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**Date and Time of Meeting:**

Wednesday & Thursday, January 10 & 11, 2024 at 1:00 p.m.

**Location of Meeting:**

This meeting will be held via video-conference only:

The public may observe this meeting and provide public comment on Zoom.

**To Join the Zoom Meeting**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9299041434?pwd=NmM5Tk1Od3ltRzg1enhRYTU3WDdUZz09&omn=85279087577>

Meeting ID: 929 904 1434

Password: NVSILC (case sensitive)

**Date Published:**

**Draft Minutes**

1. **Welcome, Roll Call, and Introductions:**

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

**1/10/24 Attendance:**

**Members Present:** Jennifer Kane, Mary Evilsizer, Dee Dee Foremaster, Sabra McWhirter, Obioma Officer, Cheyenne Pasquale, Ace Patrick, Julie Weismann-Steinbaugh, Jennifer Kane, Peter Whittingham

**Members Excused Absent:** Havander Davis, Vickie Essner,

**Members Unexcused Absent:** Linda Vejvoda,

**Guests:** Lisa Bonie, Lori Lutu, Autumn Blattman, Mark Tadder, Cindi Swanson, Genevieve Landman, Mark Winter,

**ASL Interpreters:** Kelly Bunting and Henry Yandrasits

**Staff:** Dawn Lyons & Wendy Thornley

**1/11/24 Attendance:**

**Members Present:** Mary Evilsizer, Sabra McWhirter, Obioma Officer, Cheyenne Pasquale, Ace Patrick, Julie Weismann-Steinbaugh, Jennifer Kane, Peter Whittingham, Dee Dee Foremaster,

**Members Excused Absent:** Vickie Essner, Havander Davis,

**Members Unexcused Absent:** Linda Vejvoda,

**Guests**: Gen Landman, Rylee Hockensmith, Margaret Marcucci, Autumn Blattman, Mark Tadder, John Rosenlund, Susan Waschevski, Lori Lutu, Marks Winter, Kelcy Meyer

**CART Provider:** Becky Van Auken

**ASL Interpreters:** Kelly Bunting and Henry Yandrasits

**Staff:** Dawn Lyons & Wendy Thornley

1. **Public Comment:** (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. To provide public comment telephonically, dial **+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)**. When prompted to provide the meeting ID, enter **929 904 1434** and passcode **707401**. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person. Persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name and provide the secretary with written comments.)

**1/10/24 Public Comment:**

Obioma Officer: Did get an email from Dawn with an article about the census adjustments that will be happening.

Obioma will also be reaching out and speaking with the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community about that, and she has already shared her concerns with the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community about not appropriately responding in the state.

They will adjust and add our feedback as necessary.

Dawn Lyons: Followed up with Obioma’s public comment, Dawn sent it right before the meeting so not everybody has probably seen it, but it is the article that Julie shared about how the Census Bureau collects data on the Disability Community.

They have plans to change some of the questions and how they are worded, and so Dawn encouraged everyone check out that article and let the SILC know, if they have public comment, they can also give it at the end of this meeting or at the beginning of tomorrow or end of tomorrow's meeting to help determine if the SILC should have a discussion and take further action about it.

Obioma Officer: The Deaf and Hard of Hearing Community has consistently had concerns about this issue about appropriate reporting for their needs and the Deaf and Hard of Hearing appropriately documenting who is Deaf, who is hard of hearing, who has a hearing loss.

**1/11/24 Public Comment:**

1. **For Possible Action:** Approval of Minutes from October 4 & 5, 2023.

Mary Evilsizer motioned to approve the draft minutes. Ace Patrick seconded. The members voted and the motion was carried.

1. **For Information**:

Member Introductions and Public Introductions from Individuals Interested in Council Membership and Member Announcements.

Dawn Lyons: Introduced Rylie Hockensmith, SILC’s new Youth Outreach Specialist to the members.

Rylie Hockensmith: She is excited to start her training. She just graduated from Great Basin College.

Peter Whittingham: Asked if Rylie had had a chance to meet the outgoing Youth Outreach Specialist to talk about some of the things that he had been working on.

Dawn Lyons: Explained that the prior Youth Outreach Specialist had move to Ohio back in August and so was not able to take part in onboarding activities with Rylie.

Dawn Lyons: There are no guests present on this day who are interested in membership, but the question will be asked again the next day.

1. **Presentation and Discussion:**

Updates from the Centers for Independent Living:

Southern Nevada Center for independent Living (SNCIL)

Mary Evilsizer: Would like to report that their data is doing well. This quarter, they had a total of 69 new intakes. Of those, 6% were requesting advocacy and Legal Services, and one of the gentlemen,

MM, is a 59-year-old white male who reports having heart disease and COPD. He was referred to SNCIL by his U.S. vets case manager.

SNCIL assisted him to apply to Social Security Administration for his SSDI benefits utilizing the special veteran’s program SVB to fast track his claim.

Through SVB his disability claim was processed and approved within four months with a compassionate allowance flag and guided him through the process and gathering his supporting documents.

His SSA claim was awarded in November 2023, and he will be getting $2,083 a month. Prior to that, he was almost homeless, and SNCIL also helped him to learn about his VA benefits.

SNCIL had the following for intakes: four for IL skills training, fifty for housing, which is about 69% of SNCIL’s services are for housing.

Due to a shift in the housing market, all housing services have been put on waiting lists.

SNCIL is allowed to continue to process mainstream vouchers and because they work with the HMI, that's a software program where SNCIL can enter individuals right away, they are on the list, but as of this time, housing has come to a standstill.

One of SNCIL’s housing successes was a nursing home transition.

MH, a 54-year-old female with early onset dementia and was referred to SNCIL by Nevada Legal Services. SNCIL is currently assisting MH to transition from residing in a facility to living independently in the community.

SNCIL worked with MH to be awarded a mainstream housing voucher through the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority.

MH has moved into her new apartment as of December 23rd.

SNCIL is currently assisting MH with life skills training, how to use her phone, budgeting and meal planning to ensure successful transition to independent living and to make sure SNCIL’s consumers are successful, SNCIL doesn’t close out their case for at least a year.

It remains open for at least a year; in case they need further assistance.

SNCIL had a total of 492 information and referral calls, 3% preventive services, 3% transportation services which equals 18 individuals requesting services. Three individuals requesting vocational services so that was 1% and one service request.

SNCIL had a total of 713 service requests for the quarter.

Another success story is GB, is a 72-year-old Asian male who is mute due to throat cancer surgery. He was referred to SNCIL by his hospital social worker.

SNCIL assisted him to connect with the project specialist at the Nevada Assistive Technology (AT) Resource Center.

The AT Center worked with GB to find an effective iPhone application that would allow him to successfully communicate without assistance of another person

GB and the AT group worked with the phone providing T-Mobile to install an IP relay to his phone and to train GB how to use it.

GB has been using his technology with success.

He can now do his telemedicine appointments and he's so excited.

SNCIL is going to get started with the DIF project which the SILC is involved with.

SNCIL is excited that in about three years, they will have a website for their Youth to Transition students. The phone app is going to be phenomenal. There will be a chart for the parents to know what age to reach out to what service for their child.

Disability Awareness Day was a success, SNCIL got very good ratings on their satisfaction surveys. There was a request for more elected officials available for public input.

SNCIL relates to the Work Incentive Planning Assistance Program (WIPPA). They will see about a representative coming to Las Vegas. Disability Awareness Day, next year, will be on Saturday, October 5th, or Saturday, October 19th.

The APRIL conference is the 11th through the 13th of October.

They are reaching out now to the Veterans Stand-Down group that's going to be promoting the function. Last year’s event had some physical barriers for individuals with disabilities. SNCIL will work with the group.

Mary congratulated Peter Whittingham on the accessibility of his group’s events.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: Thanked Mary for the illustrative stories.

Dawn Lyons: Agreed with Julie and thanked Mary.

It's important to hear individual stories and makes all the difference and makes the SILC happy to hear that SNCIL is affecting the community in such a positive way. Dawn appreciated Mary giving the Veteran’s stand down organizers that feedback and offering her assistance in that way.

Dawn also found it difficult to move around safely at the last event. Employment First coalition would really like to work with SNCIL for next year's Disability Awareness Day to coordinate an employment fair. Dawn is not sure if they want to do it at the same time or if they just want to coordinate combined services and partner own it and do it at a different time. She can talk with Mary more about that.

Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living (NNCIL)

Mark Tadder:

Rural Center for Independent Living (RCIL)

Dee Dee Foremaster: Rural Center for Independent Living (RCIL)

Dee Dee Foremaster: Job fairs are critical for consumers and RCIL is working on locations, like the libraries.

As a presenter for Vocational Rehabilitation, she did a workshop on training counselors how to work with people with disabilities, from the consumer's perspective. She will work with Dawn in the future for the next job fair.

RCIL has been quite busy, partly due to Sandy Coyle, passing away on November 14th. She was their grant writer, she did payroll and was also their grant administrator. It has been very difficult.

