

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)**

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

May 25, 2017

Meeting Locations (Videoconferenced)

Carson City: Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Bureau of Health Care Quality and Compliance (HCQC), 727 Fairview Drive, Large Conference Room

Elko: Aging and Disability Services Division, Early Intervention Services, 1020 Ruby Vista Drive, #102

Las Vegas: Aging and Disability Services Division, 1820 E Sahara Avenue, Suite 201

Members Present

Jeff Bargerhuff
Laura Alison (Ali) Caliendo
Jeff Fontaine
Michele Howser
Steve Kane
Mindie Lloyd
Susan Lucia-Terry
Cindy Roragen
Diane Thorkildson
Dan Wold
Dr. Allie Wright
Candace Young-Richey

Members Absent

Leslie Bittleston

Staff Present

Cindy Smith, Chief, Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG), DHHS
Pat Petrie, Elena Espinoza, Gloria Sulhoff, Connie Ronning, Gary Gobelman, Crystal Johnson, Julieta Mendoza, Erika Pond, OCPG, DHHS
David Olsen, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, DHHS
Kelsey McCann-Navarro, Division of Child and Family Services, DHHS

Others Present

Carson City

Betsy Agular and Korine Viehweg, Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation
Melanie Barkley, Susan Haas and Nick Providenti, Nevada Rural Counties RSVP
Mary Bryant, Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities, UNR
Scott Cooksley and Peter Vogel, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada
Brenda Costello, Washoe County School District FRC Coalition
Sue Eckes, Cherie Jamason and Jenny Yeager, Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Don Jackson and Christine (?), Positive Behavior Support Nevada, UNR
Rebecca LeBeau, Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County
Shannon Simmons, Advocates to End Domestic Violence

Anne Studebaker and Lauren Soulam, Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows
Mark Tadder, Sierra Nevada Transportation Coalition
Kim Young, The Children's Cabinet

Elko

Judy Andr son, FRC of Northeastern Nevada
Melissa Schultz, Communities in Schools

Las Vegas

Audrey Arnold, United Labor Agency of Nevada (ULAN)
Maria Azzarelli, Southern Nevada Health District
Polly Bates, St. Rose Dominican/Dignity Health Foundation
Sarah Beers, Clark County Department of Family Services, Parenting Project
Marcia Blake, Helping Hands of North Las Vegas
Ron Helbling, BlindConnect
Ileana Delfaus and Ann Taylor, East Valley Family Services
Brenda Herbstman, Clark County Social Service
Michele Johnson, Financial Guidance Center
Michele Klem, Boys Town Nevada
Linda Lewis, Positively Kids
Larry Matheis, Nevada Medical Center
Michele Rector, Boys and Girls Clubs of Southern Nevada
Laura Steeps, Olive Crest

I. Call to Order, Roll Call and Announcements

Jeff Fontaine, Chair of the Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC), announced there was no video connection to Las Vegas due to technical difficulties, but attendees there were connected through a teleconference line. Additionally, other GMAC members were participating via phone. He asked the phone participants to mute their phones when not speaking, and to not put the call on "hold".

Mr. Fontaine called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM. Cindy Smith, Chief of the Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG), DHHS, took roll call. All GMAC members except Leslie Bittleston were present, confirming a quorum.

Ms. Smith announced several new OCPG staff members. Julieta Mendoza, former Tribal Liaison in the Director's Office, is taking over administration of the FHN Disability Services and SSBG Title XX grants. Erika Pond is the new tribal liaison. Crystal Johnson will manage the Family Resource Centers and help Gary Gobelman with Community Service Block Grants (CSBG). The OCPG is now fully staffed except for an administrative assistant in the north.

Before opening the first public comment period, Mr. Fontaine reviewed restrictions to public comment. Due to the many public comment periods and number of action items on the agenda, he asked the public to limit their comments to two minutes per speaker, and if more than one person is attending from the same organization, they should choose one person to speak on behalf of the organization. Because of time constraints, he may need to limit public comment to thirty minutes total. Lastly, public comment period is not the time to talk about grant applications; that will be done by the committee according to the process. The applications stand on their own merit unless questions come up from the committee.

II. Public Comment

Elko: None

Las Vegas: None

Carson City: None

III. SFY18-19 Tobacco Use Prevention and Cessation Grant Awards

Ms. Smith stated these grants were first awarded several years ago as an extension of the Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN) Tobacco Settlement. The RFA and grant management processes are managed by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), and the GMAC is involved because it oversees FHN funding.

