

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

**Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)
May 14, 2015**

**DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Revised September 10, 2015**

Locations (Videoconferenced)

Carson City: Division of Public and Behavioral Health, 4150 Technology Way, Room 303
Elko: Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD), 1020 Ruby Vista Drive, Suite 102
Las Vegas: ADSD, Early Intervention Services, 3811 W Charleston, Suite 112

Members Present

Deborah Campbell
Ina Dorman
Jeff Fontaine
Michele Howser
Marcia O'Malley
Cindy Roragen
Pauline Salla

Members Absent

Dan Musgrove
John Thurman
Jeff Zander

Others Present

Laurie Olson, Chief, DHHS Grants Management Unit (GMU)
Laura Adair, Toby Hyman, Pat Petrie, Rique Robb, Cindy Smith and Gloria Sulhoff, DHHS GMU

Carol Anacker and Susan Haas, Nevada Rural Counties RSVP
Judy Andréson, Elko Family Resource Center
Madelin Arazoza, The Salvation Army
Ann Barron, Senior Center of Boulder City
Shannon Bennett and Natalie Powell, Division of Public and Behavioral Health
Lisa Bonie, Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living
Mary Bryant, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR)
Ashley Greenwald and Katheryn Roose, UNR / PBS-NV
Amanda Haboush, Prevent Child Abuse Nevada
Jennifer Henderson, Jenelle Stathes and Emmy Quinn, Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation
Brenda Hess, Washoe County School District Family Resource Centers
Lynn Hunsinger, Nevada Senior Services
Tina Jeeves, Easter Seals Nevada
Linda Lang, Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership
Lindsey Nelson, Boys Town Nevada
Kelli Quintero, Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation
Allison Ramsey, Partnership of Community Resources
Martha Schott-Bernius, Family Respite of Northeast Nevada
Shannon Simmons, Advocates to End Domestic Violence
Mark Tadder, Citicare

Peter Vogel, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada
Deborah Williams, Southern Nevada Health District/OCDPHO
Kim Young, The Children's Cabinet

I. Call to Order

Having confirmed a quorum of GMAC members present, Committee Chair Jeff Fontaine called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM. He welcomed the members and introduced Laurie Olson, Chief of the DHHS Grants Management Unit, who shared some announcements.

- The FY16-17 budgets have closed, and funding amounts published in the RFA are as solid as they get.
- On May 12 the Board of Examiners approved a new contract with Financial Guidance Center for the 2-1-1 Call Center and website, effective July 1, 2015. Ms. Olson expressed great appreciation for the work of the partnership that was created under three Executive Orders. Statute dictates that the DHHS maintain the information and referral program (2-1-1).

II. Public Comment

Mr. Fontaine prefaced the public comment period by stating some guidelines. Comments may be limited to two minutes per speaker per organization. Anticipating comments from applicants, he added that they are welcome to provide comment on the RFA and evaluation processes, but cannot comment on their programs or applications.

- Linda Lang, Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership, thanked the Tobacco Coalition for streamlining the RFA process. The packet was very helpful.
- Captain Lisa Smith, Assistant Social Services Director, Salvation Army Clark County, commented on the process to award points in the Independent Living category, which did not differentiate between government and nonprofit entities. She felt this would have leveled the playing field, been more fair for nonprofits, and provide opportunity for new organizations to be funded. She noted that more than 50% of funds are likely going to government agencies. Her organization's independent living program had been funded in the last grant cycle, but it appears they will not be funded this year. She thanked the committee for the opportunity to apply and allowing her to express her opinion.
- Amanda Haboush, Prevent Child Abuse Nevada at UNLV, thanked the committee for allowing her to comment about funding in the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) program area. If the committee approves the decision to reduce the amount of funding in order to fund more programs, they won't be able to adequately run the programs. If that happens, they will go back to fluffing budgets; in this case the amount requested was just what was needed. Some may not be able to do the job with reductions; if you have to hire a person to run the program, you can't hire a percentage of a person.
- Jenelle Stathes, Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation, agreed with Ms. Haboush's comments, adding that when they anticipate cuts there is some fluffing when creating budgets. On a separate note, her organization's application included more than one program. They were advised to include both programs in the same application and felt this gave them only half the space and word count to describe the programs.
- Ms. Olson stated that the Department had received a letter from Bruce Woodbury sent on behalf of the Senior Center of Boulder City. He thought the subcommittee made comments that the program would only serve seniors, which is not the case. A copy of the letter was included in the meeting materials.