Cold weather brought many people to RCIL for services. They were able to get a young, homeless woman and her three dogs into an apartment on December 23rd. New neighbors brought many needed items.

RCIL’s support group has been invited to use the community center in the Douglas County area.

Dee Dee spoke with the mayor the prior night at a forum about resources in the community, individual dwelling units and the city legislation regarding people in institutions.

The District Attorney unfortunately has been ill, so he has not been able to bring back the information to get it passed through, but it looks like it's going to be a permit program, which will make it easy for people to be able to do this.

And will hopefully allow the aging community in the Carson City area to be able to institute individual dwelling units in their back yards a lot easier, which will help with housing.

A 192-unit housing complex which is being built on Butti Way should be opening by March, but only 20 % of that will be low-income housing.

She is still communicating with the mayor on diversified housing in Carson and then the rural areas.

RCIL is working to have Welfare representatives at the local library on Friday afternoons to connect local homeless individuals to services.

Jennifer Kane: Extended her condolences to Dee Dee.

Dawn Lyons: She understands that it is a great loss for Dee Dee as well as the Center. She expressed her condolences; she knew that Sandy was also Dee Dee’s sister so it’s a big loss for Dee Dee and RCIL.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: Wished that Sandy’s memory be a blessing.

Dee Dee Foremaster: They will work to keep her legacy alive.

**Report and Discussion Regarding the State Assistive Technology for Independent Living Program (AT/IL Program)**

John Rosenlund: He provided all the information to Dawn for what goes into the SILC’s annual report regarding the funding that SILC puts into the Assistive Technology for Independent Living program.

The report that he provided in the text format breaks things down a little bit differently than the federal report.

He went over some of the high points of this report, and when the SILC member review their annual report after it's updated and submitted, they can get into any of the minute details, but this is going to report into the client services section of their annual reporting.

The number of consumers carried over from the prior years and then the number of new consumers during the year.

In that part of the section, they had 190 carried over cases, that's consumers that had plans, had consumer service records in a prior year, and then 127 new throughout the year coming to a total of 317 consumer service records.

Those are individuals that have an Independent Living Plan or have waived the plan, but they have Independent Living Goals established.

They have their closure information, how many people have moved, withdrawn, died, and completed goals set.

Those decisions are made based on what happens within the case, if it closes, and the consumer decides if they completed their goals set.

Throughout the year they had 144 case closures, people that may or may not have received the service, again, that overall closure could be closed, withdrawn, but they did have some goals met.

The number of CSRs, plans and waivers, they had one individual through this year that waived having the Independent Living Plan.

Another 316 did want to go ahead and have a full plan written up with steps.

Breakdown in age information is an important aspect.

Under five years old, they had three consumers, between five and 19, there were 31 consumers, 20 on to 24 years, ten consumers, 25 to 59, there were 97 consumers. And 60 and older were 176.

Most of the consumers that they are serving are in that 60 and older population. The data breaks down everything, race, ethnicity, that's going to change in the upcoming year.

Some of the federal reporting has changed and some will be number data that goes in the SILC’s report.

He does have a breakdown of race, ethnicity, disability reported by the consumer.

Goal areas.

What they look at as far as programmatically, are they achieving people's goals, are the goals tied to essential daily living and they want to keep those met and keep people living in the communities.

They always highlight their top goals such as self-care, mobility and transportation are lumped into one on the federal aspect.

Those are probably about 60/40.

40% are personal mobility issues, 60% are transportation issues.

Working on somebody's personal transportation such as securing or modifying an existing vehicle or obtaining something that allows them to transport themselves and their mobility device.

Community-based living is a category that fits into home access goals, getting in and out throughout your home. Those are the top three that they usually deal with. Again, because there's no other resources available. So self-care goals.

Number of goals set throughout the year were in the active caseload, 440 set goals. 170 of those were achieved. And they have 161 in progress.

Community-based living, 140 goals set. 77 of those goals achieved, and 27 in progress.

Mobility, transportation, 199 goals set. 51 achieved, and 70 in progress.

Communication, number 4, as far as ranking of numbers, communication is hearing and speaking. So goals set, 57 goals, 15 achieved, and 19 in progress.

Information and access to technology, there's 13 goals set, three achieved, and eight pending.

They had one listed in other and John thinks that was just selected in error, that falls more under probably a self-care: But that's what's set up and is in the person's plan and reported as such.

Dawn Lyons: Asked John about the communication goals, if there is a separate category of assistive technology goals, and could he explain the communication goals a little better.

John Rosenlund: Communication will be hearing or speaking, it’s an essential daily living need. But they help the consumers align to the goal that's most appropriate.

Information access to technology may be somebody trying to access technology that allows them to do some online shopping as well as communicate.

It could be two of those things, but what's the primary there fits more into information access to technology.

It could literally tie to self-care. They are trying to do a self-care act; it really depends on the conversation the independent living specialist had with the consumer and them making that decision early on. Information access to technology as an overall goal is kind of a confusing area. Some vision-related goals are tied into that because it's tying more to access to information and technology.

Although that device the person is working on is going to do several things, including touching on some mobility.

It's going to come down to what the Independent Living Specialist and consumer came up with when developing those goals.

Going forward, John could pull up some of those goals and generalize to give some examples of what gets written.

Dawn Lyons: Mary Evilsizer gave some examples like little, short stories of success stories that happened. That would be helpful to paint a picture for the council of one of the more successful stories you have from the program just to share with us.

To know exactly what individual stories might look like.

John Rosenlund: Read a client story that was put in the federal AT report tied directly to this program and is also reported in the ADSD’s funding report. That report is data that the agency puts out regarding what the programs have done and provided within the state and includes some of the consumer stories. Unfortunately, the SILC’s APR doesn't land a lot of places to do those exception there's a section that he will go through before they are done where they do provide with this program, historically provided in the APR a broader look in some of the satisfaction and life impact data that he usually provides.

They put that in there as well so there's a link to the consumer data that's in the SILC’s APR and outcomes that are broader than the federal.

John provided the consumer’s initials (SY), in the story.

SY Reached out to the AT/IL program seeking assistance in regaining independence and addressing barriers to her home access for transportation and self-care. She established her goals and the plan to accomplish them.

The condo complex does not have an accessible route onto the sidewalk. She was able to obtain a ramp to provide access from her parking spot to the sidewalk by obtaining a vehicle lift for her truck, she can transparent her scooter and independently access the community.

By obtaining alighted magnifier lamp she can easily read her mail and helps her with her ability to pay her bills.

The assistive technology she was able to obtain are items that are necessary for day-to-day living and are not available through any other resources in our state unless you have perm resources.

With the cost of living and costs at an all-time high, many people don't have financial means to obtain the essential things needed to address barriers presented by their disabilities.

But you would expect that that goal is really encompassing what are barriers.

Living in a condo, it's up to you to provide access.

They are not bound to provide access.

If you live in an older condominium complex there may not be a curb access from your parking spot. So those are some barriers that you would expect to see in those goals.

Transportation is being able to transport one's mobility device and so forth.

Back to the sub part 3 of the annual report, they do an expanded provision of information there that describes the AT for IL program a little bit more. And links it back to that client data.

Describing what the program does, removing essential daily living barriers and so forth. They do put some information in there that also the report doesn't have a place to put it.

That's specific to transition or priority services to keep people living in the community where we wrote that down.

This year, they had 85 independent living goals that were directly related to prevention of needing institutional care. Of these, 59 goals closed as goals met, 20 are in progress, three withdrawn, and two closed because the consumer passed away.

Next is the Life Impact and Consumer Satisfaction Survey data.

They had 47.2 percent voluntary return.

That's consumers receiving the survey and getting it sent back to them.

Consumers are asked if they are satisfied with the services, please rate the staff. They had 96% as excellent or very good. They did have one person reporting poor. That's 2% poor.

Choice and control over the goals and types of services you received, broken down into a lot of control and choice, quite a bit of control and choice, little control and choice, and not enough control and choice.

The top two indicators for an acceptable level are “a lot” or “quite a bit” in that area they had 98% saying they had a lot or quite a bit of control and choice in the goals as services received.

Overall satisfaction of the program, 96% very satisfied or mostly satisfied. They had 94% very satisfied. The top end of that survey.

Asked about if the program services made a positive impact on their life, 98% said yes.

The one and two percent as one individual that was not satisfied with the impact.

Did services provide an impact to your life.

We're asking did they feel their quality of life improved a lot, improved quite a bit, improved a little, did not change, or if not applicable or no response, we collect that data. 96% said it improved a lot or quite a bit.

2% improved lot and 2% did not change.

Overall independence to the goals established, improved a lot, 72% improved quite a bit, 24 total of 96%, independence improved a lot or quite a bit.

Chances of staying out of a nursing home: 88% said it improved a lot or quite a bit. 4% said it did not change. 8% said it wasn't applicable or they didn't respond to the question.

How often is the device or modification used: 90% daily, 6% weekly, 4% non-response or not applicable.

A lot of the times when they see no response or not applicable, it may be that somebody didn't check the box.

They have had an issue where sometimes people don't look at the back side of the survey or if they receive both pages they only return one, sometimes the not applicable will apply to that.