David Olsen, Tobacco Prevention and Control Program Coordinator, DPBH, reviewed the award process for SFY18-19 tobacco use prevention and cessation grants. Four applications were received and reviewed by a staff committee of five. Referring to the handout in the meeting materials (Attachment A), Mr. Olsen reviewed the applicants: Carson City Health and Human Services; Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership, which is made up of six rural coalitions; Southern Nevada Health District; and Washoe County Health District. The RFA included three components; only the Southern Nevada Health District applied for all three components. The evaluation committee held its final meeting on May 5 and is recommending a total of \$800,023 in funding as follows:

- Carson City Health and Human Services: \$74,004
- Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership: \$101,812
- Southern Nevada Health District: \$413,133
- Washoe County Health District: \$211,073. This amount includes \$30,000 for the Nevada Tobacco Prevention Coalition, which was previously funded by all applicants.

The evaluation committee also offered several general recommendations, as outlined in the handout. It was noted that the amount of available funding was contingent on legislative approval of the Governor's budget. Mr. Fontaine entertained a motion to approve the recommendations.

- (Unidentified) motioned to approve the SFY18-19 FHN Recommendations as presented. (Unidentified) seconded the motion. Mr. Fontaine asked if any GMAC members had a conflict of interest that they wished to disclose. There being none, the motion and second stood, and passed unopposed.

[Note for the record: The handout (Attachment A) included a typo in the total amount of the funding awards. The correct amount is \$800,022. Additionally, DPBH is now referring to this program as "Tobacco Prevention and Control Program" as no awards were granted for "cessation".]

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Fontaine called for modifications to the minutes of the March 9, 2017 GMAC meeting. There were none.

- Steve Kane moved to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2017 GMAC meeting as presented. The motioned was seconded by Diane Thorkildson and carried unopposed.

Mr. Fontaine indicated that all three members of the Wellness Subcommittee were present, and asked if they had any changes to the meeting of May 1. There were none.

- Jeff Bargerhuff moved to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2017 GMAC Wellness Subcommittee meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Dan Wold and carried unopposed.

Mr. Fontaine stated that four of the five members of the GMAC Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) Subcommittee were present, confirming a quorum. He called for corrections to the minutes. Candace Young-Richey requested a change on page three, under "Parent Education", first bullet point: Add Lincoln County to the list of rural counties mentioned there. There was a lot of discussion about funding needs in Lincoln County.

- Michele Howser moved to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2017 GMAC PCAN Subcommittee meeting with the correction as requested by Ms. Young-Richey. The motion was seconded by Ali Caliendo and carried unopposed.

Mr. Fontaine called for approval of the Disability Subcommittee meeting minutes. There were no corrections or additions offered.

- Susan Lucia-Terry moved to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2017 GMAC Disability Services Subcommittee meeting as presented. Allie Wright seconded, and the motion carried unopposed.

[Correction for the record: All five members of the PCAN Subcommittee were present. Four of the five members of the Disability Services Subcommittee were present, constituting a quorum.]

V. Public Comment

Las Vegas

Michele Johnson, Financial Guidance Center (FGC), had hoped to see consistency in the Department's decision-making processes. Unlike this current process, awards from the Problem Gambling Fund are based on scores, with the highest scoring applicants recommended for full funding. Eliminating or changing the scoring process diminishes the value of a well-written proposal. Additionally, the GMAC should take into consideration leveraged funds that come with these awards; every dollar that is decreased in the award to FGC diminishes the match by \$3. Communities lose more than just the obvious amount in the grant award. Also, it does not seem equitable to reduce all the applicants' funding requests by the same percentage when scores varied by more than 25% from top to bottom. The change is dramatic and the effect is that strong applications are punished. She thanked the GMAC for the opportunity to comment.

Marsha Blake, executive director of John Seastrand Helping Hands of North Las Vegas, explained that the organization is a collaborative partner of FGC. They have concerns over the recommendation to fund everyone at a lower percentage. Scores are not based just on good writing; they also speak to the innovation of the program and how the applicant delivers services and increases food to the community. As stated by Michele Johnson, scores varied by 25%, yet all are being asked to take a 23% reduction of their funding request. She asked the GMAC to adopt a more fair recommendation.

Audrey Arnold, executive director of ULAN, echoed the previous comments. She stated that in the draft minutes of the GMAC Wellness Subcommittee meeting, Dan Wold noted that the entire state was being covered between the top two applicants, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada and Financial Guidance Center (FGC). The "Nutrition for Life" program at FGC has more than doubled and has added more services to expand the one-stop.

Elko: None

Carson City

Cheri Jamason, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, stated that in addition to Washoe County, the food bank serves all of northern Nevada. She noted there were some challenges in this allocation process, and offered suggestions for the next RFA. The dollars available to fund the food program might be allocated by geographic areas, and determined by population, poverty level, unemployment rate, and other factors. Having a separate process for each geographical area may help. The application and allocation processes might be simplified by allowing organizations to be funded for their primary purpose. Separating the connection of services from food distribution may help smaller organizations identify funding. The State has robust distribution programs that could be used for that.

