

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) Subcommittee on Disability Services
April 29, 2013 Draft Minutes**

Meeting Locations

Carson City: Health Division, 4150 Technology Way, Suite 303

Las Vegas: Dept. of Employment, Training and Rehab, 2800 E St. Louis, Conference Room C

Subcommittee Members Present

Michele Howser
Cindy Roragen
Connie McMullen
Marcia O'Malley

Subcommittee Members Absent

None

DHHS Staff Present

Laurie Olson, Chief, DHHS Grants Management Unit (GMU)
Sally Dutton, Social Services Program Manager, GMU
Rique Robb, Social Services Program Manager, GMU
Pat Petrie, Social Services Program Manager, GMU
Gloria Sulhoff, Administrative Assistant, GMU

Members of the Public Present

In Carson City:

Jenelle Stathes and Korine Viebweb, Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation
Season Riley, Family Respite of Northeast Nevada
Mary Bryant and Mark Tadder, Citicare
Susan Haas, Nevada Rural RSVP
Melissa Starr, DETR, Rehabilitation Division
Hilda Velds, Hentjie Apag and Lisa Bonie, NNCIL
Ashley Greenwald and Don Jackson, PBS – Nevada
Scott Youngs, NCED

In Las Vegas:

Shannon Crozier, UNLV
Linda Lewis, Positively Kids
Tina Jeeves, Easter Seals
Celeste Graham, RAGE
Jean Peyton, Blind Connect
Shelle Sponseller, Accessible Space, Inc.
Jeff Lundell, Salvation Army
Jennifer Bevacqua, Olive Crest
Megan Testa, ALS of Nevada
Mary Evilsizer, Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living

I. Call to Order and Election of Chair

Laurie Olson, Chief

Ms. Olson opened the meeting at 8:30 am with the announcement that all subcommittee members were in attendance along with several members of her staff in both the north and south meeting locations. As the first item of business, she called for nominations for a subcommittee chairperson.

- Cindy Roragen nominated Marcia O'Malley as Chair of the GMAC Disability Services Subcommittee. Connie McMullen seconded the motion, and there being no discussion, the motion carried unopposed.

Before turning the meeting over to Ms. O'Malley, Ms. Olson asked attendees to turn off their cell phones, be mindful of the noise created by rustling papers, and keep the microphone muted when not speaking. She expected the meeting to continue until 4:30 pm or the close of business, whichever came first. The first subcommittee to meet, which reviewed program applications for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN), began at 8:30 am and ended by noon.

Ms. Olson also stated for the record that a representative from Family Respite of Northeast Nevada had been in attendance, but left before the meeting began due to a family medical emergency. The Department decided to make an exception and allow that application to stand. Any questions for the applicant will be addressed by Rique Robb from the GMU staff. Any other applicants who fail to have representation at the meeting without prior notification will be disqualified. Having no further announcements, Ms. Olson turned the meeting over to Ms. O'Malley.

Ms. O'Malley thanked the applicants for their hard work in putting together their proposals, which were reviewed in detail by the subcommittee members. She noted that this is a very competitive process and due to the limited funding available, unfortunately it would not be possible to fund all the proposals.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Overview

Laurie Olson

Ms. Olson explained that the DHHS budget closed, and the money is still available, so there was no need to amend the RFA. There was still a chance of that happening if the economic forum comes out with a poor forecast, but it is not expected. The federal sequestration did reduce the Title XX money by 5.1%, but DHHS Director Mike Willden commented he would like to try to back that out of our state grants, instead of our nonprofit grants. Another good thing is that it's a fairly small amount, and we have almost \$1 million in reserves to carry us through the next two years. As a Unit we did not assign the Title XX funds to any program area. These funds are very flexible and can be used for any of our current funding priorities. It will be up to the subcommittees to request Title XX money. The PCAN subcommittee decided to request some to supplement the \$821,000 available for parent training and crisis intervention. They asked for \$550,000, which is a cut from what they have been receiving, but not as large as it could have been. They originally were thinking of asking for 33%, but because Title XX is currently funding more in that funding priority, they didn't want to send a message that supporting programs for prevention of child abuse and neglect isn't as important as it used to be.