Ability to volunteer to be involved in my community or do leisure activities: improved quite a bit, 45%, improved a lot, 45%, improved quite a bit, 25%, improved a little, 9%, did not change, 8%, not applicable, no response, 13%.

The overall rating of the vendors building contracts or businesses they worked with, the vendors going in and doing the modification or working with them to provide the assistive technology.

85% reported them as excellent.

13% as very good.

The rest were 0%, there was one reported as poor.

Dawn Lyons: I'd like to mention just something that my guess would be, is a lot of the time people -- it's not their original goal, they hadn't considered that “gee this might keep me out of a nursing home, or this might make my life more easy” or something, right?

It's just they had one track and one goal in mind, like “I needed to get out to my car and back” and that was all they thought about.

So maybe that's why they thought it was not applicable or they didn't really think about it ahead of time.

John Rosenlund: They do want to know how the consumers feel. They are working to transition somebody out of a care facility, and they put not applicable on the survey.

If a consumer puts their name on the survey and allowed him to, he could put the data into the survey himself.

Sometimes the data is confusing.

There is a breakdown in communication, he can see it coming in the next APR because he was looking at the SILC’s new instrument and did include that in the data, but there's no place for the federal report but they have a breakdown by county.

You'll see where it deals with consumer and consumer services where all this data is applied to.

Dawn Lyons: Once the SILC has that reporting data together, she can go over that data report with the SILC but since ACL pushed back the due day to the end of January, she didn't have that prepared for this meeting yet.

She can go over that with SILC as well and give them an overview of that at the next meeting.

John Rosenlund: For the next meeting, he can put this into that other format that is accessible.

He will add some of the Independent Living goals there. In the last report that he provided, he broke down the information and looked at what was the difference between transportation and mobility.

It gives a better sense of what was a personal mobility goal and what is a transportation goal and separates those a little bit.

Dawn Lyons: Feels it would make more sense. Asked John if he reports this information quarterly to the feds or does he just report it annually?

John Rosenlund: Agreed there's the assistive technology that is provided, is extracted for the Federal Assistive Technology report, but it doesn't address goals. This is a combination of two different programs. So that report is really looked at and it's only done annually as well but he pulled this together for every SILC meeting.

Dawn Lyons: Would like to start at the next meeting with this fiscal year’s data.

Mary Evilsizer: Agrees with John on how confusing it is in defining a goal. Access to information, communication, transportation, self-care, and you're right, it depends on what the individual consumer and the Independent Living Specialist decided.

John Rosenlund: The report does touch on a bit of information and referral, but the APR doesn't allow you to talk about how many people are trying to access a program, he will get back into that with the new year's data.

**Updates and Discussion Regarding the Nevada State Rehabilitation Council (NSRC)**

Dawn Lyons: Raquel O’Neill has resigned from Blind Connect as well as the Rehabilitation Council; Jack Mayes will be taking her place as Chair of the NSRC. Raquel has also resigned from the SILC. She is not stepping away permanently but she's pursuing a new career in her given degree of social work and didn't want to over-obligate herself. She wants to settle into and then come back and work with the SILC.

Dawn asked if anyone would like to apply for the SILC representative for NSRC and give updates. Dawn can assist with SILC talking points for NSRC meetings. Anyone interested in this, can contact Dawn.

**Updates and Discussion regarding Aging and Disability Services (ADSD)**

Cheyenne Pasquale: There was an attachment added to the meeting materials on the prior day, with a couple of updates.

No Wrong Door Project.

Since 2005, Nevada has joined several other states in trying to develop No Wrong Door approach to long-term services and support.

A lot of efforts have focused on resource and service navigation, helping individuals understand long-term service and support options and supporting people in accessing various long-term services and supports.

Last year, they received a grant, a two-year project, to help the state reset those efforts.

The first year of the project was focused on mapping access points and doing an analysis of where people access long-term services and support.

They have the final report for that activity and will be publishing that on our website in the next week or so and will send a link out to that.

The next phase is developing their plan to further their efforts in line with the Administration for Community Living's definition of No Wrong Door. Sort of a “No Wrong Door implementation 2.0.

They have had several challenges, she has been working in the No Wrong Door sphere for a long time, and there's been several challenges over the years, but there's a lot of opportunity and a lot of good conversations happening now.

They saw a lot of importance of this work in the Olmstead plan in terms of ensuring that people know about different programs and services that are available and can be supported in accessing those programs and services.

Their work is paused temporarily on the No Wrong Door project because of some state contracting issues with their facilitator, which is the University of Nevada, Reno.

They hope to have more information soon.

The Olmstead Plan was finalized in September and thank you to Julie for your participation on their steering committee.

They are going to create a web page on their website where the plan will be posted, along with some of the materials that were developed throughout the process, including summaries of the public comments and things like that.

She is working on creating an initial baseline report that can be published to help further define benchmarks throughout the plan implementation.

It is her goal and intention that this existing ADSD Olmstead Plan becomes a living, breathing document, and that they will have annual updates, and will change as they progress through the plan.

The current project is the ADSD outreach project.

They received some funding from the Governor's offices under the ARPA and the goal of this project is to rebrand the Aging and Disability Services Division, make the services and programs that they have available through their agency more visible to the community.

A big piece of that is working on their messaging to make sure that it is relevant to the public and to the individuals they serve.

The large piece that she is most excited about, is looking at revamping the ADSD website and maybe modernizing that.

Making it easier to find information and navigate through the website.

They have had their initial conversations with their vendor, those conversations have been focused on getting to know the different programs and units within ADSD.

She has a meeting next week to look at what that project plan is going to look like and help solidify their approach going forward.

There will be more information to come, and they have expressed the desire for the vendor to have some community feedback sessions, particularly as they get involved in the website design, to be able to have user experience inform that website development.

This will be happening in the next month or two.

They included a section this time called the Regional Coordinator Report, and what they wanted to do is highlight some of the focus of the different community conversations that they have been having with various stakeholders across the state.

They highlighted three areas that have come up across the state regardless of which region the coordinator is representing.

A lot of these are probably familiar to SILC.

The first area is Transition Services.

There has been a lot of community conversation around transitioning out of hospitals to their home or to long-term care facilities.

There are real challenges across the state, particularly from the housing shortages. As people transition out of the hospital, they don't have a home to go to, there is also that lack of capacity within homeless shelters to support individuals with disabilities.

There have been discussions regarding transitions for people with disabilities outside of the school systems.

As they graduate or age out of the school system, how can there be stronger support in those transition services.

One of the areas of opportunity also is benefits planners.

Supporting individuals in planning for benefits and if a person has certain benefits and they starting to work and how does that impact their benefits.

Their developmental services team has a pilot for benefits planners but in their Olmstead Plan they also recognize there's a need to broaden the availability of benefit planners across the state.

The third area of transition is for individuals who have a dual diagnosis of a disability and a mental health condition, transitioning out of jails and prisons and needing some support in those areas as well as housing.

The second area is the availability of services for people with disabilities under the age of 60.

Looking at the need to strengthen transition support, food, and nutrition, and then support for individuals living with a dual diagnosis of intellectual and developmental disabilities and mental health conditions, again, housing, and then awareness of services for children in the school system and the lack of specific funding for services for people with disabilities.

And then the third area is provider gaps.

Wait times for getting a Medicaid provider to come into the home to provide services, that's a challenge for state waivers and plan services.

There are several barriers and challenges for people becoming Medicaid providers due to requirements in the paperwork, the lack of providers in rural areas, transportation funding for providers in rural areas, so being able to support the increased costs related to providing services in rural areas.

There's been quite a few conversations around providers for Jobs and Day Training or disability-friendly employers.

And then, also, services for survivors of domestic violence who have a disability.

The provider gaps are one area that's really challenging for ADSD as the operator of the waivers.

They have limited authority or capacity to change the Medicaid rules around providers and requirements. They have had quite a lot of conversations with the state Medicaid agency and shared concerns that they are hearing from the providers, it’s difficult to improve provider relations.

Dawn Lyons: Has heard feedback about people who need to renew their waiver services and being told that they are probably not going to be approved for as many PCA hours. She was wondering if Cheyenne had heard anything about that through Medicaid.

It's a dual eligibility process between Aging and Disability Services and Medicaid. Asked Cheyenne if she had heard any changes that took place or the reasons why they are being told that?

Cheyenne Pasquale: She has not but is happy to follow up with their waiver representatives and see if they can get some clarity and they can send that out after the meeting.

Dee Dee Foremaster: In a lot of states, “Money Follows the Person” is connected in with CILs, who are ready and able to help

Maybe they should look at what the other states are doing in this area.

Providers are not being compensated like they need to be for services or mileage.

Mary Evilsizer: The FOCIS program was here, and SNCIL used to partner with them in preventing individuals from going into the nursing home, and assisting individuals transitioned from the nursing home to the community, and did the FOCIS program go away?

Cheyenne Pasquale: FOCIS and Money Follows the Person have been transferred to ADSD. There's currently no staff in the FOCIS program.