Peter Vogel, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada, discussed the letter he provided to the committee asking them to reconsider one stop shop funding option 1. He noted that the subcommittee meeting lasted only 23 minutes, and the data they saw was insufficient to make an adequate decision, having only received the documents Monday morning. Catholic Charities is based in Washoe, but 58% of its grant-funded services goes to the rural counties. Funding Option 1 showed Clark getting 30%, Washoe 67% and the Rurals 3%. One subcommittee member commented that Option 1 should not be considered because of the small percentage going to the Rurals. The reality is Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada funds can be split between the Rurals and Washoe. He asked the GMAC to reconsider Option because it does cover the State well. He also objected to making the same funding cut for high scoring applicants as for low scoring ones. Option 2 doesn't factor in scoring; all are funded at same percentage. Catholic Charities provides services to all counties except Clark. With the 23% cut that the subcommittee is recommending, the agency will not be able to cover the entire state, and the most affected areas will be the Rurals.

Ms. Smith stated that the wellness grant award recommendations attached to the subcommittee meeting minutes and approved by the subcommittee contained an error of (\$254,569). The Director was able to identify an additional \$250,000 to allocate to the wellness grants, increasing the available funding to \$2,550,000. That left a shortage of \$4,569, which she deducted from the lowest scoring applicant.

Diane Thorkildson asked for clarification. Ms. Smith explained that the original document did not incorporate the \$269,000 funding for Food Bank of Northern Nevada into the total. When she added that back in, total funding was overallocated by \$254,569. The Director reallocated \$250,000 to the wellness program area, which still left a shortage of \$4,569. That amount was deducted from East Valley Family Services, the lowest scoring applicant.

Michele Howser asked if the subcommittee is going to respond to public comment. Mr. Fontaine indicated that they cannot respond to comment but can respond to issues raised in general. He called for conflict of interest disclosures from GMAC members. Steve Kane stated that he serves on the board of directors for Food Bank of Northern Nevada and Catholic Charities of San Francisco, and would abstain from voting on the hunger grant awards.

Ms. Howser suggested they review all subcommittee reports before voting on any recommendations with the purpose of determining a consistent funding formula for all. Mr. Fontaine agreed, and turned the floor over to Ms. Thorkildson for the Wellness Subcommittee report.

VI. SFY18-19 Wellness Grant Awards

Diane Thorkildson, Chair of the GMAC Wellness Subcommittee, thanked the members of the subcommittee for their work and the applicants for the quality applications. During their subcommittee meeting, they discussed the two funding options. The first option would fund only the top few candidates. The second

option provided a 23% reduction in the requested amount to all applicants, allowing funding for all applicants with a score of 70 or more. Following discussion, it was decided that the best option at that time was to recommend Option 2, resulting in the following:

- Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada: \$922,541
- Consumer Credit Counseling Service dba Financial Guidance Center: \$525,343
- Food Bank of Northern Nevada: \$269,012
- Family Resource Center of Northeastern Nevada: \$325,722
- NyE Communities Coalition: \$180,851
- East Valley Family Services: \$326,531. This includes the \$4,569 reduction that Ms. Smith explained earlier.

Mr. Fontaine clarified that the funding amounts quoted by Ms. Thorkildson were those as shown on the revised recommendations handout, which includes the adjustments as explained by Ms. Smith, not the recommendations that were included as an attachment to the subcommittee's meeting minutes.

Ms. Thorkildson shared that as a new member of the GMAC and her first time chairing a grant application review subcommittee, she was comfortable with their decisions at the time, but afterward became less comfortable. She asked if the subcommittee could reconvene to look at a map of the state, find out what areas are being covered, and what services are available across the state. Fellow subcommittee members Dan Wold and Jeff Bargerhuff both indicated they would be willing to revisit their recommendations. Mr. Bargerhuff added that if they did reconvene, he would reevaluate the applications and make scoring adjustments based on the information they now have. Mr. Fontaine stated that it would not be appropriate to alter scores at this point, but alternate funding options could be discussed. The subcommittee could choose to reconvene, and bring new recommendations back to the GMAC at the June 8 meeting. The subcommittee members agreed to move forward today. Ms. Thorkildson added that prior to the next grant application cycle, she would like the GMAC to review the RFA process and have discussions regarding the issues that have been raised.

The group took a brief interlude while Connie Ronning, Auditor, OCPG, ran the numbers for Option 1 funding based on the additional funds allocated to the program area. Back on the record at 10:13 AM, the allocations were as follows: The top three scoring applicants would receive 100% of their request, leaving a balance remaining of \$320,265 for the next highest scoring applicant. The two lowest scoring applicants, NyE Communities Coalition and East Valley Services, would not get funded in this option. Mr. Bargerhuff asked how this would change the funding allocations in the three geographical areas of Clark, Washoe and North Rurals, and Rural Counties, and asked staff to update the dollar amounts and percentages, based on Mr. Vogel's estimation of 58% of Catholic Charities' award going to serve rural counties.