Ms. Olson explained a variety of ways the subcommittee could proceed. Last year, every applicant was brought to the table for questioning, and the proceedings lasted all day. The PCAN subcommittee decided to question only those in the running for funding. If this subcommittee considered full funding for all qualifying applicants, the funds would cover programs on the score sheet down to Nevada Rural Counties RSVP. If each applicant was questioned for 15 minutes, it would take 5½ hours. Allow yourselves enough time to discuss, deliberate, and bring people back to the table if you find you have further questions. She reminded the group that the GMAC was asked not to make across-the-board

budget cuts by percentage, but to identify specific budget items which might be cut. The applicants were advised at the RFA orientation to submit sensible budgets with the amounts they required, and be prepared to defend their budgets. The score sheets include a column with fiscal year 2013 funding; a zero indicates they are not currently funded. She noted that the amount indicated is not necessarily reflective of the original request, because funding awards were lowered. A score adjustment sheet was provided to the members for making score adjustments as applicants were questioned. Ms. Olson asked the members not to change their overall score, but only change specific scoring areas. When the subcommittee has finished questioning the applicants, any adjustments in scores will be provided confidentially to Ms. Olson for recalibration. She indicated that once the granting process has been completed, applicants can request their scores, as well as the strengths and weaknesses as identified by the GMU, by sending her an email.

As reviewed at the GMAC meeting in March, if a program is scalable, you can request GMU to work with the applicant to reduce the budget. You can also request changes to the Scope of Work, or assign specific award conditions such as increased fiscal or program monitoring requirements. The subcommittee's funding recommendations will go to the full GMAC to make final recommendations, but they are still only recommendations. They will be reviewed by DHHS Director Mike Willden, who makes the final decisions. Most of the time he honors the GMAC because they have done the work; however, last year he asked us to adjust the dollar amounts based on the scores. Ms. Olson stated that she would make live adjustments on her computer as the subcommittee proceeded in order to track changes in geographic distribution. The score sheet was color-coded for her benefit to assist in compiling a breakdown of requests by geographic location.

It was necessary for the subcommittee members to disclose any conflict of interest for the record. Ms. Olson explained that if a member has an affiliation with any of the applicants, he could decide to abstain from voting, or if he is unsure whether the affiliation requires an abstention, he can ask for input from the other subcommittee members. If any member decides to abstain, when it becomes time to vote, that agency will be taken out of the mix and voted on separately.

Cindy Roragen, Connie McMullen and Michele Howser all indicated they have no conflicts of interest with any of the applicants. Ms. O'Malley stated that her teenage son participates in Teen Rave, although that program is not up for consideration. Ms. Olson added that the GMAC bylaws specify a conflict as receiving financial gain. There were no comments from the subcommittee members.

Ms. Howser asked for recommendations regarding allocation of the Title XX funds. Ms. Olson replied that the subcommittee has the right to ask for any amount it feels is needed, but she recommended they be prepared with a back-up plan in case they don't get their full request at the May 9th GMAC meeting.

IV. Review of Proposals

Marcia O'Malley

Ms. O'Malley led a brief discussion on how to proceed regarding the applicant interviews, and it was decided to interview only the higher scoring applicants, not all of them. They would also have to keep in mind geographic distribution, type of program services, and client demographics. The subcommittee began their reviews with Respite proposals, beginning with the highest scoring applications.

Easter Seals Nevada, Respite Program, represented by Tina Jeeves.

Q: I have a concern in this category for several of the applicants regarding the statement that all, or majority of, the children are at-risk for out-of-home placement. Can you give us justification?

A: We get parent survey responses. We are well-known for accepting children and adults that others don't; individuals who have been kicked out of other places.

Q: Is this grant your only source of funding?

A: We did write and get a grant from Catholic Healthcare West – St. Rose – for service in their zip code areas.

Q: Personnel includes the program director. What is the role and why is \$18,000 needed from this fund?