They are working on recruiting to hire those vacant positions, as well as looking at how the program operated when it was under Medicaid, what opportunities there are to expand and strengthen those efforts now that they are going to have a whole new team for FOCIS.

Mary Evilsizer: They were one of the most effective resources SNCIL had to partner with.

Together, they would find housing and get the Medicaid waiver.

SNCIL connected with the Money Follows the Person program and had an in-service and exchanged information as to what they each do, and they have plans in January to strengthen the partnership with the institutional transitions.

She appreciates the work being done around PCA’s because consumers are leaving Nevada due to a lack of PCAs.

Cheyenne Pasquale: Two new projects that are being worked on. The first one she calls Disability Supportive Services. ADSD received additional funding from the Director's Office under Title 20 of the Social Security Act, which is to be used for supportive services.

They are going to be targeting this funding to support programs that provide social services for people with disabilities specifically.

The title 20 funding has five broad goals. Self-support, self-sufficiency, preventing neglect, abuse, and exploitation, preserving families, community-based care, and institutional care.

Based on known gaps, they are looking at targeting services that fall under the self-support goals, self-sufficiency goals and community-based care goals.

They will have funding available for ongoing programs as well as one-time infrastructure projects and have approximately a million dollars available for projects each year. This is something they have been working towards for quite a while. They are going to get this Notice of Funding Opportunity published this month so that they can get some projects started in this realm.

It's not very often that they get an extra million dollars to put out into the community, knowing that there are a number of gaps and services needs particularly for people with disabilities, they ae open to suggestions, but their thought is to keep it more broad within the confines of the funding source, and putting it out to the community to see what types of projects they get back so they can see where there are real needs and opportunities.

And then as they go through and hopefully continue to receive this funding, be able to formalize programs and services to meet some of these gaps.

Dawn Lyons: It is a good idea to leave it open to the community and have availability to cover some of those resources that are needed. Also, it's a good idea to maybe provide extra points in the evaluation for specific services that are especially needed in the community that can encourage providers in a certain direction for needs shown by data.

Maybe housing issues could provide additional help and support.

Perhaps additional PCA hours, the provider shortage is real.

Cheyenne Pasquale: That’s an excellent idea. She is excited about this funding and this opportunity. She asked if anyone else had

any thoughts that they would like to share about this funding opportunity?

Dee Dee Foremaster: All the CILs are staffed and ready to go. Partnerships are important in helping the disabled community. Resources are needed for PCA services, housing, especially for transitioning out of nursing homes and group homes.

Mary Evilsizer: As SNCIL was doing the nursing home and institutional transitions, they worked with HUD and at one time they put on a grant to help community partners transition individuals and they did a study, where they came up with a figure of $3,500 per individual for a solid transition.

SNCIL started using that figure, and discovered that that would cover the housing deposit, key deposit, startup home supplies, a bed, table, tv, clothing, food, and microwave.

Cheyenne Pasquale: Money Follows the Person, when this program transferred to ADSD, which happened through the legislative process, they also had to do a lot of work over the last year or so with the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare services or CMS.

They are looking at the transition with ADSD being the grantee for Money Follows the Person, as a new program.

Within the federal regulations or guidance, Money Follows the Person has this very technical document that's called the Operational Protocol.

This is a standard template that is used to detail how the program will operate in the state.

The template itself with no information in it, is very thick.

Around 50 pages just with no information, just the required sections of the Operational Protocol.

Cheyenne is working with the project director Kelly Nash, to develop their plan in terms of how they are going to get stakeholder input in the development of the program for Nevada.

They have some pieces that were in place that worked well, but they also recognize that they have some opportunities to strengthen the Money Follows the Person program.

That could be things like looking at what the average is that they have available for transition services.

How do they engage in some efforts around provider development, et cetera?

They are looking at mid-February where they will start to work within the Operational Protocol and have several different opportunities for conversations with the community to help them design this program and how it can best meet the needs of people that are looking to transition out of facilities.

Every year, every grant has a goal for transitions, and so they set a very conservative goal of doing 15 transitions in 2024, and that is with the assumption that it'll take them probably six to eight months to design the program, get contracts in place, et cetera.

That's where they are with Money Follows the Person.

She appreciated the comments at this meeting and wants everyone on the call to know that the SILC and CILs have been top of her mind since they transitioned the program, and I believe that there is some real opportunity for partnership to strengthen this effort in Nevada.

She wanted to invite a SILC member or Dawn, to their Nevada Lifespan Respite Care Coalition meeting to have general discussion around family caregiver supports and respite services and some of the priorities the SILC is seeing in relation to having some of the priorities that the coalition is seeing.

She is also inviting the DD Council.

It is time to look at the appointed member from the governor's office, for the DSE representative as Cheyenne is close to terming out.

Lori Lutu is going to apply to be their DSE representative appointed member for the SILC.

She did still have a request for a SILC member to attend the Nevada Lifespan Respite Care Coalition meetings.

Mary Evilsizer: At one time, the Money Follows the Person program had a memo of understanding with the HUD housing authority. There had been a lottery at one time where there were some housing vouchers that went just for individuals that were institutionalized.

Money Follows the Person in the south and SNCIL are going to work together. She offered to start the research. She congratulated Lori Lutu.

Cheyenne Pasquale: Kelly is connecting with the housing advocate at the Nevada Division of Housing to start some of those state-level conversations. But ADSD will reach out if they need more history or background.

Dawn Lyons: The Nevada Lifespan Respite meeting was the discussion that she sent out to SILC members to ask them to consider what kind of feedback they would like to give to Cheyenne about.

Dawn’s thoughts are that the SILC had Medicaid present on the reporting or on the process for reevaluating rate increases or rates in general. And when they presented their findings and methodology, she had questioned if they had thought about improving those methods because they had a very small handful of responses on their surveys out in the community to the providers.

It didn't seem like valid data to her, and so they said that they would be reviewing their process because it really wasn't informing them properly, in her opinion.

She knows that the SILC kind of felt the same way when she mentioned it at their meeting last year sometime.

When she asked them about it recently, during one of their forums, maybe November or October. She asked about whether that rate process of the review on how they determined their rates was if they had come up with any answers or better solutions to that, and they said it was still under review.

She thought it was important that the coalition might want to partner with the SILC on speeding along that process and getting some answers from Medicaid about whether they reevaluated yet or if they plan on reevaluating or how they determine those rates.

Because that's the biggest issue in our state.

In her opinion, leaving it in the hands of two or three providers out of the whole state is really doing a disservice to whole state.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: Felt that some people had concerns.

Dee Dee Foremaster: Has extreme concerns over the PCA pay rate.

People cannot live off the wages that are being paid, they also travel long distances in bad weather, and poor road conditions.

Cheyenne Pasquale: Invited any SILC member to attend the next Lifespan Respite Coalition meeting on January 22nd at 10:00 am, to talk about caregiver support and particularly the coalition is more focused on family caregivers or unpaid caregivers.

This would be an opportunity for the SILC to highlight any priorities or issues that they are seeing in terms of family caregiver support as a means of just cost sharing information between their advisory bodies

Dawn Lyons: It would be important for a SILC member to attend the Coalition meeting. And since she did attend the Self-Direction by herself, no other SILC member did and she understands Self-Direction, and she also understands quite a bit about the State of Nevada's buy-in to self-direction recently on the HCBS waiver. She is probably feeling like she is informed enough to participate in this conversation if everyone else is ok with it. She is available.

Autumn Blattman: ADSD is putting on a conference in April on the 16th through 18th of April. The 16th is a half day.

Directed towards professionals in the Aging and Disability Services community through funding for ADSD or provider contract with ADSD or Medicaid.

The other two days are open to anyone who is interested in professionals in the community or advocates and individuals working with older adults and people with disabilities, but they are looking for speakers as well.

If anyone is interested in submitting a proposal, they have a quick form to fill out for a speaker opportunity at: autumn@adsd.nv.gov

Dawn Lyons: If any SILC member would like to collaborate on a presentation or have a suggestion, they can reach out to her as well because she can coordinate that with Aging and Disability Services. She appreciates that Lori Lutu is willing to come on board with the SILC and looks forward to the SILC’s endorsement of Lori.

Obioma Officer: Will speak to Lori Lutu about presenting at the ADSD conference and it would be wonderful if anyone on the SILC would like to co-present with her. She would like to present on two separate topics.

One will be with community members and the other one she would like to do with another SILC member. Everything is going fast, so we'll see.

She is in the process of getting approval.

Jennifer Kane: The Department of Education has received the email through the listserv regarding the conference.

They are interested a few items down she will be presenting about the disability Nevada Department of Education's Disability Innovation Fund Partners to Pathways model demonstration project and thought it might be nice, they have nine for under innovative collaboration, one of the strands.

The theme will be “The Force Awakens”, Nevada Services Saga “May the change be with you”.

They thought it would be great to have that innovative collaboration strand. She doesn’t know if they are going to make it by January 17th because they are at the startup of the grant and they are right now drowning in meetings and paperwork that's due. It is on their radar at the Department of Education, and they have. They don't have their next meeting with their partners until January 23rd, after the 17th when it's due.