Mr. Fontaine asked Mr. Vogel, based on revised figures and considering that now, under option one, Nye, Lincoln, and Esmeralda Counties would not be funded at all, whether the percentage of funding going to the Rurals would change, and how it would affect Nye, Lincoln, and Esmeralda Counties. Mr. Vogel responded that the percentage may change, but they are all serviced under Option 1, just by a different agency.

Mr. Bargerhuff stated he wasn't coming up with the same numbers, and asked for clarification of which counties are considered northern rural and which are southern rural. When the subcommittee looked at the options presented, one objective was, regardless of scores, to consider equitable funding throughout

the state. Rather than make a decision now, he asked that the discussion be tabled so that staff can revise the numbers. Mr. Fontaine agreed, and moved on to the next agenda item.

VII. Public Comment

Elko: None

Las Vegas: None

Carson City: None

VIII. SFY18-19 PCAN Grant Awards

Ms. Smith reported that the GMAC PCAN Subcommittee met and is recommending funding all applicants scoring 80 or higher with a 10% reduction in the amount requested. This totals \$1,769,571, which includes all advertised funding for PCAN plus additional Title XX money. She stated there was a correction to the numbers that changed during the subcommittee meeting, and referred to the revised spreadsheet included in the handouts, not the one attached to the subcommittee meeting minutes.

Mr. Fontaine called for conflict of interest disclosures for PCAN.

- Stave Kane is on the board of The Boys and Girls Clubs of Wisconsin, but didn't know if this constituted a conflict.
- Jeff Fontaine recused himself from voting on the application from Clark County because they are a member of his association (Nevada Association of Counties).

Ali Caliendo, Chair of the GMAC PCAN Subcommittee, reported that the subcommittee met May 2 for about two hours. They had a very lengthy and informative discussion and have recommendations for process improvements in the next grant award cycle. She thanked all the applicants, adding that they are aware that these decisions can make or break some of the programs. All subcommittee members reviewed each of the 26 applications, so the scores are fair and consistent across the board. All those scoring 80 and above are being recommended for funding at a 10% reduction of the requested amount. This allowed funding to reach into some of the rural communities. A main concern was that the Rurals, particularly the frontier counties, were not being included. The subcommittee also wondered if the right amount of money had been allocated to each of the three subcategories of parent education, crisis intervention, and respite care. Candace Young-Richey commented on the challenges of programs in rural communities which the scoring process did not take into account. She suggested that in the future, the GMAC analyze the process, including how the rural and frontier counties are scored. The current process compares apples and oranges with the result that a very much needed parenting program in Lincoln County is not being funded, compared to Clark which receives much support. Also, the number of applications received played a part in the subcommittee's determinations. Ms. Caliendo concurred that while they followed the process guidelines strictly, the final recommendations might not be the most equitable, especially in parent training. They would like to see more collaboration, particularly in Clark County where there are so many programs.

Mr. Fontaine called for discussion or comments on the subcommittee's recommendation to fund all applicants with a score of 80% or more at a 10% reduction. There being no comments or further discussion, he tabled the action on this agenda item and moved to the next agenda item.

IX. Public Comment

Carson City

Mary Bryant, UNR, stated that they submitted a letter for the public record, but page two was missing in the handout distributed in Carson City. The issues she wished to review were:

- Page 3 of the RFA clearly spells out the dollars allocated to each subcategory in the disability services program area. During the meeting the subcommittee pooled all the money together and divvied it up.
- The RFA states that only proposals scoring over 60 will be considered, but in the Independent Living subcategory, there were four awards to applicants scoring in the 60s.
- The funding formula used reduced awards by a percentage equal to the application's score, so someone with a score of 73 got 73% of the funds requested. This changes the look of every project, to such a degree that you might not even want to fund them anymore. The criteria were different in each subcategory. She hoped the GMAC will reconsider using funding option one or option two, adding they prefer option one, which funds the best of the best.

Mark Tadder, Sierra Nevada Transportation Coalition, commented on awarding grants to applicants scoring lower than 60. The scores are reflective of the applications, and he would like to see the higher scores rewarded. Also, changing the funding award changes the proposed scope of work. He strongly recommended funding option one or two.