A: The program director devotes 25% of her time to this program for family outreach, respite vouchers, distributes checks, answers questions and gives referrals.

Q: \$150 per month provides how many hours?

A: Most get about \$20 per month, depending. They choose their own provider, and most pay \$10/hour.

Foundation for Positively Kids, Respite Care program, represented by Linda Lewis.

Q: Licensed nurses are included in the budget but there is no explanation of who they are or their experience.

A: We employ only licensed nurses and require experience working with medically fragile and developmentally disabled children.

Q: Are staff rotated, or are they assigned?

A: It is based on geographic location, the individual needs of the family, on a case-by-case basis.

Q: Are there any collaborative efforts?

A: We don't collaborate in direct delivery of services but do work with other organizations.

Q: Clarify "medically fragile/disabled" that you work with; does this mean health conditions or disabilities?

A: Both. These are children who are medically fragile at birth or by accident require basic medical care to survive, as well as children ages 1-3 with developmental disabilities.

Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation, represented by Korine Viebweg and Jenelle Stathes.

RAVE Family Center:

Q: Explain your assumption in Outcome 2 that all children are at-risk for out-of-home placement.

A: We are not stating they are at risk currently, but that they are at increased risk.

Q: In providing respite for children with disabilities, does that include siblings without disabilities?

A: Yes, siblings under the age of seven.

Q: Are there any collaborative efforts?

A: We have an operating MOU with Washoe County School District. We receive \$20,000 in-kind for rent and utilities, and provide several presentations in the school district to recruit families.

Q: Are you currently serving 40 families?

A: Our current goal is 35 families, and has been for past funding cycles. We believe 40 is attainable.

Rural Respite:

Q: Is this grant your only funding source? Also, you have cost of service at a rate of \$10/hour, while many others use \$20.

A: That has been our ongoing rate in the past. It works for the families. Some families ask to pay more. In the past we have not written other grants but have become aware we'll need to do that.

Q: How do you identify families in rural areas and is it the same director for both programs?

A: Yes, I am the director for both programs. The families fill out a medical form that comes with the application. That's how we make sure.

Q: Do you believe you can make your goal?

A: Yes, we have a waiting list.

Olive Crest Foster Family Agency, Respite Program (Family Preservation), represented by Jennifer Bevacqua.

Q: How do you justify 250 children at-risk for out-of-home placement?

A: That's what we're aiming to serve. It's at-risk. We hope to prevent out-of-home care. Children with disability are at risk. Our goal is to keep the family intact.

Q: You listed no collaborations?

A: We are the main provider of our respite linking with providers. It's our responsibility to work with the community. The voucher becomes our agreement. We have a partner agreement with providers. We do work with and have community partners as families are assessed to need more services.

Q: Did you receive the pending grant?

A: We have a grant department which has been able to secure some funding; foundation grants. I have not been notified yet on the pending grant.

Q: Please confirm you serve children with autism and emotionally disturbed?

A: Yes. Our goal is to try to complement and leverage what's out there, to fill the gap.

(For the record it was noted that Ms. Olson had returned to the meeting after fixing a computer issue.)

Head Start of Northeastern Nevada, Family Respite of Northeastern Nevada, representative Season Riley was excused due to a family emergency. Represented in questioning by GMU staff Rique Robb.

Ms. Robb explained that this is a center-based respite program for young children and youth. Respite care is provided by volunteers.

Q: There was not much data in the needs statement. What is the impact to the community?

A: They are the only center-based respite program in that area.

Q: Regarding the cost per unit, the narrative states one hour of respite care equals one unit. Others are at a rate of \$20 per hour, is this \$53.80 per hour?

A: This is not an hourly rate. They took the cost of their entire program, including operational costs, and divided it by the number of respite hours they provide. Other center-based programs are substantially higher, probably at \$150 per hour.

Q: The budget includes \$1,000 for a laptop?

A: I think they've been using the program director's computer, and never had one of their own.

Nevada Rural Counties RSVP, NV Rural RSVP Respite Care, represented by Susan Haas.

Q: Clarify the volunteer stipend. Do all receive a stipend, and how does that offset volunteer time?