Because of the timeline, they might be out but know if they don't do this this year, they would be interested in doing that in the future when they have things more up and running than where they are today.

Updates and Discussion Regarding Employment First

Dawn Lyons: The Employment First Coalition decided to call themselves a coalition officially because that is technically what they are.

They are now officially, the Employment First Coalition.

The SILC had had a subcommittee where she had created a draft Executive Order on Employment First a long time ago.

She brought that back to this coalition, and they made it more generalized so that it could apply to any governor, because at the time it was a different governor.

They did submit that to Governor Lombardo, and it looks like his team is on board with that, which is awesome.

It's a matter of getting an Executive Order out and they sent a letter to the GOWIN, Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation.

They sent the new Director a letter asking him if he would work with them to incorporate Employment First into the new Strategy for Workforce Innovation.

Vocational Rehabilitation has expressed that they're also interested in backing the SILC and giving them their support on that.

And so working together with August these really important entities that can really push Employment First for people with disabilities in Nevada forward is exciting.

It's just a little slow to progress because of the holidays here but they are really moving along and planning on, because they couldn’t with the short time span, create employment fairs last October, because she thinks they had like a month's notice when Anthem brought the idea to them, they decided to go ahead and do that this year.

They would like to work with the Centers for Independent Living on that and she knows Dee Dee, they talked about that and they are going to do one in the urban areas in the North and South first and then take what they learn from that and incorporate that into the rural areas so they go into the rural areas more informed and have hopefully have some employment fairs in the rural areas as well at a later date.

They are excited about that and excited about the collaboration.

They haven't heard anything back from the GOWIN department, but as soon as they have the Executive Order in place and she gets the notice she is going to reach out to them again and say, “Hey, we sent you a letter, we have this executive order. What do you think?”

They are on track to really making some progress here.

And so it's exciting.

It's exciting for community because Nevada has been trying to get this off the ground for so long.

It's called, of course, not Employment First, it's been historically we've called it Competitive Integrated Employment.

But Employment First sends the message that we want to send in this regard.

She thinks they will make a lot more progress with this messaging.

She looks forward to hearing anyone who wants to join their coalition meetings, reach out to her, she can always send them an invitation.

Right now they are not an official commission or council or anything in statute or executive order yet.

They are not necessarily an open meeting law-compliant council, so they are able to get a lot done fast.

Not saying there's anything wrong with Open Meeting Law, but, yeah, they have been able to make a lot of progress really a lot quicker, it's been really encouraging.

So if anyone wants to be part of that let her know.

And if anyone has any ideas, let her know.

She is going to combine this with the discussion regarding the potential 700-hour program improvements.

Because they have been talking about that too.

And she has been drafting some new language for legislation for NRS 284.327. And for NRS 284.215. And 284.290. And so those are all in relation -- they all mention the 700 Hour Program, so she had to include all of those.

Mostly what she wanted to do was incorporate language, because they have had some feedback especially at the Voc Rehab town halls, they heard from the DD Council and some members of the community that what's happening with that program is because the state has a one year probationary period, and so Social Security benefits end at approximately nine months, people are losing their benefits and then being let go at the end of their probationary period.

And it's really putting them in a huge pickle.

She says that in a lighthearted way but it's a big deal.

So people are upset about it, they're discouraged by the program, and they are afraid to use the program because of it.

And so she is hoping that with the language she is putting in and she has talked to Voc Rehab about this and hoping to get their support and backing on this as well as they move forward into legislation, that they can get a champion to put this out there maybe Assemblywoman Brown-May to help them get language in this. They can help define the probationary period a little bit differently for 700 Hour Program participants, so they don't lose their Social Security by the end of the probationary period so that just before those nine months are up, maybe couple weeks before that.

They have a probationary period finalization and have mandatory evaluations before that.

So they know what they need to improve if they need to improve anything so they can make those efforts like everyone else.

And then at the end of their probationary period if the state chooses not to hire them as permanent employees, they still haven't lost that opportunity to keep their Social Security benefits. That's the intent.

And she just wanted to let the SILC know about that and make sure that they were on board as the SILC and that she could speak for them in that regard if that's okay.

Peter Whittingham: He read the letter and the draft, Executive Order that Dawn sent.

He planned to make some comments and then recognized the draft has already been sent but pending formalizing it.

He agrees that the 700-hour, in terms of probation, he didn't see that the appropriate training be given to correct those deficiencies before the performance evaluation is completed.

There must be.

The related training is done to complete the evaluation process.

He would appreciate being included on the team for Employment First, which he suspects also dovetails into the 700-hour issue as well.

Dawn Lyons: In that first NRS, there's a numeric point in the second point says a person with AB disability who is certified by the Rehab Division must be placed on the appropriate list for which the person, is eligible.

Each such person must possess the training and skills necessary for the position in which the person is certified.

It does mention training.

However, and maybe they can talk about this more behind the scenes, but when they have the proper evaluations and feedback happening between supervisor and probationary employee or 700-hour employee, that that feedback given is part of that training, and it counts as here's what's expected. Here's what you need to improve if they do. And here's what you're doing right.

And then at that point, by the end, because she thinks there's three different evaluation periods during that probationary and 700 Hour Program period, where during those three, if that person does not meet their probationary period at that point, they know why.

It's not going to be a surprise.

So they can request the training and because they are working with Vocational Rehabilitation, Voc Rehab can step in and say, “Hey, my client needs more training and have expressed that to me can you help.”

That's something that the 700 Hour Program already does she believes or is supposed to do.

She is not sure if they could add more language to strengthen that. Shei is open to suggestions for language.

Peter Whittingham: It seems to reference training on coming on board. His thoughts were during the training period through the evaluation period they will discover as much as the participant might have had training for the position, during the probation period, there's deficiencies discovered.

His thoughts are that specific to those deficiencies, part of the corrective measures taken should be including training specific to deficiencies that can be evaluated in terms of meeting the probation period. There can be a conversation in more detail. We're on the same side on this one

Dawn Lyons: As a state employee there's quite a bit of mandatory training at the beginning of that probationary period and there are different due dates for those trainings as a state employee depending on which division or which unit you're being hired on to that even includes more trainings that are mandatory.

So it may be a little bit overwhelming if they add more to it, but she understands where Peter is coming from, and they can talk about that, and she will put him on the list.

Mary Evilsizer: Too, a slightly different perspective, there are some Social Security work incentive regulations that are put into place.

Everyone that receives Social Security has a nine-month trial work period.

When an individual goes to work, they can ask for their records from Social Security, and it's called the BPQI, an individual can ask for a copy of the BPQI, it's a benefits record that will tell them how many months of their nine-month trial work period have been used, let's say they've tried to work before but let's say a person goes into the sour club and haven't used any of those trial work period.

Well, per the working incentive program, everyone is guaranteed nine months if they can earn over the Social Security threshold during those nine months and during training they earn the little bit they can earn over.

After that Social Security is not supposed to take away their benefits because after that they have a two-month evaluation period that their checks are not supposed to be on taken away.

If they stay on the job they have another five years where Social Security monitors and watches them.

So she is really taken aback to hear that people on the 700-hour Program are losing their Social Security benefits after the 9-month trial work period.

She knows that Vocational Rehabilitation knows about the 9-month trial work period and the two-month extension, and then the five-year monitoring.

But if they can educate individuals if no one is going to advocate for them, to advocate for themselves, get a copy of their Benefits Planning Query (BPQY) so if they are let go after nine months, Social Security should not be taking away their benefits.

Dawn Lyons: Appreciated Mary’s feedback, in fact, there are nuances of Social Security that she does not understand and so Mary’s expertise is important in helping Dawn understand how this will work. Dawn would like to get together with Mary outside of the meeting to go over some of the specifics of how that's worded and just ask Mary questions.

Mary Evilsizer: Then they can pair up with the WIPA in Denver. One of the ways to avoid losing a check after nine months, when the individual starts the employment period, is to go ahead and get processed through WIPA.

The WIPA program can also get them their Benefits Planning Query (BPQY) but they are empowered to get it themselves too.

And then to start tracking and monitoring and watching that nine months because the benefits should stay with them.

And if they stay working they get another two-months trial evaluation period and then the five-year.

She will show Dawn where those regulations are. If they can marry the two programs, the WIPA and the Voc Rehab, but in addition, she knows VR counselors receive some training so they can also help to advocate for that.

Dawn Lyons: The biggest thing she is curious about is if they were not hired on as a permanent employee at the end of that however long probationary period before they lose Social Security benefits, and then they got another position on the 700 Hour Program and restarted that time over again, would that time not start over with Social Security.

Mary Evilsizer: No, because the nine-month trial work period is something you get once. If they have used it or started the 700-hour Program that might be that they are out those nine months but the ones that aren't, they shouldn't be losing their benefits.

Also with Social Security, as far as the benefits reinstatement go, they should be able to apply or be reinstated traditionally if an individual is not able to perform the essential functions of their job, it's because of a medical reason, threshold.

Something is going on that's creating a barrier towards employment.

And not to lose those benefits because they're hard to get back.