III. SFY16-17 Tobacco Use Prevention and Cessation Grant Awards

Ms. Olson introduced this item by stating that the GMU used to have responsibility for the tobacco use prevention and cessation funding, but four or five years ago the Legislature moved administration to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH). However, the GMAC still needs to weigh in on the funding recommendations. She introduced Natalie Powell and Shannon Bennett from DPBH to present their recommendations.

Ms. Bennett gave a brief overview of the competitive process required by statute. Of the funding available, 5% was allocated for administrative costs per NRS, and \$91,282 was awarded off the top to the Nevada Tobacco Quitline, leaving \$950,000 to award during an RFA process. The solicitation was announced via their listserv and to current grantees.

Ms. Powell reviewed the RFA application and review process. The RFA was published on April 6, 2015 with an application deadline of April 17. Applicants were required to implement evidence-based strategies and recommend strategies addressing three goals: eliminate exposure to secondhand smoke, prevent tobacco use among young adults, and identify and eliminate tobacco-related disparities. An evaluation committee reviewed six applications and met on April 24 to formulate the following recommendations.

- FOCUS, a faith-based organization, is ineligible by statute to receive State funds. The committee is recommending that they partner with the Southern Nevada Health District.
- Carson City Health and Human Services requested \$90,096, scored 81 of 115, funding recommended at \$72,463.
- Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership requested \$144,278, scored 100 of 115, full funding recommended.
- Southern Nevada Health District requested \$440,000, which includes a \$40,000 competitive evaluation component, scored 111 of 115, full funding recommended.
- Washoe County Health District requested \$201,977, scored 108.4 of 115, full funding recommended.

Marcia O'Malley asked how they came up with the reduced dollar amount for Carson City Health and Human Services. Ms. Bennet explained that funding fell short by approximately 17,000 and someone had to be cut. They chose CCHHS because they proposed to serve only 2.5% of the population, the lowest amount of all the applicants, and had the weakest application. In response to additional questions from GMAC members, Ms. Bennet stated that there was no minimum score designation, and the short turn-around time was due to short notice they received in the beginning of April.

Mr. Fontaine asked each GMAC member to disclose any conflicts of interest; there were none. There being no further questions or discussion, he entertained a motion to adopt the recommendations.

- Marcia O'Malley motioned to approve the recommendations as presented.
~~She~~ **Pauline Salla** stated that she is the Board Chair of Frontier Community Coalition, which is a member of the Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership. While she does not receive any benefit from serving in this position, she excused herself from voting to avoid a potential conflict. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ina Dorman, and carried unopposed with one abstention (Ms. ~~O'Malley~~ **Salla**).

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- Call for approval of the March 12, 2015 GMAC meeting minutes.
 - Deborah Campbell moved to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2015 GMAC meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Malley and carried unopposed, with one abstention by Pauline Salla, who was not present at the March 12 meeting.

- Call for approval of the minutes of the April 21, 2015 meeting of the GMAC Subcommittee on the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN). Two of the three subcommittee members were present to consider approval. Ms. Salla requested a correction to Page 3 of 5, under the Boys Town application comments. Her office is with the State's Juvenile Justice Programs, not the Department of Juvenile Justice, which is a federal office.
 - Ms. Salla motioned to approve the minutes as corrected. Dr. Dorman seconded, and the motion carried unopposed.

- Call for approval of the minutes of the April 23, 2015 meeting of the GMAC Subcommittee on Disability Services. Three of the four subcommittee members were present to consider approval.
 - Ms. O'Malley moved to approve the minutes as presented. Cindy Roragen requested a correction on Page 4 of 5, where it states she pointed out a math error. It was actually Michele Howser who noticed the error. Ms. O'Malley restated the motion to accept the correction. Michele Howser seconded the motion to approve with the correction as noted, and the motion carried unopposed.