A: Our in-kind budget figures are based on overall program volunteer time. There are a wide variety of program support services for seniors. One is the respite program. Not all volunteers receive stipends. Some volunteers provide more than the eight to 10 hours we request, and others not as many.

Q: Who is eligible?

A: In this proposal we're looking to expand our client base to younger people who are taking care of their parents and other family members who are caregivers. We also want to expand to include under-50 respite care.

Q: Have your pending grants been secured? Do you have a formal collaboration with United Way?

A: United Way has us on a tier system. Their focus is on youth, there's no definite funding with United Way. We have submitted grant applications to MGM Foundation, ADSD, and one other.

Q: You have an MOU with the Alzheimer's Association?

A: We have an MOU with the Alzheimer's Association to train respite providers. We've worked with them for many years.

Q: I see no clear definition of disability.

A: Most of our clients self-identify. They may receive disability from the State, or they state that their spouse needs assistance. We don't have a doctor's statement. If they need assistance we give it to them if we can. We evaluate the situation and use an intake form developed with ADSD. We can't do toileting or medications because we have no medical staff volunteers.

Q: What is the public information expense for in the budget?

A: That is to provide outreach, news articles, a respite commercial. KNPG filmed an Alzheimer's training session. We want to increase our presence in the rurals.

Q: How do you propose to cover so many counties?

A: We start with the areas of greatest need by sending representatives to senior centers and community centers. For instance, in Pahrump so many need help but have a hard time accepting help. They see it as a weakness. It is a scalable program, instead of 50 volunteers, we could cut back to 30 or 20, but the need is great.

Q: If you were to cut vouchers, cut clients, would overhead be cut, too?

A: Yes. We would scale back in all other areas.

Q: Regarding public information, have you worked with the Public Broadcasters Association?

A: Yes, they've had us on their radio show.

Q: Can you talk about the role of the marketing director? How does that benefit the program?

A: Yes. I am the marketing director and director of development. I was the program director for five years prior. These elderly are isolated, homebound, and without the internet.

The subcommittee members held a discussion regarding the funding available for this service area. They considered scaling programs, the instruction not to cut funds across the board, and the impact of geographical distribution. They decided to review the remaining categories before making decisions in Respite.

Before beginning the questioning in Independent Living, the subcommittee discussed determining a scoring cut-off point for the questioning. It was noted that only two programs serve youth, Best Buddies and Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living.

Citicare, Non-ADA Transportation, represented by Mary Bryant and Mark Tadder.

Q: What is the status of the two unsigned MOUs?

A: They have since been signed. Washoe County School District is still working through the system.

Q: Will the RTC be able to meet the demand for additional service delivery?

A: Yes, they have been able to meet demand for the past 12 years.

Q: Is this a new program?

A: We purchase rides from the RTC. The partners are excited. We don't anticipate bumps and hope it goes smoothly.

NV Rural Counties RSVP, Escorted Transportation, represented by Susan Haas.

Q: Please clarify how you document disabilities.

A: We currently use State documents. If we can open the program to younger clients we will need better documentation. With elderly clients it's fairly obvious, they can't see to drive, etc.

Q: In your outcomes, you expect 100% participation in the survey. Is that realistic?

A: The surveys will be with the volunteers who will have clients fill them out right then. They will not be mailed in but submitted at the time of service.

Q: Is there a status change in any of the pending grants?

A: The CDBG of \$55,750 has been awarded. We don't know the results of the ADSD grant yet.

Accessible Space, Nevada Supporting Housing Services Project, represented by Shelle Sponseller.

Q: Clarify the difference between this project and what you do now. Is there collaboration?

A: Yes, we collaborate with the Department of Welfare, Medicaid, the Rural Regional Center, Desert Regional Center, statewide.

Q: Do you share data? Is there a universal application?

A: We have our own application for housing because of HUD.

Q: Do residents leverage Disability and other benefits?

A: Yes, although it is not required to have our services.

Q: How does the need for case management relate to the lack of housing?