Once you lose them then you must reapply all over again.

Let's talk about how maybe to interweave those at the beginning so that's not happening to people.

Dawn Lyons: It may be an education problem. Maybe people just don't realize the steps they have to take to begin with to make sure they don't lose benefits. Maybe there's something they need to emphasize as well. Besides looking at legislation.

Dee Dee Foremaster: Agreed with Mary, there are things in place so that even if they continue the work program after the 700-hour or nine-month trial period, they can keep their medical coverage and she would like very much to be involved in this coalition.

Dawn Lyons: She will add Dee Dee to the invitation list. She appreciates everyone's input and everyone's ideas and thoughts. She is trying to do this but thinks they need an expert.

She thinks they need someone who can help them with that information. They have Catherine on the Coalition from the DD Council and a couple other helpful and knowledgeable people on their coalition, but none of them really understood what surrounds that necessarily that are present.

She appreciated that from everyone, including Peter, about the training, because that's something they need to think about.

Dee Dee Foremaster: There is a young man who went through the process back in 1998. He is still successfully employed with the state of Nevada. He might be able to give insight as a client going through what it was like.

Dawn Lyons: Would like to invite him to the next Employment First Coalition if Dee Dee thought he would like to tell his story.

Dee Dee Foremaster: Is sure he would love to because he also has served on the DD Council for quite a few years. He is a wonderful success story, and a very amazing man who, has a dual diagnosis, which is also something that was very much in those days, ignored.

Dawn Lyons: Asked Dee Dee to invite him to the next coalition meeting. Dawn will send Dee Dee the calendar invite and Dee Dee can forward it.

Updates and Discussion Regarding Takeaways from Conferences Attended by Members

**(APRIL) Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living**

October 12-14, 2023, Garden Grove, California

Peter Whittingham and Dee Dee Foremaster attended:

Dee Dee Foremaster: APRIL was wonderful. She sat in on a speaker who talked about grant writing and the speaker had a very wonderful perspective on how to grant-write.

Dee Dee sent her an invitation to put on a presentation at the conference coming up and told her that SILC would very much like her to come and have the opportunity to present her grant-writing proposal.

She writes grants a lot like Sandy and Dee Dee used to, which was not an individual situation, but, rather, a group input into grant-writing, which really is a wonderful way to do it.

A lot of the networking that Dee Dee did at the APRIL conference and a lot of sharing that they gave them time to network, which really needs to happen at a lot more conferences.

She learned about the concepts of what other states were doing.

That's how she learned about Money Follows the Person and a lot of states that are incorporating that into their CILs to be able to shore up the staffing as well asset money situation.

She also met the woman who works with the Pacific ADA.

They had some very informative breakout sessions, and she encouraged everyone to attend APRIL conference because it is so full of wonderful, positive energy, as well as information, especially pertaining to rural areas.

Peter Whittingham: His daughter was not able to attend with him. He spent most of his time getting to know individuals in the business of servicing the disability community.

This was his first conference as a representative from SILC, and like Dee Dee, was more interested in getting to know individuals and sharing ideas about our different service population.

One of the material things he took from there was an organization that has an automated system that manages the interior, the organizational systems, and processes in the nonprofit organization.

It's an automated information management system and the framework they have has informed him to set up a new system in the Down's Syndrome organization.

That was rewarding from an organizational perspective, but he appreciated the opportunity to attend on behalf of SILC.

Dawn Lyons: Networking is one of the biggest benefits of going to those conferences. Learning about what other states are doing, learning about what other disability communities look like.

That's huge.

And that's not just novice behavior there, just exploring, that's part of being a SILC member, a very important part, because the SILC needs that information.

Dee Dee Foremaster: There was a wonderful breakout session about the justice system.

We had a rather lively discussion during the two-hour time which we really needed half of a day to explore those areas.

But they said that with all the encouragement that all the people in the breakout session gave them, they are going to come back next year with a full four-hour session, where people can really learn a lot about the justify system so we can make our clients more comfortable with dealing with the justice system.

Because I know one of the biggest things that we do here out of our office is we go to court often with people who are scared.

They are extremely fearful of the justice system, and I think that people with disabilities need to learn more about the justice system so they can become more comfortable with it.

And that was the other breakout session that really had a big influence on me.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: That is a subject that does not get discussed as often as it should be.

**Discussion Regarding Potential 700 Hour Program Improvements and Legislative and/or Educational Initiatives**

(Combined into the Employment First update above)

**Presentation Regarding Details of the Department of Education’s Disability Innovation Fund (DIF), Pathways to Partnerships Innovative Model Demonstration Project**

Jennifer Kane: A lot has happened since the last meeting. The Department of Education found out that they have been awarded almost $10 million from the Disability Initiative Fund and there have been ABCDEF projects before ours.

Ours is E.

And this one is specifically called the Pathways to Partnerships Model Demonstration Project.

And they were asking states to bring together a bunch of required partners and we went beyond the required partners and brought in additional partners like Nevada Statewide Independent Living Council.

To get us to a place of more truly seamless transition.

Again the target population this grant serves is children, ages ten to 13 and youth, ages 14 to 24 with disabilities as well as their support systems so that would include families and others that support the students, as well as all the service professionals across all the difference realms that serve children and youth of transition age.

And so last time we met we were excited to share with you that we had been awarded the funds and, boy, have we had our work cut out for us since.

The joke among the states that received this is you have that moment of we got the grant and then you have the moment of oh, my gosh we got the grant because as you can imagine, getting to a place of truly seamless transition for students, families, and service providers is something we have aspired to for many years within the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

And they wouldn't have created a fund to help us get there if anyone had figured it out so far.

So we have a huge undertaking before us, but as we always do in Nevada, when you start talking about secondary transition for individuals with disabilities, the tables we sit around become smaller and smaller because there are those of us that are different institutions.

On organizations that serve this specific population.

A reminder for those who may not have been here last meeting, the required partners were the State Education Agency, that's us, Nevada Department of Education, Office of Inclusive Education, Nevada's Vocational Rehabilitation along with local education agencies, and then our federally funded Centers for Independent Living.

One local education agency is required, we have three that we'll be partnering with; Carson City, Humboldt County School District, and White Pine County School District. One federally funded center for independent living is required, we have two in our state, we elected to bring both on board because they serve different populations across the state.

We chose to bring in additional partners at ADSD to the table and while they helped us develop the entire grant on the timeline with which this had a to be turned around they ultimately didn't end up being one of the nine partners, but have committed to doing the work moving forward, but the additional partners are Nevada SILC as well as the Nevada Center For Excellence in Disabilities at the University of Nevada, Reno, and they engage with our Nevada Student Leadership Transition Summit efforts and have for the past 16 years so wanted to bring them in to bring that work into the grant but also expand that work as well.

That's all aimed at empowering transition age youth with disabilities to help them create positive paths towards future positive outcomes and post-secondary education training employment and independent living and their own lives but also do a bigger service back to their schools within their communities.

Creating a space for disability pride for students on campuses across Nevada.

We were excited to bring that work into the project and have some ability to expand it with the funds available.

Nevada's Parent Track and Information Center, Nevada PEP, so many partners.

But we have some great people at the table to help us determine what we need to get past the barriers to get to seamless transition.

So they were part of coming up with our innovative model of how we wanted to try and tackle this as a state in Nevada.

As part of the grant we're required to create a website.

We also elected as part of our innovation to develop an app, you heard Mary Evilsizer talk about that earlier, that is Nevada Transitions Roadmap Through Innovative Partnerships.

Since Congresswoman Lee announced for us that we received the grant back on September 13th, we have just hit the ground running.

Feels like a lot of the first couple months has been all over the red tape -- a lot of work has been things like all the internal paperwork required, both ourselves at the Nevada Department of Education and our collaborators and partners, Nevada's Vocational Rehabilitation.

We put in together to work programs to bring the money into the state.

Both were unanimously approved at the December 13th Interim Finance Committee so that was a big celebration day for us.

So there was relief involved having that jumped past that hurdle and the other thing we need to be able to sub grant out to our nine partners.

And while many of our nine partners are people the Nevada Department of Education regularly sub grants to local education agencies, there were partners like SILC, for example, that we had never done that before.

One part of what we're doing right now is having them do the paperwork and go through the process of getting into our E page system which is our electric grant system at the Department of Education.

Because, as our federal partners shared, these grants are very visible on the hill, so they require a hundred percent transparency.

We have monthly reporting requirements of all nine partners to show us spend down, how the funds are being used, who they are impacting, how they are impacting those people, how those people are receiving the things that we're putting out.

There is transparency and support through our federal partners at the Rehabilitation Services Administration.

And then they partnered with a company called Mathematica.

We've established regular meetings with federal partners, and they have had to revise some deadlines because they were supposed to get us things in November that we didn't get until January.

They have backed out some of our deadlines for the cooperative agreements and we've got a memo of understanding we're working on with Nevada partners.

Our next meeting of all nine Nevada partners facilitated by the Department of Education, myself as the project director and Ashley Price my colleague as the co-director, will be January 23rd.