Don Jackson, UNR Reno, Center for Excellence in Disabilities, College of Education, disclosed that he is semi-retired and works on projects as needed, including advising staff of the PBS project; however, he receives no salary or funding from project. He echoed previous comments related to deviation from the RFA. He respects the work that went into the review process to make it fair and equitable; there are so many things to consider, including geographical distribution. In the disability category there are three distinct subcategories and it is a mistake to compare them apples to apples; they should be considered independently. The PBS project was funding in the previous cycle; they are the only provider providing statewide services and will lose \$20,000 already due to the decrease in funds allocated to that subcategory this year. The proposed option 3 would drop funding an additional 21.5%. About a third of the funds serve the Rurals, so cutting the project cuts services to those areas. He asked that the award recommendations follow the RFA which allocated funding as determined by the needs assessment between the three subareas, rather than cutting everyone's request so hugely, and that they consider funding option one or two.

Korine Viehweg, Northern Nevada RAVE, piggybacked on Mr. Jackson's comments and asked the GMAC to consider funding Option 1, adding that it is important to stay within the parameters described in the RFA. Also, copies of the letter they submitted to the GMAC that were distributed in Carson City did not include the second page.

Elko: None

Las Vegas: None

X. SFY18-19 Disability Services Grant Awards

Ms. Smith stated that the subcommittee recommendations include funding all applicants in all three subcategories. There were overallocations of \$234,768 in Independent Living, and underallocations of \$68,880 in PBS and \$327,168 in respite services. The residual funds were carried over to Independent Living, as shown on the handout in the packet. Per the RFA, the subcategory allocations are: \$550,000 for Independent Living; \$320,000 for Positive Behavior Support; and \$640,000 for Respite Care. These allocations feed in from the Community Needs Assessment and are included in the legislatively approved Governor's budget. Therefore, the Director's Office cannot accept this recommendation. It was noted that because funding for the PBS subcategory is legislatively allocated, as the only applicant, PBS Nevada will be awarded the full amount requested even though the application scored low.

Ms. Smith responded to public comments regarding the 60 point scoring threshold. It is an internal threshold for staff and has no bearing on the GMAC recommendations.

Mr. Fontaine called for disclosure of any conflicts of interest.

- Diane Thorkildson stated she works for Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities at UNR, which has multiple applications in Disability Services. Her salary is not funded out of these, but she works with some of the people and felt it best to abstain.
- Jeff Fontaine stated he would abstain from voting on the recommendations for Clark County Social Services.

Steve Kane, Disability Services Subcommittee Chair, thanked the committee members, staff, and applicants. The subcommittee struggled with the funding options; they could either fund the all-stars and starve everyone else, or find a way to fund everyone at the same percentage. They also acknowledged that scores often are reflective of the sophistication of the grantwriter rather than the quality of the program. Another consideration was to encourage smaller agencies or ones new to the process so they would get some experience working with grants from the Department and receive some funding. They did not consider an automatic cutoff score, or funding anyone at 100%. Mr. Kane suggested a third funding option which allowed them to fund everyone to the extent they could by awarding a higher percentage of the requested funding to higher scoring applicants and a lower percentage to lower scores, and reallocating money from one category to another. They have now learned that was not allowable, so the subcommittee recommendations will need to be revisited.

Mr. Fontaine referred the members to the spreadsheet attached to the subcommittee meeting minutes, which showed the funding allocations by subcategory and funding options one and two, and opened the floor for GMAC discussion. Ms. Howser suggested a funding formula that could be utilized by all subcommittees. PCAN recommendations would stand as presented, with a 10% reduction for all applicants scoring 70 or higher. In the Wellness category, reduce funding by 5% to those scoring in the high 80s, and by 10% for the rest. In Disability's Independent Living, fund scores of 85 and higher at a 5% reduction, and those scoring 70 and above at 10%. Fully fund the other two subcategories because the money is allocated. Mr. Fontaine added that they will also need to consider a recommendation on how to use the overage of funds in respite. Because the money is in the budget, it needs to be used. He explained that the subcommittee can have another meeting prior to June 8, or come up with a recommendation at this meeting. Steve Kane and the subcommittee members decided to move forward rather than reconvene the subcommittee, using the funding formula proposed by Ms. Howser.

Mr. Fontaine confirmed that it was the intent of the GMAC as a group to be as consistent as possible throughout all three subcommittee recommendations as to how the money is allocated. Ms. Howser formulated a recommendation for all three program areas as an action item.

- The PCAN recommendations stand as is, funding at a 10% reduction all applicants scoring 80 or more; the same in all three subcategories.
- In Wellness, apply reductions ranging from 5½% to 10% from the top scorer down to the score of 74.3, with Catholic Charities receiving the least reduction percentage and NyECC the highest percent reduction.
- In Disability Services, award 100% of the request to all applications in the Respite and PBS subcategories. In Independent Living, apply the same formula, funding all applications scoring 70 or

more, from RSVP down to Angela's House, with reductions between 5% and 10%, with RSVP receiving the lowest percentage of reduction and Angela's House the highest percentage cut.