A: There is a lack of housing, and no funding to build new housing. Case management allows us to keep in touch with applicants; 300 a month apply to three to five buildings at a time. Once in a building, they help maintain annual housing paperwork. HUD does not have case managers.

Q: You have a wait list. Do you refer to other places?

A: Yes.

Q: Are you leveraging or applying for other funds?

A: We have applied for other funding. We leveraged HUD, but the 2011 funds have been cut. We try to access home funds, and have a department to seek funds.

Salvation Army, Vocational Training program, represented by Jeff Lundell.

Q: Is this request to fund an existing program or to expand?

A: It's for an existing program. The Salvation Army has had several changes, especially the Owens Campus, so it's important in order to maintain our program to seek out new sources of funding.

Q: Explain the need for computer and printers.

A: We have a computer lab with wireless laptops from 2006. Out of 17, eight are operable. This is needed to bring the computer lab up to speed. They are necessary for job applications and vocational training.

Q: Mental illness is an obstacle but there is no MOU for a mental health assessment?

A: All come through SAMHSA (*Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration*). We receive many through Shade Tree, Catholic Charities, and the Rescue Mission, with a lot of co-occurring substance abuse. We send suspected mental health clients to SAMHSA for formal evaluation. Thirty-five percent or so of folks have a disability.

Q: Explain the culinary arts program.

A: It is a joint collaboration with Job Connect, the College of Southern Nevada and the Salvation Army. We hold two classes per year. DETR (*Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation*) and Job Connect are very supportive. Money has increased steadily per individual. Success varies, with 70% to 80% of the people completing the program and obtaining employment. The focus is on self-sufficiency, and employment is key.

Q: After job placement, coaching, what is the level of follow-up?

A: Program participants can stay on campus for up to nine months. Those who stay do very well. Even for three to six months, they can develop a nest egg, a work history, and work references. Many move out of state to work in national parks in Utah and Arizona, which is well-suited for singles and individuals. It is hard to follow-up on these people but we do stay in contact with those parks.

Q: Are you seeking new sources of funding?

A: We are hoping for that opportunity here.

**Blind Center of Nevada, Vision Rehabilitation program, no representative in attendance.
Application Disqualified.**

Blindconnect, Independence program, represented by Jean Peyton.

Q: Your application states that there is no blind skills training available for ages 22-55, yet a second applicant makes the same claim. With two projects operating, explain how you can make this claim.

A: There are two reasons. Our organizations' focus is different. Our daily independent living skills program has been operating for four years. The low vision program started last December. It performs vision evaluations and provides adaptive equipment to maximize vision use.

Q: You list no collaborations. Do you plan to seek collaborations?

A: We are collaboratively working with the College of Southern Nevada, West Charleston for facilities and students, and the RTC for our summer program that provides transportation for youth and trains youth to access public transportation. We have a new MOU with RAGE and are working more and more with the Nevada Disabilities Advocacy Law Center.

Q: A follow-up question. Do you have an MOU with the school and RTC, and what does the RTC offer your program? Do clients pay?

A: The RTC provides transportation for youth 10 days during the summer and a mobility trainer, so they do not need to depend on paratransit. There is no charge to clients; it is an in-kind from RTC. We have always operated on a handshake agreement but can obtain an MOU if needed. We have one more year on our contract with the college.

Q: An MOU would be an improvement moving forward. You could have scored higher on collaboration for an additional 10 points.

Best Buddies International, Northern Nevada Friendship and Mentoring Project, no representative in attendance. Application Disqualified.

Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living, Student Advocacy Training Project, represented by Mary Evilsizer.

Q: Do you have an MOU with the schools?

A: We partner with schools, help identify activities at schools, and provide a school to work transition. It's a marketing issue. We could do an MOU, but chose to go to the front line individuals directly working with the individuals, based on needs.

Q: Regarding your 279-page guide, how is that accessible to challenged students?

A: It is published in book form, available on the web, on CD Rom, in large print, and in Braille. We find that having hard copies they can take away is important when they move on to remind them of the organizational help available.