- Call for approval of the minutes of the April 27, 2015 meeting of the GMAC Subcommittee on Wellness. Two of the three subcommittee members were present to consider approval.
 - Deborah Campbell moved to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fontaine and carried unanimously.

V. SFY16-17 Grant Awards for PCAN, Disability Services and Wellness

Ms. Olson opened this agenda item with some introductory comments.

- She thanked staff for their work in developing the RFA, which takes a different approach from previous years. They researched best practices across the county and developed an RFA to attract strong organizations that are mission driven and goal oriented; aligned with the goals of the Department; and address the whole individual with person-centered service delivery.
- Staff evaluations were performed to ensure the strongest applications were passed on to the subcommittees for review.
- The award process is a competition, not a negotiation. Interaction between reviewers and applicants was eliminated. This is not a best practice and she found no grantors who include it.
- She thanked the GMAC members for their work in reading and scoring the proposals within the parameters of the review process. The same parameters are to be followed today.
 - The committee should be concerned with geography, but the competitive process is based on merits of application.
 - Cherry picking is not allowed. The committee cannot skip over higher scores to fund lower scores.
 - Budget reductions must be formula-based, taking scores into account.

- No score or ranking adjustments are allowed today. The committee will review recommendations presented by the subcommittees. Recommendations can be changed, but not the scores or rankings.
- Staff did prep work to assist the process by providing some funding options. These are not intended to be the only options; only scenarios to help the committee see how different approaches would affect the outcome. There are no perfect options.

Ms. Olson then addressed some concerns that were voiced during public comment.

- State agencies and universities are allowed to compete with nonprofits. There is no statutory reference allowing for preference to nonprofits, and there was no preference in the application process.
- The suggestion that a cap be placed on awards can be considered in the future, but not this time since a cap may have changed the way grantees prepared their proposals.
- Regarding a concern during one subcommittee meeting that a proposal went forward which should have been disqualified, she stated that disqualification is taken very seriously. Any deficiencies in an application are reflected in the score and noted in strengths and weaknesses. There are always issues to negotiate. Of the 73 applications that were received, only one was disqualified because it did not meet the intent of the RFA in any way.
- A number of applicants have asked for a copy of their strengths and weaknesses. Those can be distributed next week if requested by sending an email to Ms. Olson.

Mr. Fontaine expressed appreciation for the work and effort of staff, adding that this year's process has been fair, objective and transparent. He acknowledged the difficulty of the process and that there is no perfect system, just a lack of resources to meet the need and fund all the requests. He asked the GMAC members to disclose any relationships they may have with the applicants that might constitute a conflict of interest.

- Ms. Howser stated that she derives no direct benefit, but does work with some of the applicant agencies to approve them for student internships.
- Ms. Salla stated that Family to Family ISD 13 provides services at Caliente Youth Center, and she interacts with them in her employment with the State. The committee felt this did not constitute a conflict of interest.
- Mr. Fontaine stated that he is director of the Nevada Association of Counties, noting that a number of county agencies are applicants. He receives no benefit and does not feel there is any conflict, but deferred to the GMAC. They agreed there was no conflict.
- Ms. O'Malley stated that her son receives respite services from Teen Rave, but this did not influence her scoring or recommendations. The committee did not ask her to abstain from the discussion or vote.
- Ms. Campbell stated that she has a contract with a team at the Department of Employment Rehabilitation and Training (DETR) to develop a marketing and advertising campaign for hiring persons with disabilities. She did not feel it was related to the assistive technology application. However, the GMAC members asked Ms. Campbell to excuse herself from discussion and voting on recommendations for DETR.
- Dr. Dorman had no relationships with any of the applicants.

Because of the conflict noted within the Independent Living category, Ms. Olson suggested that the committee hold separate discussions and votes for the three program areas within Disability Services.

Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) Subcommittee Presentation

Ms. Salla, PCAN Subcommittee Chair, reported that they met on April 21 with all three members present. She thanked staff for the work that was done ahead of time. They had a lot of applications to review, and the members spent a lot of time reviewing, sharing feedback and comments. She presented their recommendations by program categories. Available funding for each category was pre-determined by the Department.

Child Self Protection Training

Two applications were received. The subcommittee recommended full funding for both because there were sufficient funds allocated to the category, both applicants scored well, and the recommendations fill gaps in Clark County.

- Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County, *Elementary Child Abuse Prevention Workshop*, requested \$102,350, scored 98.0, full funding recommended.
- The Rape Crisis Center, *Child Assault Prevention* program, requested \$40,000, scored 91.0, full funding recommended.

Crisis Intervention

Five applications were received. The subcommittee recommended funding for those receiving scores of 90 and above at 82.8% of the request, and those scoring 80 to 89 at 72.8% of the request. One applicant, Hopelink, was not recommended for funding due to its very low score.

- The Children's Cabinet, *Safe Place* program, requested \$117,090, scored 95.0, recommend \$96,951.
- Tahoe SAFE Alliance, *Children's Program*, requested \$44,365, scored 94.0, recommend \$36,734.
- Boys Town, *In-home Family Services*, requested \$393,981, scored 92.9, recommend \$326,216.
- Olive Crest Foster Family Agency *Strong Families* program, requested \$289,390, scored 87.3, recommend \$210,676.
- Hopelink, *Family Support Services* requested \$114,999, scored 56.5, not recommended for funding.

Ms. Salla noted that The Children's Cabinet's average score was adjusted during the subcommittee meeting from 100 to 95 when one reviewer's missing score was factored in.

Parent Training

Because of the high number of applications received in this program area, the subcommittee set a score cut-off point of 80 or above. They recommended those scoring 90 and above to be funded at 86.5% of their request, and those with scores of 80-89 to be funded at 76.5% of the amount requested. During their meeting, one of the reviewers submitted a score adjustment for Ron Wood Family Resource Center (FRC), increasing its score by three points and resulting in an increase in its average score of one point.

- Advocates to End Domestic Violence, *Positive Parenting through Family Crisis* program, requested \$29,207, scored 99.7, recommend \$25,264.
- Clark County Department of Family Services, *Parenting Project*, requested \$89,985, scored 99.0, recommend \$77,837.
- UNLV, Prevent Child Abuse Nevada, *Community Outreach and Training Project*, requested \$65,124, scored 94.7, recommend \$56,332.
- The Children's Cabinet, *Parenting Education* program, requested \$33,053, scored 93.0, recommend \$28,591.

- Boys & Girls Club of Truckee Meadows, *Strengthening Families* program, requested \$75,871, scored 92.6, recommend \$65,628.
- Boys Town Nevada, *Common Sense Parenting* program, requested \$52,488, scored 91.0, recommend \$45,402.
- East Valley Family Services, *Bears and Binkies* program, requested \$30,635, scored 90.0, recommend \$26,499.
- Washoe County Family Resource Center Coalition, *Parent Training* program, requested \$191,453, scored 89.3, recommend \$146,462.
- Dignity Health (St. Rose Dominican Hospital), *WIC Parent Training Project*, requested \$55,999, scored 88.0, recommend \$42,839.
- Family to Family Connection ISD #9, *Parenting the Love and Logic Way*, requested \$33,580, scored 87.5, recommend \$25,689.
- FRIENDS Family Resource Center, *Parenting Classes*, requested \$40,000, scored 86.0, recommend \$30,600.
- Elko Family Resource Center (aka FRC of Northeastern Nevada), *Parent Training and Activities to Prevent Child Maltreatment*, requested \$98,160, scored 85.5, recommend \$75,092.
- The Salvation Army Clark County, *Nurturing Parenting Skills* program, requested \$10,097, scored 83.0, recommend \$7,724.
- Ron Wood Family Resource Center, *Positive Action Parent/Family Training and Case Management* program, requested \$92,003, scored 82.3, recommend \$70,382.
- The following three applicants scored below the 80-point threshold and were not recommended for funding.
 - UNR Cooperative Extension, *Partners in Parenting* program, requested \$38,743, scored 79.3.
 - Nevada Outreach Training Organization, *Parenting Classes*, requested \$64,937, scored 77.5.
 - Family to Family Connection ISD #13, *Essential Services* program, requested \$95,000, scored 64.7.