Mr. Fontaine called for a fifteen minute recess for staff to recalculate the funding award amounts and compile a list of GMAC conflicts of interest. He asked the members to think about a recommendation for using the residual funds in the respite category.

The meeting reconvened at 11:51 AM. Staff reported out the recalculated funding award amounts, beginning with the disability services category.

- Independent Living: Funding allocations were computed using the formula of 5% reductions for the top three scoring applicants, and 15% reductions for the next four applicants. This resulted in an overage of \$20,105. Further computations were conducted applying various other percentage reductions, but a conclusive distribution of funds was not determined.
- Positive Behavior Support (PBS): The sole applicant would receive full funding.
- Respite Care: All applicants would receive full funding. The GMAC needs to formulate a recommendation for the balance of funds remaining.
- Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN): All recommendations stand as originally submitted.
- Wellness: Some time was spent running numbers for funding the applicants at 5%, 7%, 10% and 11% of the requested amount, depending on scores. In the interest of time, Mr. Fontaine commented that it was clear the group was interested in funding scores of 80 and above at a 5% reduction or less, and lower scoring applications at a higher reduction of around 10%, and that he would be comfortable giving staff allowance to divide the remaining funds proportionally among the highest top 3 applicants. Those formulas put the total at more than what was available. The group discussed eliminating East Valley Family Services, having decided that NyE Communities Coalition (NyECC) should be included because of its geographic service area and the score being close to where funds cut off. They discussed 5% for the top two, 10% for the next two, and the remaining funds to NyECC.

Candace Young-Richey objected to eliminating East Valley Family Services (EVFS), with a score of 70. They have a huge catchment area which includes Laughlin. She preferred they receive some funding and suggested revisiting funding option 2. Ms. Howser felt it unfair to apply a 23% reduction across the board and have the top scoring applicant take the same hit as the lowest scoring applicant.

Cindy Roragen stated for the record that with the elimination of EVFS, urban Clark County is taking a hit. Ms. Young-Richey added that East Valley relies heavily on this funding; they received \$387,000 last fiscal year and giving them nothing will decimate the program. On the other hand, Washoe is getting a brand new program that's never been funded before. Ms. Howser stated it would be cherry-picking to award funding on the basis of a geographic area not being serviced with money they used to get. Scoring, while not a perfect science, is the best we have to work with. Mr. Fontaine noted that first and foremost, they must ensure integrity in the process and confidence for the applicants that there is integrity and a system in place that is fair and objective. The question of geographic distribution also came up during the PCAN subcommittee review. He advocated for frontier counties, which did not score well, but the group decided they had to maintain integrity and next cycle either sub-allocate money geographically or score differently. If

you want to include EVFS, you are back to Option 2; otherwise the option before us is to fund five of the six applicants at a reduced level proportional to their ranking, without including EVFS.

Mr. Fontaine wrapped up the discussion, stating that due to a lack of time, the group needs to decide whether to move forward with recommendations today, or delay action until the June 8 meeting. Several members indicated their desire to finalize the recommendation today. Mr. Fontaine indicated that individual motions would be needed for each program area and sub-program area.

Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN)

- Michele Howser motioned to approve the *parent training and education programs* as listed on the awards recommendations handout (Attachment B). Dan Wold seconded. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unopposed with two abstentions (Jeff Fontaine and Steve Kane).
- Michele Howser motioned to approve the *crisis intervention programs* as listed on the awards recommendations handout (Attachment B). The motion was seconded by Ali Caliendo. There were no conflicts of interest noted, and no further discussion. The motion carried unopposed with no abstentions.
- Michele Howser motioned to approve the *child self-protection programs* as listed on the awards recommendations document (Attachment B). Diane Thorkildson seconded. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unopposed with no abstentions.

Disability Services

Positive Behavior Support

- Cindy Roragen moved to approve a grant award recommendation to UNR PBS at the full requested amount of \$320,000. Steve Kane seconded, and with no further discussion the motion carried unopposed with one abstention (Diane Thorkildson).

Respite

- Susan Lucia-Terry moved to approve grant awards to all applicants at the requested funding amount. The motion was seconded by Steve Kane and there being no further discussion, carried unopposed with no abstentions.
- Michele Howser moved to recommend that the \$194,223 in residual Respite funds be earmarked for special projects as determined by the OCPG. Cindy Roragen seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unopposed with no abstentions.

Independent Living

- Michele Howser motioned to recommend funding option 2 as listed on the awards recommendation handout. After further discussion by the committee members, Ms. Howser amended her motion and recommended:
 - funding the top three applicants scoring 80 and above (Nevada Rural Counties RSVP, Dignity Health/St. Rose Dominican, and Clark County Social Service) with a 5% reduction from the requested amounts;

- funding the next three applicants scoring between 70 and 79 (Accessible Space, Sierra Nevada Transportation Coalition, and BOR NSHE UNR Center for Excellence in Disabilities) with a 15% reduction from the requested amounts; and
- awarding the balance of the remaining funds to BlindConnect.