Q: Not having an MOU with CCSD (*Clark County School District*) is a sort of red flag. School district policy is sometimes easy, sometimes not. How can you demonstrate that once you get in you can stay in?

A: It is in our strategic plan to get an MOU. For now we are going in with people who work with the students and have the power to invite us. We can establish MOUs.

Q: Do you collaborate with other youth-based organizations, including Nevada PEP?

A: Yes, we provide them our guide books. We do not do joint presentations but that is a good idea. Also, since submitting our application, I have talked to Voc-Rehab and another group we could collaborate with on joint presentations.

Q: Regarding the guide, why not use an electronic searchable database or tie in with ADRC (*Aging and Disability Resource Centers*), Family Ties, 2-1-1?

A: We have a searchable database on our site. Updates for the printed copies are posted on the website. Also we are listed in ADRC and 2-1-1. It would be a matter of connecting.

Q: Have you any other funding?

A: We have a resource development person on our board and have submitted applications to private foundations and MGM. We are branching out and participated in the recent online fundraiser, Nevada GIVES. Our Board has been fundraising, and since our proposal was submitted we received notice that Congress has reauthorized Ticket to Work and another program that, if re-funded, will provide trainers to talk to students regarding Social Security funds when they turn 18 or get a job. We average five proposals a month.

Ms. Olson recalculated the running total of funding requests, after having eliminating the two applicants who were not in attendance. She confirmed that the money allocated to this category could not be used for another category.

The subcommittee then interviewed the only applicant under Positive Behavior Support (PBS).

Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, Positive Behavior Support to Nevadans, represented in Las Vegas by Dr. Shannon Crozier and in Carson City by Don Jackson and Ashley Greenwald.

Q: My concern is that most of the funding request is for salaries, not direct services.

A: PBS is a process of enabling people with disabilities. It's science-based process and labor intensive. Staff is providing the services, training, follow up.

Q: Are you training school district personnel, or are they contracting with you? I'm not sure of your role with districts.

A: PBS falls into school-wide, and is individual and family-based. A joint process can't support the entire district. Washoe has adopted the school-wide model funded through the district. We don't provide it. We can't afford it.

Q: Provide clarification about why the Northwest and School-Wide Training Coordinator is in your budget.

A: She has good talent with experience in behavior intervention. It is a field-based faculty position. She is an employee of the school district working with us. We pay the school district to pay her salary.

Q: How would your budget be impacted if there were no additional Title XX funds?

A: During the application process we consulted with GMU and colleagues and had reasonable expectation that some Title XX funds might be available. We included that in the budget to show how the money would be spent. We have a 25% reduction in funds this cycle versus the last three years and have combined the three projects to save money. We have submitted a reasonable budget. It is not padded. We are requesting 6% percent of total Title XX funds available. Not getting it would be a devastating cut. Looking at a \$325,000 budget would be impossible; we would have to drastically cut back on goals. There would be a 33% reduction in direct services.

V. Break

The subcommittee took a short break to process score adjustments, after which time they planned to consider requesting budget cuts and the scaling back of programs. After processing the score adjustments, the applicants maintained the same ranking with the exception that the two RAVE programs switched ranking positions.

VI. Award Recommendations

Marcia O'Malley

Discussion began with the Positive Behavior Support category. Full funding of the proposal would require Title XX funds. It was recommended that the award be limited to the \$325,000 available in this category. The subcommittee requested that GMU work with the applicant to identify specific areas in which to reduce the budget from \$398,654, while ensuring that reductions were applied to overhead costs, not just to direct services. They also requested that benchmarks and special conditions be put in place to clearly report how the money is being spent and identify the population numbers and types of services delivered. Ms. Olson suggested that GMU staff and the grantee present a report at the fall GMAC meeting.

- Ms. Howser moved to recommend funding the Nevada System of Higher Education's Positive Behavior Support to Nevadans program for \$325,000 with specific budget reduction recommendations and special conditions to be negotiated by the GMU. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMullen and carried unanimously with no abstentions.