We'll be working with our partners to go over all the processes related to them, finalizing their paperwork and what's needed to get in our E page system to get them money moving which is what we need to do to start because many of us wrote positions and wrote people in wrote in things we've never had money for.

I have heard and I've now begun to understand from our federally financed Centers for Independent Living, we have an unfunded mandate for these transition age children and youth.

With this funding, we're excited to build Independent Living Philosophy into every single training that's developed in ways we've never had that level of engagement with that Independent Living Philosophy before.

And starting at age ten, so in my entire almost 20 some years of working with transition age youth in the education system, I get down typically as low as about age 14.

And so this, being able to look at helping students and families prepare for transitioning from elementary to middle school for the first time, that's super exciting work to me.

New and innovative work we're going to get to engage in be on the front lines of 19 other states for attempting to do this work and then everything we do in build and learn we share with other states, and they share back with us, that networking aspect of we don't always have to start from zero.

On Tuesday, we had our monthly meeting with federal partners and our quarterly evaluation meeting with Mathematica and we're ready to turn that information and share it with the nine partners on the 23rd.

We are happy to share updates at future SILC meetings.

Part of the reason we want to bring the SILC in is we wanted to fund the Youth Action Council position through these funds so it was more sustainable so we could perhaps offer some additional money and make it a more permanent position and hopefully bring someone in.

We're seeing positive benefits of the work and collaboration.

I've got about ten years left in my career before I retire and I'm feeling like it, we can get to a place where we're anywhere close to seamless transition, we're going to be doing a good job with this plan.

So we're excited about the next five years, the focus will be on ages ten through 24.

But all the partners VP committed that following the grant period when we sustain these funds with Vocational Rehabilitation funds, with the individuals with disabilities education ability funds through the Nevada Department of Education and the workforce innovations opportunities act funds through Nevada Vocational Rehabilitation, we want to make this to be birth through life.

So this grant and five years are going to get us there hopefully with ages ten through 24 and they are support systems families and service providers.

But it's our goal to make it a truly lifespan seamless transition place for Nevada.

So that website and that app will serve everyone's needs and we can't get there without all of you.

So know if you weren't in the original build of these ten to 24 age groups, you all are as members of the SILC of course, but know that we will be coming looking to work with you as we get further along and expand that timeline as well.

Obioma Officer: Congratulated Jennifer Kane.

Dawn Lyons: Also congratulated Jennifer and the Department of Education. The SILC has also just hired a Youth Outreach Specialist with funding that the SILC already had in place as well as the award from the DD Council. Rylie will be attending this meeting tomorrow.

Obioma Officer: Asked Jennifer Kane if the grant would include the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community and if there will be a focus on specialists for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

Jennifer Kane: The grant is for all students with all disabilities, all the way up to students and children and youth.

Everything will be developed on the app and the website will be accessible to all including in multiple languages as well as screen readers, anything of those sorts, we are changing how we have done all our training.

We used to have a long tradition of if you're a teacher or VR counsel other service provider, this is the training you get.

If you are a parent you probably go through Nevada PEP and get training they created. We're going to create one training that is understandable by everyone from the children and the youth to their families to all the service providers and their support networks.

So everybody gets the same message.

And our plan is to provide it in as many formats as possible.

While a lot of this information will live on our roadmap which is kind of the app, its just like a fun app that kids would pay to download, it will be free. they then go on their Nevada Transitions Roadmap Through Innovative Partnerships Journey or Nevada trip, they're going to start by selecting a car and then they will move through the roadmap depending on their age, there will be different touch points, they will get to build their trip to match their needs and navigate through those touch points. The vision is they will go into a town and will be a movie theatre, and the movie theatre is where they access videos, whether you're an educator, student, or family member, on the topics that would be meaningful at those different kind of touch stones across the ages.

I am watching all the stuff new information come out about ABLE accounts. At what point would students and families need to be made aware of that on a broader level.

And then at what point would they need more specific information to open an ABLE account or begin that process.

So every single aspect of the things we're going to be developing for those touch stones along the roadmap all that information will be presented the same way no matter who is accessing it.

There won't be different messages or different information given to different groups to try to level the playing field.

That's our goal with the marketing team that we put in as part of the website and the app and the Nevada trip that by the end of this five year cycle when it's been rolled out statewide that any time you're at your meeting with ADSD about regional centers or meeting with VR about becoming a client or having reemployment transition services or at IEP at a school that every single one of those places will be talking about Nevada trip and sharing the same resources that were developed in common by all of us with the underlying philosophy of independent living.

As the goal.

And that philosophy guides everything that we do.

That's been a huge missing piece of why we have never had seamless transition because we haven't brought Centers for Independent Living (CILs), into these grants. This is the first federal grant where they have been required to be partners.

Because those folks are being left out, that's part of the reason we've never gotten a truly seamless transition and they're right.

We know how to get to seamless transition, we need everyone to be part of building it.

Dee Dee Foremaster: Is excited for RCIL’s transitioning students to engage in this program.

Obioma Officer: It is important to have the Deaf and Hard of Hearing be involved from the beginning.

Jennifer Kane: On January 23rd, in this first, large meeting, with all nine Nevada partners we're going to talk about that there's a requirement within the grant that we have an advisory workgroup.

And who is going to be on the workgroup will be determined or begin to be determined in this meeting January 23rd.

In addition to my full-time role as the secondary transition person is the navigate department education I happen to co-facilitate with my partner at the University of Nevada vision services team meeting, so I'm linked in with that group.

I'm not as linked in with the DHH community because it's not one of my assigned roles.

So I would love for you to reach out and share with me who you think the contact person would be because as we begin to develop who will be on that advisory workgroup, is that you?

Perfect.

We need that expertise of the table from day one.

We will be determining who to invite in January and February.

We are hopeful we get enough people to have a quorum for a meeting in either April or May.

We're going to include you from the beginning.

We just need people to help us understand who those people would be.

Dawn Lyons: Vocational Rehabilitation had a Deaf Community representative to begin with, but I do not know if they do anymore. So I appreciate that you're stepping up, Obioma, because I'm not sure that we have that in place anymore.

Obioma Officer: Vocational Rehabilitation had one before, I can give Jennifer the contact information. They currently have a Deaf and Hard of Hearing team there that's providing services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in our state.

So if you've already partnered with them, then go ahead and continue that partnership, I can give you that contact information if you need that. If you need other people involved that are not Vocational Rehabilitation, I have contact information for them as well.

Jennifer Kane: Vocational Rehabilitation is one of the partners of the $10 million, 4.5 is going directly to them. They put out the RFP already for the website and app development and hiring the marketing along with that. That will be our rollout marketing.

I have a meeting coming up with them, we meet monthly with the Department of Education and Vocational Rehabilitation outside of our Nevada trip meetings.

I will find out if they have thought through that piece and if they have somebody they are thinking would be great to sit on the advisory workgroup.

It would be beneficial to have someone who is connected in different ways to that community be present.

There's no limitation to who we can have.

We can't have 150 people on the workgroup or we're going to have issues getting quorum. But simply bringing in one additional person with that specific expertise makes a lot of sense to me.

I'm the project director so we can talk.

**Discussion Regarding AARP’s 2023 LTSS (Long Term Services and Supports) State Scorecard Report for Nevada** that can be found at: <https://ltsschoices.aarp.org/scorecard-report/2023/states/nevada>

Dawn Lyons: Under the 2023 Nevada Scorecard report from AARP about Long Term Services and Supports, there are a few different dimensions as they categorize them.

They have an overall ranking which is 44, which is the fourth tier so it’s basically not the worst but close to it of all, overall we're close to being the worst.

Affordability and Access are in the worst category at 49.

And I believe we're ranking out of states and territories, but I'm not certain of how many territories or which ones or anything like that.

So I don't know the full total number that it should be out of, but we have 50 actual states, and then we have some territories opposite you know it's not good when it says 49.

The choice of setting and provider we're ranked 48, which is in the fourth tier.

Safety and quality 48.

Support for family caregivers we're ranked 19, which is in the 30 tiers, which is a little better than all our other categories.

And community integration, we're ranked in the 30 tiers at 33.

So some of the details of that, it goes through home care cost and nursing home cost, long-term care insurance, No Wrong Door functions, Medicaid, and the Medicaid buy-in, which is bad in Nevada, it's ranked 43.

The buy-in is an additional option to buy into Medicaid coverage that Nevada has some stringent rules around.

So I think that's probably why we're not ranked so great in that.

As far as for the choice of setting and provider, we've got Medicaid balance, long-term services and supports balance on spending.

We've got self-directed program involvement or enrollment.

Self-directed program enrollment is ranked 48 but I just do want to express a caveat there, we just recently changed our home and community-based services waiver application to include more self-directed program enrollment.

So that number should get better for the next report card.

Assisted living supply, adult day services supply, which aren't too bad overall, but not too great either.

And home health aide supply. That one is ranked 45. So that's not great. But some of these have improved.

Adult day services supply and home health aide supply have improved since the last report card.

Some of the ones that have stayed the same are worker wage competitiveness and pace enrollment.

