department delivers on this mission through four divisions including. Administrative Services, Children Services, Adult Services, and Senior Services. The target populations for this funding opportunity are Lyon County residents with disabilities ages 18 and older. This funding would supplement existing services within the Adult and Senior Services division increasing access to information and referral, skills training, individual advocacy, and transportation. Over the past two years Adult Services has seen an increase of individuals with disabilities needing assistance rising. FY20 data shows 22.5% of individuals served, reported as living with one or more disabilities. Adult Services has been fully trained and successful in using the SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access, and Recovery (SOAR) model. The department community referral data has shown a steady increase of 5% each year for the past 3 years of seniors in area needing assistance with information and referral. The most recent community needs assessment identified a lack of adequate transportation as a major barrier to accessing services. There has been a steady increase in the request for medical transportation, in particular for dialysis treatment locations which are all out of area with the exclusion of small tribal clinic in Yerington LCHS has had to implement a wait list for transportation services due to demand exceeding capacity in addition to restrictions in seating due to CDC and State COVID-19 guidelines for social distancing.

	This funding opportunity would increase the Adult Services division capacity to expand intake, assessments, and comprehensive case management activities for individuals living with disabilities, with the primary goal of reducing barriers and increasing self-sufficiency. The Senior Services Division would provide individuals over the age of 60 with a disability or individuals caring for someone over the age of 60 that have a disability services and supports identify needs, information and referrals to meet those needs, skills training in areas of scope such as technology assistance , basic mental health coping skills, and more. Case managers also advocate on behalf of clients . LCHS currently provides medical transportation to the Reno area on Mondays, Wednesday, and Fridays; with additional funding the department would add a second route on these days to meet the needs of our residents. The total funding request of $105,251.00 to add 1.6 FTE to increase transportation and case management services as well as provide cell phones to allow expansion to home visits.
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Donna – transportation in rural areas is a huge problem, likes the program. Tom – has experience with services offered in rural areas agrees transportation is a challenge, well needed project.
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Donna – who will get the cell phones? Tom – thought it was the case workers so they would feel safer when they were going into the homes, how is lack of cell phone service coverage addressed? Donna – seems like Lyon County would already provide caseworkers with cell phones? Would have liked examples of people who have benefited from the project.
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Donna – 2,000 square miles is covered so budget is reasonable, unclear re: cell phones.
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	Tom – unclear how cell phones fit into project.
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Donna – yes Fred – yes
Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify	Who will get the cell phones? How is lack of cell phone service coverage addressed? Examples of people who has benefited from services?

Proposal 6:	**State of Nevada, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR), Rehabilitation Division, Vocational Rehabilitation Program**
Abstract:	The Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR), Rehabilitation Division, Vocational Rehabilitation program includes the Bureau of Services to Individuals who are Blind and Visually Impaired (BSBVI), who will join with its

	community partner, Blindconnect to develop and provide tailored soft skills and job seeking skills training to its clients - Nevadans who are blind or visually impaired. This training will equip participants with the needed skills to achieve or progress in employment and fully access independent community life throughout Nevada. Based on Cornell University's 2018 research, 42.5% of Nevadans with disabilities are employed. In comparison 78.2% of Nevadans without disabilities are employed. The primary goal of the BSBVI and Blindconnect collaboration is to close the employment gap by increasing the number of employed Nevadans with disabilities who are visually impaired and promote independence. This project will include the development of a vocationally based independent living skills curriculum built upon the expertise of BSBVI vocational rehabilitation counselors and Blindconnect staff; as well as input from our local focus group. Leveraging online training resources, the project will then develop and deliver in-person and virtual soft skills and job seeking skills training. This unique offering will provide virtual access statewide. Our project timeline plans for a total of 60 BSBVI clients to complete the 9- week (54 hour) training within the project period. Project impact will be tracked via a combination of surveys (pre-training, post-training, and 6 months after training completion) and data (training, job search, employment). Total project cost is $115,970.00. [$29,500 training development, $77,880 client training costs ($1298 x 60 clients), and $8,590 indirect costs].
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Tom – believes there is a need, often don't have info re: needs until cross paths with someone who is blind, project very well laid out, tied in with a state agency responsible for rehab, positive program.
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Donna – read where it said it was new, confused who is applying for the money, State of Nevada ? Blind Connect? Where is the unmet need? Seems there are many programs like this.
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	no comments
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	no comments
Scope - Is the project an existing project? Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Donna – lack of examples, unclear how it is a new program as vocational training must be done somewhere along the line. Tom – sensed it was a new approach to the training, if enhancing an existing program clarification would be helpful. Fred – how much of this program relies on DETR doing what they need to do, if there are technical challenges will they be able to gather or post data? Tom – DETR's challenges in the past year raises questions on their ability to assist this sub-group.
Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify?	Who is applying for grant – State of Nevada or Blind Connect? Is this an existing program which will be enhanced? How much of this program relies on DETR doing what they need to do? If there are technical challenges will they be able to gather or post data?