The subcommittee then reviewed the Respite proposals. There was a change in ranking between the two proposals from RAVE. They were mindful to consider geographic coverage, service delivery styles, and the number of people served. Fully funding all the applicants they interviewed would put them over budget by \$371,270. Available options including scaling back programs such as the voucher programs, changing the Scope of Work, and adding special conditions. After considering several options, the subcommittee recalled the applicants to request specific budget cuts to their proposals.

Easter Seals, Tina Jeeves. Reducing the number of vouchers to 125 per family and eliminating the Senior Vice-President of Program's salary and the travel to Reno came to a reduction of \$36,757. Ms. Jeeves accepted that reduction indicating there was no need to go through negotiations with GMU. The revised funding request is \$207,344.

Positively Kids Foundation, Linda Lewis. Ms. Lewis agreed to reduce the number of respite hours to 45, resulting in a budget reduction of \$6,500 and a revised funding request of \$58,500.

Northern Nevada RAVE Foundation, Jenelle Stathes.

Rural Respite. Budget cuts included reducing salary percentages as negotiated by GMU, and reducing the number of vouchers to 800, for a revised funding request of \$171,000.

Family Center. Ms. Stathes offered to cut the costs of supplies by 50% and reduce salary percentages of two personnel. This resulted in a \$17,932 cut in the budget and a revised funding request of \$88,503.

Olive Crest, Jennifer Bevacqua. Budget cuts included reducing the number of vouchers to 275 per family for 250 children, reducing respite staff from two to one, and reducing staff mileage. This came to a cut of \$11,191 for a revised funding request of \$124,670.

Head Start of Northern Nevada, GMU staff Rique Robb on behalf of organization. Ms. Robb indicated that the biggest increase in the grantee's budget is in staff. She was donating more than half her time in-kind, and travel costs due to two locations. Ms. Olson recommended waiting until the next break so she could calculate the reduction percentages of the other requests, and make a comparable reduction.

Nevada Rural Counties RSVP, Susan Haas. Ms. Haas suggested reducing volunteers to 30, respite volunteer stipends to 30, corresponding mileage expense reimbursement reductions, a 50% reduction in

the public information category which would require a line item change, eliminating the cost for Charter Media and the Director of Marketing's salary, and reducing the Respite Coordinator's salary by 50%. This resulted in a budget cut of \$42,753 for a revised funding request of \$130,380.

The subcommittee took a lunch break and reconvened at 2:33 pm. Ms. Olson reminded them that the room would become unavailable at 4:30. Ms. Olson calculated the percentages of budget cuts for each applicant to ensure that higher scoring applicants were not reduced more than lower scoring applicants. The percentages ranged from 15% for the higher scoring to 25% for the last two.

- Ms. McMullen moved to recommend funding Easter Seals, Foundation for Positively Kids, Northern Nevada RAVE Foundation (both proposals), and Olive Crest at the negotiated funding levels as indicated; and to reconsider the funding the proposals from Head Start of Northeastern Nevada and Nevada Rural Counties RSVP through Title XX after they complete additional review of programs in the Independent Living category. The motion was seconded by Ms. Howser and carried unopposed with no abstentions.

Following a brief discussion on the applications in the Independent Living category, the subcommittee recalled several applicants for further questioning.

Accessible Space, Shelle Sponseller.

Q: No additional funding sources were listed. Are you pursuing other funding?

A: No, other grants won't cover this. We can take some cuts, but we were told to ask for what we need.

Salvation Army, Jeff Lundell.

Q: Given our lack of funding, could you reconsider the need for 12 computers?

A: Every year it becomes more imperative that we have those computers. Last year someone donated 20 computers, but the hard drives were scrubbed and it cost more than to buy them new. We need them, they are critical to the program.

- Ms. McMullen made a motion to fund the four top-scoring applicants, CitiCare, Nevada Rural Counties RSVP (Escorted Transportation), Accessible Space, and Salvation Army for the full amounts requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Howser.