Having presented the subcommittee's review process and recommendations, there were no questions from the GMAC. Mr. Fontaine thanked the subcommittee members for their work and opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Howser commented on the different approaches taken by the subcommittees in deciding on funding options. The Disability and Wellness subcommittees both chose to fully fund from the top scores down, while the PCAN subcommittee did not. She was concerned about consistency and continuity as an advisory committee. Dr. Dorman stated that they did the best they could in terms of the number of applications; they had a lot of discussion regarding how to fund, and ultimately concluded they would rather fund all of the strong proposals. Ms. O'Malley felt the subcommittee was very methodical and thoughtful, fair and equitable, and had no objections to their choice. Ms. Salla stated that usually there are items in the budget that are padded in case they get cuts; she saw things that could be reduced without impacting services. Though the preference would be to fund everyone at 100%, it just is not possible. Ms. Howser felt the agencies may not be able to provide the program with these cuts, and if any budgets are padded, that should have been reflected in the scores. She disapproved of two of the three subcommittees choosing one funding option and the third choosing another option, and asked the GMAC to consider full funding here. Ms. Campbell noted that all the subcommittees had the same options. Ms. Olson confirmed that each subcommittee was provided with

three possible scenarios – fully fund, reduced funding with percentage reductions based on scores, and establishing a standardized amount. The only differences among subcommittees were that the percentage reductions and standardized amounts varied depending on the amount of money available and the amount of the requests. Ms. Olson reiterated that the subcommittees were also at liberty to develop alternate funding options.

Ms. Salla reviewed the subcommittee's methodology in deciding on a funding option. The Child Self-Protection Training program area had only two applications, both scored above 90, and funds were available to recommend 100% of the request amounts. For the Crisis Intervention applications, the subcommittee agreed to Option 2, which resulted in a more equitable distribution of funds. For the Parent Training applications, they again selected Option 2 for applications scoring 80 or higher, the agreed upon cut-off point.

Ms. Olson described how fully funding all PCAN applications would change the outcome.

- In Crisis Intervention, the top three applicants would be fully funded, with a remaining amount of \$115,390 that could be offered to the next highest scorer, Olive Crest.
- In Parent Training, the top 11 applicants would be fully funded, with a remainder of \$28,349, which could be offered to the next highest scorer, the Elko FRC.

Mr. Fontaine asked the committee members if they felt a need for consistency in how the subcommittees award funds. Ms. O'Malley stated that within each subcommittee, there are many things to consider. She deferred to the judgement of the PCAN Subcommittee and saw no need to change their recommendations. Dr. Dorman added that if they had decided on full funding, only a few more applicants would have been eliminated, but the subcommittee decided they were deserving. It was a fair process, and because they had options available, they took advantage of that. She would hate to see options go away. Ms. Howser stood by her comments, but conceded to group consensus.

Ms. O'Malley stated that, when an applicant is not fully funded, they should not be expected to provide all of the services included in their original proposal. She did not believe all applicants padded their budgets because of conversations she has had with providers. Ms. Salla stated that the PCAN Subcommittee discussed the ramifications of reduced budgets and expected GMU staff to adjust scopes of work during final award negotiations. Ms. Campbell asked Ms. O'Malley to clarify whether she had discussions with applicants. Ms. O'Malley said that was not the case.

Ms. Campbell, in looking for a place of commonality, remarked that they were all instructed to review the proposals, and allocate the funds based on scores. Ms. Salla confirmed that the PCAN subcommittee followed the process. They reviewed the applications separately and submitted scores. At their meeting, they were presented with the average scores and then went through each proposal before looking at the funding. They were assured by staff that the applicants' scope of work would be adjusted based on the decreased funding.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Fontaine called for a motion.

- Dr. Dorman moved to accept the PCAN Subcommittee recommendations as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Malley. The committee had no further discussion, and the motion carried with one opposed (Ms. Howser).