Proposal 7:	**CARE Chest of Sierra Nevada**

Abstract:	The goal of this project is to provide Independent Living (IL) services to Nevada-based consumers who have been accepted to the applicant's Independent Living Program and are currently on the waiting list. Consumers must be residents of the State of Nevada and have self-- declared permanent disabilities to participate in the program. The IL Program ensures those in our community with disabilities have access to technology, home, or vehicle modifications that they require and would otherwise be unable to afford. The adaptations provided by the applicant's IL Program make it possible for at risk individuals with disabilities to remain in their home and out of care facilities. On average, consumers spend between eight to twelve months waiting for Independent Living, goal-based services. A grant of S150,000 will fund the entire project budget and remove 13 consumers from the waiting list, satisfying 43 identified Independent Living goals. The applicant partners with The State of Nevada's Aging and Disabilities Services Division to fund their Independent Living Program. Once additional funding is secured for the Wait List Easement Project, consumers will be identified from the current waiting list and their cases will be activated. From that point, consumers ' cases will follow the organic progression of the applicant's Independent Living Program. Once removed from the waiting list, the process includes the collection of three contractor bids, the submission of the winning bid to the applicant's financial services department along with a detailed purchase order, executive review, the applicant issues the purchase order to the contractor and IL staff oversee the modification process while maintaining frequent contact with the consumer. When each consumer's IL goals have been satisfied, final interviews are conducted by the applicant' s team and noted in each case file. By fast-tracking the waiting process, at-risk Nevadans with disabilities will be able to remain in their homes and will be more likely to live fulfilled, productive lives.
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Donna – fantastic project, uses contractors, will make a huge change for 13 people, ability to make home ready for person with special needs is a great expense.
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	Tom – referenced ADSD contribution amount not clear, how does the amount requested fit or not fit into the amount previously received from ADSD, needs more info re: how this project doesn't fit into that grant mechanism. Donna – what is the unmet need?
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Fred – requesting $1,153 per client, 13 clients, does not know if too high or too low, needs are variable. Donna – wheelchair friendly automobiles listed as well, and they are expensive.
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	Tom – these are almost like one-of-a-kind subgrants, individualized needs such as wheelchair or a ramp, difficult as an evaluator to say if it does or does not make sense. Donna – as an example, having a wheelchair to roll into the shower is huge and will help individuals be independent.
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Tom – yes, activities address needs, have a waiting list and they know who needs what. Donna – yes, and examples were given. Fred – agrees.

Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify?	What is the unmet need? How does this project fit or not fit in with ADSD's financial commitment? Is money needed because project does not fit ADSD's model?

Proposal 8:	**Nevada Rural Counties RSVP Program (RSVP), Independent Living Transportation**
Abstract:	Nevada Rural Counties RSVP Program (RSVP) will expand and enhance transportation services in Nevada ' s 15 rural county service region including Carson City, Douglas, Elko, Humboldt, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Esmeralda, Eureka, Storey, Lincoln, White Pine, Pershing, Lander, and Churchill Counties with escorted, on demand, door-to-door transportation services for low-income transit- dependent senior citizens (aged 60 and above) and adults with disabilities (aged 18-59). This service provides a vulnerable population with easy and reliable access to critical and essential services to help maintain their independence, self-sufficiency, and live in the community for as long as possible. RSVP's well trained and background checked volunteer drivers deliver services, and serve as companions, providing emotional support which helps relieve feelings of loneliness, isolation, and despair among this population. RSVP's evidence-based transportation program fosters independent living to help seniors and adults living with a disability with access to social supports, essential services, and goods, and remain in their homes for as long as possible rather than being institutionalized. RSVP's service delivery system keeps the client at the center of the relationship and promotes a care partner approach. Family members, volunteers, project staff and medical/social service professionals all work with the client to support them in their quest to remain independent. RSVP volunteers will provide escorted on demand door-to-door transportation to assist 400 seniors and adults with disabilities with access to medical appointments, dental services, physical therapy, dialysis, prescription pick up, grocery shopping, senior center lunch programs, socialization activities, and other essential trips. Critical food and medicine delivery, and telephone reassurance calls will be provided for clients who are social isolating due to COVID. Client self-assessments and personalized care plans are developed and evaluated regularly, and the annual client satisfaction survey will measure the impact of the Transportation Program on improving quality of life, self-sufficiency, and living independently. RSVP will coordinate efforts with volunteers, service providers, and the community - to engage volunteers, recruit clients, make service refe1rnls, and strengthen collaborative partnerships. RSVP collaborates with social workers, discharge planners, hospitals and the VA health system who routinely contact RSVP for transportation assistance for clients being discharged to help ease the transition back into their own homes. Project partners also include the Nevada Department of Transportation, Transit Mobility Managers, Elko County Transit, Storey County, Senior Centers, Carson City Sheriff's Office, Aging and Disability Services Division, Corporation for National & Community Service, Nevada Health Centers, Sanford Center for Aging, AARP Nevada Chapter, Nevada Ensures Support Together (NEST) Collaborative; and Family Resource Centers of Northeastern Nevada, Winnemucca and Ron Wood. RSVP respectfully requests $114,274 under the FHN SFY 2021/2023 funding opportunity for transportation program personnel, travel for site visits and volunteer recruitment, supplies, telephone, advertising, and volunteer mileage and stipends. The