The amended motion was seconded by Cindy Roragen. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unopposed with two abstentions (Jeff Fontaine and Diane Thorkildson).

Wellness (Hunger One-Stop Shops)

Mr. Fontaine recapped the previous discussion. The program area has \$2,550,000 available to allocate. The committee discussed funding the top two applicants at a 7½ % reduction and the next three at a 15% reduction from the requested amount, which comes to exactly 2,550,000. In this scenario, EVFS would receive no funding. He called for a motion or further discussion.

- Diane Thorkildson motioned to recommend funding awards to:
 - Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada and Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Southern Nevada at a 7.5% reduction of the requested amounts; and
 - Food Bank of Northern Nevada, Family Resource Center of Northeastern Nevada, and NyE Communities Coalition at a 15% reduction of the requested amount.

The motion was seconded by Michele Howser. There was no further discussion. The motion carried with one opposed (Candace Young-Richey) and one abstention (Steve Kane).

XI. Public Comment

Elko: None

Las Vegas: None

Carson City: None

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Fontaine thanked the applicants, staff and GMAC members for their effort and time, and adjourned the meeting at 12:53 pm.

**Grants Management Advisory Committee
DRAFT Meeting Minutes May 25, 2017**

Attachment A

SFY18-19 Tobacco Use Prevention and Cessation Grant Award Recommendations



Fund for a Healthy Nevada SFY18-19 Recommendations

Organization	SFY14-15 Biennium Funding Amount – Per Year	SFY16-17 Biennium Funding Amount – Per Year	Next Biennium Funding Amount, Per Year - Requested	Next Biennium Funding Amount, Per Year - Recommended	Application Averaged Score Ranking ¹
Carson City Health and Human Services	\$89,912	\$72,463	\$129,027	\$74,004	2
Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership	\$125,891	\$144,278	\$135,000	\$101,812	4
Southern Nevada Health District	\$385,130	\$440,000	\$450,000	\$413,133	1
Washoe County Health District	\$186,950	\$201,977	\$276,542 (inc. \$30,000 NTPC)	\$211,073²	3
	\$787,883	\$858,718	\$1,020,569	\$800,023	N/A

Background: The Tobacco Prevention and Control Program’s Request for Applications for SFY18 and 19 included three components. All four agencies listed above applied for Components 1 and 2. Only Southern Nevada Health District applied for Component 3 in addition to Components 1 and 2.

Evaluation Committee General Recommendations

- Carson City Health and Human Services: for Component 1, link strategies and activities to outcomes; regarding the health systems component, the applicant should articulate a two-year timeline, include more quantitative numbers, and clarify direction change for desired outcomes.
- Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership: increase Nevada Tobacco Prevention Coalition participation, increase efficiency by having one coalition work on the health systems component, develop health systems activities beyond introductory steps (outline in narrative), and address rural disparities in the work plan.
- Southern Nevada Health District: reduce travel budget (specifically to Reno), remove “etc.” from budget; regarding the surveillance component, include an estimate of the number people to be surveyed as appropriate to funding requested, and include clear methodology.
- Washoe County Health District: objectives should be more aggressive for youth prevention and eliminating secondhand smoke goals, the efficacy of smoke-free meetings is questionable and should be linked with other strategies to be truly evidenced-based, such as replacing the number of smoke-free meetings with number of venues that adopt policies. Additionally, the applicants should make work plan and narrative language consistent (while aligning with best practices), specify a partner to follow up on efforts to educate decision-makers and leaders about the importance of smoke-free jurisdictions, evaluation measures for both components need to be improved, substitute an intern or temporary P/T employee instead of adding an FTE.
- Overall: applicants’ strategies and activities described in the project narrative should include clear and direct purposes in future applications and provide more quantitative information throughout the application.
- RFA Scoring Process: for applicable applicants, place increased emphasis on the history of past outcomes (and/or the status of current progress achieved).

¹ Scoring criteria accounted for factors besides grant writing such as historical reporting, burden, and the potential to address disparities.

² Washoe County Health District’s award includes \$30,000 for the Nevada Tobacco Prevention Coalition (NTPC) which was previously funded by all applicants. This reallocation was prompted as a result of input communicated by NTPC and stakeholders.