Disability Services Subcommittee Presentation

Ms. O'Malley, Disability Services Subcommittee Chair, reported that the subcommittee met on April 23 to review proposals in the Independent Living, Positive Behavior Support and Respite program areas. They decided across the board to fully fund from the top down with remaining funds to be offered to the next highest scoring proposal. Of the 13 proposals submitted, they recommend five for funding.

Independent Living

Thirteen qualifying applications were received in this program area.

- Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, *Path to Independence* program, requested \$45,525, scored 96.4, recommend \$45,525.
- DETR, Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, *Assistive Technology Employment Services*, requested \$159,840, scored 95.6, recommend \$159,840.
- Clark County Social Services, *Transition to Healthy Living* program, requested \$234,500, scored 89.0, recommend \$234,500.
- Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada, *Comprehensive Case Management*, requested \$122,189, scored 86.0, recommend \$122,189.
- CitiCare, *Transportation* program, requested \$50,841, scored 85.0, recommend \$17,618 (balance of funds remaining).
- The following eight were not recommended for funding.
 - The Salvation Army Clark County, *Vocational Training* program, requested \$60,002, scored 81.0.
 - Best Buddies, *Nevada Jobs*, requested \$75,000, scored 79.5.
 - Nevada Rural Counties RSVP, *Transportation* program, requested \$92,343, scored 74.9.
 - Accessible Space, *Nevada Supportive Housing Services Project*, requested \$140,490, scored 73.8.
 - Elko County Transit Department, *Reduced Fare* program, requested \$75,000, scored 71.7.
 - Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living, *Improved Independent Living with Assistive Technology* program, requested \$103,748, scored 71.3.
 - ALS of Nevada, *Durable Medical Equipment* program, requested \$79,708, scored 69.5.
 - Blind Center of Nevada, *Yes I Can!* program, requested \$50,000, scored 61.4.

Positive Behavior Support

One qualifying proposal was submitted in this program area.

- Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, *Positive Behavior Support Nevada (PBS-NV)*, requested \$425,000, scored 69.2, recommend \$340,000.

Ms. O'Malley noted that the applicant requested more than the amount available on the assumption that supplemental Title XX funds would be available, but those funds already had been allocated to other program areas. Ms. Howser added that, even if sufficient funds were available, the recommended award is reflective of their disappointingly low score.

Respite

Seven qualifying applications were received in this program area.

- Foundation for Positively Kids, *Respite* program, requested \$99,000, scored 94.0, recommend \$99,000.

- Easter Seals Nevada, *Family Respite* program, requested \$222,420, scored 79.2, recommend \$222,420.
- Nevada Rural Counties RSVP, *Respite Care* program, requested \$154,247, scored 75.7, recommend \$154,247.
- Nevada Senior Services, *Respite Care and Support Services* program, requested \$41,040, scored 74.1, recommend \$41,040.
- Olive Crest, *Respite* program, requested \$132,856, scored 73.8, recommend \$132,856.
- Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation, *Family Center and Respite Voucher* program, requested \$363,132, scored 66.6, recommend \$25,437 (balance of funds remaining).
- Head Start of Northeastern Nevada, *Family Respite* program, requested \$75,020, scored 66.2, no funding recommended.

Ms. Olson stated that since the subcommittee's meeting, staff has been in touch with Easter Seals, Olive Crest, and Nevada Rural Counties RSVP and all have agreed to work with the GMU to reach rural areas that might be impacted by the reduction in funding to RAVE Family Foundation, which was funded at \$62,753 in FY15.

Following her presentation of the Disability Services Subcommittee recommendations, Ms. O'Malley stated that she is more of a reflective thinker in terms of decision-making. After the subcommittee meeting, she came to some different conclusions about the outcome. She was concerned that the subcommittee might have overlooked the fact that some applicants use these funds for federal match, and she felt that Independent Living funding was inequitable across the three program areas of transportation, life skills and assistive technology. She saw some benefit to capping funding requests as suggested in public comment, and observed that some scoring differences might be attributed to professional grant writers. She requested that the GMAC give these recommendations more consideration, especially the Independent Living proposals, and asked if they could look at percentage budget reductions in order to better fund transportation.