Prior to a vote, the amount of the total requests was confirmed to be \$317,545, within the \$325,000 available in FHN funds. In order to fully fund the next two applicants as they appear in scoring rank order – Blindconnect and Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living (Student Advocacy Training) – would require \$106,473 of Title XX funds, raising the subcommittee's total Title XX fund request to \$296,997. Ms. Olson commented that if they want to fund the programs, they should ask for the money, but she also suggested they formulate alternate recommendation plans in the event they do not get all of the Title XX funds they request.

With no further discussion, the motion was voted on and carried unopposed with no abstentions.

The subcommittee decided to review additional proposals with the time remaining.

Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living, RAMP, represented by Lisa Bonie and Hilda Velds.

Q: There is a discrepancy regarding the cost of replacement ramps.

A: I'm sorry, we compared apples and oranges. The cost of building a new one is \$3,000, with staff \$4,500. There is no program available to repair ramps, so when people with existing ramps ask for repairs we have to wait until the ramp completely disintegrates and then replace it.

Q: No collaboration was noted. Have you explored partnerships with Home Depot, donations from building supply companies or contractors?

A: As far as collaboration, there are no programs for repairs. We have some donations from contractors.

Q: How does your program differ from the Mod Squad?

A: Mod Squad serves those over the age of 62 only.

Q: Are there additional costs to inferior ramps, demolition and costs of injuries due to inferior ramps? Are those additional cost savings?

A: Inferior ramps are dangerous. We want to try to avoid accidents. Most clients are on such low fixed incomes.

Q: How many per year apply for repairs?

A: We don't have a number because there is no repair program.

Q: In the last seven years how many have been installed?

A: Forty to 45 wooden ones.

DETR, Assistive Technology Project, represented by Melissa Starr and Scott Youngs.

Q: Why are you applying for funding from another State agency? Why not include this in your budget?

A: We do have some funding in our budget. This is a collaborative with UNR that our counselors have knowledge. They're training us. Our goal is to no longer require this funding. We'll be trained.

Q: So as a state agency, you can't collaborate?

A: I'm not sure I understand the question. Any additional funds we can get help us get more money in our budget. We came to the GMAC in 2008 with two requests, and they directed us to collaborate because of the 4:1 federal match. Voc Rehab provides bare bones services.

Q: If you asked the State for that money, would it count as a match?

A: Yes.

Q: When kids age into adult disability services, is it difficult for them?

A: Yes, it is a difficult transition from high school to employment. The school district keeps the devices, there is a big gap in services, and we have to start over with an assessment of needs.

Q: Could you lower your request?

A: Yes, we could reduce the full-time position by whatever percent of time allocated for assessment and training, but it would impact client services.

Q: Please clarify what the program offers – training clients or training staff to train clients?

A: Both. Clients require more training and assistance in learning how to use their new devices, and staff training on best practices.

Q: The budget looks a little top heavy in training of staff.

A: Adaptive technology is tricky and changes quickly. This is what it really takes.

Ms. Starr added, for the record, that a lot of personnel aren't included in the budget, including her position and the counselors. Mr. Youngs added that the people who are paid are the service delivery people.

Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living, Ticket to Work, represented by Mary Evilsizer.

Q: Earlier in the questioning you mentioned that the feds reauthorized Ticket to Work. How does that impact this request?

A: At the time of this application, the federal money was cut. In view of the fact that this program is coming back, albeit in one year increments, I could say, with federal funding, we could withdraw this proposal.

Following further discussion by the subcommittee, they decided to request sufficient Title XX funds to fully fund the applications from BlindConnect, Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living (Student Advocacy Training Project) and Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living.

- Ms. Howser moved to fund BlindConnect, Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living and Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living in the Independent Living category; and Head Start of Northeastern Nevada and Nevada Rural Counties RSVP in the Respite category, with \$324,783 in Title XX funds. Should the GMAC not allot this subcommittee the entire amount of Title XX funds requested, these programs will be funded in order of ranking of their final scores. The motion was seconded by Ms. Roragen, and there being no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed with no abstentions.

VII. Public Comment

None

VIII. Adjournment

Ms. O'Malley thanked everyone, acknowledging it had been a long day as well as a painful process. The meeting adjourned at 3:53 pm.

Marcia O'Malley