**Grants Management Advisory Committee
DRAFT Meeting Minutes May 25, 2017**

Attachment B

**Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) Subcommittee
FY18-19 Grant Award Recommendations**

**SFY18-19 Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) Proposals
GMAC PCAN Subcommittee Funding Recommendations**

PARENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS						
Geographic Service Area	Organization Name	Project Title	FY17 Grant Amount (if any)	FY18 Request Amount	AVG GMAC Score	FY18* Recommended Award
Rural (Carson and Storey Counties)	Advocates to End Domestic Violence	Positive Parenting Through Family Crisis	25,264	29,306	90.4	26,375
Rural (Elko County)	Family Resource Center of Northeast Nevada	Parent Training and Activities to Prevent Child Maltreatment	75,092	73,451	88.8	66,106
Clark County (Urban and Rural)	Clark County Department of Family Services	Parenting Project	77,837	96,660	87.5	86,994
Washoe County (Urban and Rural)	The Children's Cabinet, Inc.	Parenting Education	28,591	82,439	87.4	74,195
Washoe County (Urban and Rural)	Washoe County Family Resource Center Coalition	Washoe County School District Family Resource Center Parent Training Programs	146,426	169,341	87.2	152,407
Elko County	Wells Family Resource Center	Parenting Classes		7,026	85.4	6,323
Rural (Carson, Douglas, Lyon, Storey Counties)	Ron Wood Family Resource Center	Positive Action Parent/Family Training and Case Management.	70,382	70,372	83.8	63,335
Clark County (Predominantly Urban with some Rural)	UNR - Board of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education - Cooperative Extension	FY18-19 UNCE Partners in Parenting		83,080	82.6	74,772
Clark County (Predominantly Clark with some service in Washoe and Northern Rural)	UNLV - Board Of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education	Prevent Child Abuse Nevada Community Outreach and Training	56,332	101,042	82.0	90,938
Clark County (Urban and Rural)	Boys Town Nevada, Inc.	Common Sense Parenting®	45,402	172,905	82.0	155,615
Washoe County (Reno/Sparks) and Lyon County (Fernley)	Boys & Girls Club of Truckee Meadows	Strengthening Families Program (SFP)	65,628	105,578	81.2	95,020
						-
Clark County (Las Vegas South, West, East and Henderson)	Dignity Health St. Rose Dominican	WIC Parent Training Project	42,839	48,071	77.8	
Churchill and Lyon Counties	Churchill County Social Services	Churchill and Lyon Parenting Initiative		143,625	75.3	
Rural (Lincoln County)	Family To Family Connection - ISD 9	Parenting the Love and Logic Way	25,689	32,207	75.6	
Carson City and Washoe County	Nevada Urban Indians	Victim Services and Family Support		73,516	74.2	
Esmeralda and Nye Counties	Nevada Outreach Training Organization - No To Abuse	Parenting and Education Training		61,188	72.8	
Clark County (Las Vegas Central and East, and Laughlin)	East Valley Family Services	Bears and Binkies, a positive parenting program.	26,499	30,135	70.2	
Washoe County	Ridge House	Celebrating Families Parenting Education and Training		25,000	63.0	
		TOTALS	685,981	1,404,942		892,080

CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS						
Geographic Service Area	Organization Name	Project Title	FY17 Grant Amount (if any)	FY18 Request Amount	AVG GMAC Score	FY18* Recommended Award
Clark County (Urban and Rural) and Southern Nye County	Olive Crest Foster Family Agency	Strong Families	210,676	184,229	85.6	165,806
Washoe County	The Children's Cabinet, Inc.	Safe Place	96,951	143,413	85.0	129,072
Clark County	Boys Town Nevada, Inc.	In-Home Family Services		384,511	83.4	346,060
Washoe County (Incline Village to Crystal Bay)	Tahoe SAFE Alliance	Tahoe SAFE Alliance Children's Program	36,734	44,375	80.6	39,938
Humboldt, Lander, Pershing Counties	The Family Support Center	No Wrong Door, Child and Family Support		132,057	70.0	
		TOTALS	344,361	888,585		680,876

CHILD SELF-PROTECTION TRAINING PROGRAMS						
Geographic Service Area	Organization Name	Project Title	FY17 Grant Amount (if any)	FY18 Request Amount	AVG GMAC Score	FY18* Recommended Award
Mineral County	BOR NSHE UNR Coop Extension Mineral County	Peacemaking Skills for Mineral County Little Kids		36,773	88.0	33,096
Washoe County (Reno/Sparks), Lyon and Storey Counties	Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County	Elementary Child Abuse Prevention Workshop	102,350	120,621	82.4	108,559
Clark County (Urban and Rural)	The Rape Crisis Center	KidSPACE Programs	40,000	66,304	80.4	54,960
		TOTAL	142,350	223,698		196,615
		TOTALS	1,172,692	2,517,225		1,769,571
		Available SFY 18 (FHN & Title XX)	1,769,571	1,769,571		1,769,571
		Difference	596,879	-747,654		-

* The subcommittee recommends funding all agencies that scored a minimum of 80 points at a 10% reduction of their funding request.