Ms. Roragen agreed that it's a difficult process, with many variables to look at, but disagreed with a number of points. She said that the subcommittee looked at score criteria and just like a race, one comes in first, one second. It's hard to draw the line.

Ms. Howser also agreed that it was a difficult process but disagreed on the importance of figuring out who has a grant writer. Individual reviewer scores were fairly in line with each other, and almost all were in line with the average scores. She appreciated the rules set down by the GMU, which eliminated subjectivity, and added that the guidelines were given to the applicants. Some achieved, and some didn't.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Fontaine called for a motion. The GMAC members were reminded that these recommendations needed to be approved individually by program area to allow any members with conflicts to abstain from the votes.

- Independent Living: Ms. Howser moved to approve the Disability Services Subcommittee's Independent Living proposal recommendations. Ms. Roragen seconded. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unopposed with one abstention (Ms. Campbell).

- Positive Behavior Support: Ms. Salla moved to approve the subcommittee's funding recommendations for Positive Behavior Support programs. Ms. Howser seconded, and with no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed.
- Respite: Dr. Dorman moved to approve the subcommittee's funding recommendations for Respite programs. Ms. Roragen seconded, and there being no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed.

Wellness Subcommittee Presentation

Ms. Campbell, Wellness Subcommittee Chair, thanked fellow subcommittee members Mr. Fontaine and Dan Musgrove, noting that Mr. Musgrove was unable to attend the GMAC meeting that morning.

Ms. Campbell described the process. Each member independently read and scored the proposals and then met on April 27 by videoconference. Ms. Olson provided an introduction with reminders that this was a competitive process; scores were based on merit, not geography; and any budget reductions were to be based on scores. The subcommittee considered each of the funding options and came to consensus after going through each proposal. Individual scores and average scores were in line; all reviewers were in sync though coming from different backgrounds. They received eight proposals requesting a total of \$4,005,610. Five programs were recommended for full funding in rank order totaling \$2,121,431.

- Consumer Credit Counseling (aka Financial Guidance Center), *Nutrition for Life* program, requested \$355,971, scored 87.7, recommend \$355,971.
- Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada, *One-Stop Shop Project*, requested \$988,178, scored 83.7, recommend \$988,178.
- NyE Communities Coalition, *One Stop Hunger* program, requested \$167,472, scored 81.3, recommend \$167,472.
- East Valley Family Services, *Chance Choice Change* program, requested \$323,381, scored 80.7, recommend \$323,381.
- Elko Family Resource Center (aka FRC of Northeastern Nevada), *Hunger Project*, requested \$286,429, scored 80.0, recommend \$286,429.
- The following three applicants were not recommended for funding.
 - Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada, requested \$1,351,912, scored 72.0.
 - Helping Hands of Vegas Valley, requested \$408,693, scored 71.2.
 - Senior Center of Boulder City, requested \$123,574, scored 67.0.

Ms. Campbell recapped that the subcommittee members chose to fully fund applicants scoring 80 or higher in accordance with the first option provided by GMU staff. They chose not to fund Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada primarily because of the score; the large amount of the request was secondary. Helping Hands of Vegas Valley and Senior Center of Boulder City also scored below the minimum of 80. The subcommittee debated pros and cons of the funding options prepared by GMU staff and fully funded all possible programs, which left a remainder of \$128,569. Rather than dip below the 80-point threshold and offer the balance to the next highest scoring applicant, the subcommittee decided to request that the GMU staff present options for distribution at the December GMAC meeting. The funds would be distributed to the five funded applicants based on demonstrated performance and utilization of funds. In conclusion, Ms. Campbell noted that the FY15 grant amount indicated on the spreadsheet for Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada included FY15 funds awarded to their

collaborative program partner, Community Services Agency, which decided not to apply for funds in FY16-17.