	Project will serve 400 (Year· 1) and 450 (Year 2) seniors and adults with disabilities to ensure they have access to transportation services to support their independence and help them remain a vital part of their communities.
Evaluation Review	
Discuss the Pros of the overall project.	Donna – felt it is fantastic, will affect 400 plus people in rural areas, transportation in rural areas is a big issue, program has many volunteers. Fred – likes the talk about partners, partners were listed and how they are working with the partners. Tom – looks like all hands-on deck in most counties, services go beyond transportation, emotional support is provided, have ongoing efforts through volunteer structure to generate other portions of the budget.
Discuss the areas of the project that were not clear.	no comments
Discuss the reasonableness of the budget proposed.	Donna – 460 people served, very reasonable budget. Tom – very reasonable budget, proven they can spend money wisely. Fred – agrees
Discuss the applicability of the budget proposed.	no comment
Is the project an existing project? Scope - Are you confident the details have been addressed in the proposal?	Donna – yes Tom – they noted that they survey the folks they are working with, got 98.4% satisfaction rate. Fred – objectives are clear, activities and how they will be documented, expanding on program.
Are there questions you would like the GMU to clarify?	none

V. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Independent Living - Proposal Recommendation Review
(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido shared her screen again showing the average score ratings. The recommendation will go to the Grants Management Unit who will then take this information, review the historical performance information and the applicability, and then map the coverage throughout the State. The recommendation will then be presented to the Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC). Proposals on screen are ranked according to scores. Received $762,916 in requests and there is $550,000 available in the Funds for a Healthy Nevada funding opportunity. Ms. Lucido asked if any evaluator would like to change their scores.

Ms. Coleman replied she would not like to change her score.

Mr. Schultz replied he would not like to change his score.

Mr. McCoy asked for the calculation for Dignity Health to be verified.

Ms. Lucido realized the calculations were off due to being averaged by four reviewers instead of the three who returned their evaluations. The average scores were recalculated and displayed. The rankings are used for discussion and information purposes, no action is necessary at this time. Ms. Lucido invited feedback or conversation.

Ms. Coleman asked how it is determined who gets the money and how much they get?

Ms. Lucido replied this meeting serves to gather the evaluators' input regarding applicability and reasonableness. Ms. Lucido asked the evaluators if they wanted to go back and add any comments regarding the proposals?

Ms. Coleman replied she did not. She asked if Ms. Lucido makes the decision on how the money is divided.

Ms. Lucido said one of the things the GMU is charged with is to ensure services are provided statewide, with an appreciation of the location of the population as well as infrastructure concerns seen in rural areas. In most evaluations the first $550,000 in requests would be funded which would include the ranked proposals down to the UNR Path to Independence. We are fortunate to have Title XX funding to backfill some areas of funding. The proposals will be taken in the order they were ranked by the evaluators, plotted onto a map, and along with the recommendations will be taken to the GMAC meeting. The GMAC will review and make a recommendation to the Director of DHHS. Ms. Lucido asked if were any other questions? There were none.

VI. Public Comment #2

Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.

There were no public comments.

VII. Additional Announcements and Adjournment

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Coleman offered to review NOFO proposals again in the future.

This notice was mailed to groups and individuals as requested and posted on the DHHS website at: http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/ *and on the State of Nevada Public Meeting Notice website at* https://notice.nv.gov/. *Meeting materials will be available to the public online prior to the meeting or contact the Grants Management Unit via phone at 775-684-3470 or by email:* gmu@dhhs.nv.gov.