Mr. Fontaine, alluding to an earlier comment by Ms. O'Malley about applicants that request a high percentage of the available funds, stated that was the case on this subcommittee, and it did influence his decision. The subcommittee considered a formula-based funding option that prorated a share to all or most of the applicants, but because Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada's request was so high, the method was ineffective. He thought a cap on requests vs. what is available might alleviate this situation next time.

- Ms. Campbell motioned to approve the Wellness Subcommittee's FY16 grant award recommendations as presented. Ms. O'Malley seconded the motion and it carried unopposed.

Mr. Fontaine initiated a discussion regarding the \$128,569 in remaining funds. The subcommittee agreed to recommend that GMU staff report back to the GMAC on allocating these funds to the grantees, but he asked if there were other options for utilizing these funds. Ms. Olson stated that following the subcommittee meeting, she reviewed the counties that would be served through their recommendations. Only four counties – White Pine, Carson, Mineral and Storey – were not covered, along with rural areas of Clark and Washoe. These could be reached by the funded organizations through outreach events, SNAP applications, and help with referrals while giving out food.

Ms. Campbell suggested that, in an effort to ensure fairness, the funds be allocated as incentives to the organizations meeting or exceeding their performance and outcome measures. Ms. Howser disagreed with this approach; she said she trusted staff to meet with grantees and determine who can do it cost-effectively, and recommended that staff make the determination without GMAC review.

Dr. Dorman commented on the letter submitted regarding Boulder City Senior Center and asked for an explanation of their low score. They were funded in the past and the remaining amount could fund them. Ms. Campbell responded that all three subcommittee members scored them the lowest and saw that was the consensus. The application mentioned, but not as clearly as it could have, that they are the food bank for the Boulder City area. The application could have been more explanatory, could have been stronger in presenting outcomes and how they serve people. Mr. Fontaine added that they were bound by the rules to fund by scoring rank and couldn't skip over other applicants to get to them.

Ms. Roragen supported Ms. Howser's recommendation that staff negotiate with grantees that have the capacity to expand cost-effectively. Ms. Campbell explained that she trusted staff to make recommendations but would like to be advised of what they are and why they were chosen before they are approved. Her position is not based on lack of trust, but on her responsibility as a GMAC member. There were no further comments.

- Ms. Campbell motioned to have GMU staff present options for distributing the unallocated \$128,569 to the GMAC at their December 10 meeting. Jeff Fontaine seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ms. Howser stated a concern that it would be six months into the grant year by then. Ms. Olson reminded them that their next meeting is scheduled for September, but at any rate the timing would not affect the usefulness because the amount is not enough to serve all four counties for the entire year. Ms. Howser requested that the motion be amended to seek

approval at the September GMAC meeting. The amendment was accepted by Ms. Campbell and Mr. Fontaine. Ms. O'Malley asked for clarification on the subcommittee members' thought process and decision to agree to this. Mr. Fontaine responded that, at the subcommittee meeting, all were in agreement regarding staff discretion and flexibility in the use of the \$128,569. He reconfirmed that the subcommittee members agreed on flexibility rather as opposed to allocation of the funds, and they agreed to seek GMAC approval at a later meeting.

There being no further discussion, the amended motion carried unopposed.

VI. Public Comment

- Peter Vogel, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada, stated he has been involved in the GMAC grant process for a few years. Referring to Mr. Fontaine's earlier comment that it's not a perfect process, he thinks it's getting closer every time. He was impressed with the professionalism of the process. Regarding Ms. Howser's comment, of the 37 agencies that applied, 29 had been previously funded, most for multiple years, and should know the procedure. Twenty-five received reduced (68%) funding. From his side, not to speak for others, they have to do the calculations when preparing budgets. What if we only get 80%? They consider long and hard, and ponder both sides. The more definitive it is for applicants, the easier it is. He also commented on an overall cap, stating they received a large grant. If they were capped at a half-million, they would not have gotten to all those counties. The program started in the Reno/Sparks area and is now serving communities far away. It takes a lot of money to do that.

VII. Adjournment

Mr. Fontaine thanked the GMAC members for their work in this challenging process, lauding their diligence and willingness to serve the State's best interests. He thanked the staff for their assistance and adjourned the meeting at 11:37 am.