Pace is the program of all-inclusive care for the elderly.

So those things aren't ranked the worst, but they're not ranked the best either.

The long-term services and sports worker wage competitiveness, I know we just recently had a conversation about how dismal that is in Nevada.

But we're ranked 15 in that.

Even though we haven't made improvements from the last report card to this one, which is 2023, we're still not as bad as some states.

So that's interesting to find out.

But long-term services worker wage pass-through, we're ranked 21 in the U.S. And that's from 2022. They didn't have 2023 data for that, I think. State policies that require Medicaid providers to allocate a certain dollar amount or percentage of the rates they are paid to LTSS worker wages.

Greenhouse availability is the number of residents in greenhouse communities plus state and local policies that facilitate greenhouse development.

We don't have a performance scorecard for that, and we don't have a performance scorecard for capable availability, available ability of Community Aging in Place, Advancing Better Living for Elders, which is has an acronym CAPABLE.

Restorative services model. These are programs I don't think we have in the state, so they're not scored.

Safety and quality include home health hospital admissions. Ranked 41.

Nursing home hospital admissions, 43.

This is back from 2021.

And it hasn't really changed since the report card before that.

Nursing home residents with pressure sores, 41, ranked 41.

Nursing home inappropriate antipsychotic use, 15.

We're doing much better than other states, apparently.

Nursing home just the category is scary to me -- nursing home staff turnover, 21.

That's an issue all over the U.S., but apparently we're not as bad off as some. Nursing home COVID-19 vaccinations regarding residents, we're ranked at 49. And staff are ranked at 34.

So staff are getting vaccinated a little bit more than our residents are in nursing homes for COVID-19.

Performance our performance percentage was high.

And this is for 2023 for the COVID-19 vaccinations for residents and staff.

For residents, 39.6 percent, even though we're ranked at 49, and then for staff it was at 18.6 percent even though we're ranked at 34.

It's a little confusing to try and absorb what that means exactly.

But it sounds like we could be doing better.

Nursing home with top quality ratings, ranked at 43 and nursing home staffing levels ranked at 9. And those are from the year 2021.

At safety and quality, I don't think we have any 2023 rankings for that. We do have some from 2019 and 2020.

State emergency management plans, that was ranked in 2023, and we're number 9 in that. So apparently pretty good.

But the other categories are a little bit old and either they stayed the same or have gotten worse, which is Home and Community Services quality benchmarking, which is use of national core indicators, and then HCBS quality benchmarking and using the consumer assessment of healthcare providers and services survey, and the National Committee for Quality Assurance statewide accreditation, both of those have stayed the same since 2019 and 2020. Support for family caregivers, we've got nurse delegation, ranked at 12.

And the support for family caregivers, I don't see any improvements from the last one necessarily, but we're ranked high on that one overall.

So individually the nurse scope of practice we're ranked at 40 but family responsibility protected classification, we're ranked at seven.

State exceeds federal FMLA, and paid family leave, ranked at 12. Mandatory paid sick days, 18. Flexible sick days, 18.

Unemployment insurance for family caregivers, 27.

Spousal impoverishment protections, 13. Care Act Legislation, 43.

That means we just don't have a lot of legislation passed into law regarding that. Respite care three Medicaid waivers, 48.

However, that is from 2022 data, and I know that we've ramped up our respite care, I know Aging and Disability Services has some newer respite care programs. So that could improve in the next scorecard.

State caregiver tax credits, ranked at 6. Community integration is the last category. And for that, we have employment rate for people with disabilities, ranked at 42.

Hence the effort for Employment First, just saying.

That data is from 2021.

And it has gotten worse from 2018 to 2019 to 2021, it went down.

So we really need to improve that.

I think that was also shown in the Guinn report.

No matter how much more money and effort we put into integrated competitive employment for people with disabilities, we just seemed to be getting worse at it.

In Nevada.

Successful discharge to community, 27.

Liveability index regarding transportation, ranked at left.

Liveability index regarding housing and this is 2022 data, ranked at 33.

I would imagine that's going to get worse for next year even though it is a national issue, Nevada kind of seems to have been hit hard with that. Access to housing assistance for people with disabilities, ranked at 33. And that's for 2022.

Age friendly health systems, ranked at 28.

Community integration has a subsection called Multi-sector Plans for Aging, which is the existence of multi-sector plan on aging or comparable statewide strategic plan as defined by the scan foundation which I'm not familiar with.

But we're ranked eighth in the U.S. on that.

And that's recent.

So we're doing great planning for our aging population, we could just do better for our disability population.

Ace Patrick: Was surprised at some of the ratings and not at some of the others.

Peter Whittingham: Are there any ratings that the SILC, as an organization can impact?

Dawn Lyons: Going back to the overall scores and the broader picture, I think it gives us a little bit better of an idea when we talk about affordability and access as opposed to provider safety and quality, a little easier to understand how we might be able to apply those to what we're trying to improve in our state.

In a way, we could potentially improve every one of those categories if we really put our minds to it and got some buy-in from the rest of the state and some important people and possibly legislators.

But there are, like I said as I was going through them, there were a few specifically that I know we’re already really trying to make an impression on because we know we've had dismal numbers for a long time, and that we've not done as well as we should be or could be doing.

For instance, employment for people with disabilities, that's a big one.

Choice of setting and provider, we're ranked 48.

I know the state has been really pushing person-centered care and that's coming down from the feds, but really, what's important to me is that the feds just recently started pushing Independent Living with that Disability Innovation Fund grant.

And since we did receive that grant or the Department of Education did this year, over the next five years, we can improve that choice and control with an Independent Living Philosophy and pushing for that which -- not that person-centered care doesn't, but it just doesn't do it quite as well as Independent Living Philosophy does. Or the independent living model.

So those are areas that we want to see improvement in and that we work at and maybe not in the specific -- some of the specific categories that we drill down for AARP report but in many ways.

And some of the categories.

Peter Whittingham: It provokes a conversation about what else can the SILC do as a council, search ourselves in such a way our voices are heard at the and I know there are a lot of issues that affect our service population, and we must be reasonable in terms of what we can impact or some of the things that are removed from our immediate control.

To the extent that we can identify one, two, or three specific areas, that we know we can impact as a constituted council, using all of the power that is vested in us as a council, we can take a closer look and see how we can perhaps move forward in those areas to -- as much as possible -- improve the services, the standard, and -- that would affect our service population.

Dawn Lyons: She appreciates that AARP puts out this report for the state…. because we do have limited access to statewide data like this and it's important that -- as a state, we don't collect as much data on the disability population specifically as I think we should personally.

And so I know it's been a challenge in the past.

What do we work on exactly?

We kind of get feedback and we go on that, but how do we get the real data to drive what we're trying to change, right?

To drive the change that -- advocacy that we're trying to promote.

And so the AARP data is just that, like you said, Peter, and we are working on some of the things.

We have the Employment First or Disability Employment movement that we're really trying to support as a council.

I would also include in that, because this isn't included necessarily in the AARP report, but it's very related, is the youth transition.

We're focusing on youth transition but that's also employment, that's disability employment.

And so those are the numbers that will improve those report cards down the road.

The Medicaid rates, for home care workers or PCAs that we've been pushing to get a better system for Medicaid to review those rates with, and so those are things that we are doing, and we should continue to focus on.

But it's great to see how what we're doing impacts the whole state, and our numbers and our rankings and how good we are doing compared to other states and how necessary it is to continue pushing for these things that we are working on.

If you have other data -- other issues or specifics that you think we can glean out of this data that we really should be focusing on, now is your opportunity to share that with the group.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: As part of the SPIL we have an opportunity to use the SPIL as a chance to make sure we address these important issues.

Dawn Lyons: Agreed with Julie. Our State Plan for Independent Living is exactly where we want to write these goals into and affect these things appropriately.

And make our goals for what we're going to focus on for the next three years.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: It really is the place of the SPIL.

Ace Patrick: The SILC has been working hard to educating the legislators …. and just working with other councils and commissions on really educating just everyone across the board including public, including consumers, about the IL philosophy versus person-centered care.

We've had some good opportunities to do that, and that's one thing we can do that would improve a lot of these other issues that we have.

Dawn Lyons: Last year when we spoke at the Silver State Self-Advocacy Conference, we did an Independent Living panel to talk about Independent Living. We didn't have as much participation as we would have liked to have had, maybe it was the presentation or the -- just didn't have the draw because people didn't understand it.

Maybe this year at the Self-Advocacy Conference we could have it framed a little bit differently like maybe we could say why the Independent Living model is opposed to the Medical Model.

Or use some clever verbiage to get people to come in and listen to what we have to say and how what we must teach about why Independent Living is so important.

Ace Patrick: One of the things that Ace liked about the updates from the CILs as well as John, are the personal stories of success, of people working within the Independent Living model and having success at doing that versus the Medical Model where personally, there's not been a lot of success at.

Dee Dee Foremaster: Would like to see accessibility to medical care in the next SPIL.

Mary Evilsizer: Was surprised that Nevada is 33rd in affordable housing. What we're seeing out here in the front lines is gridlock, finding housing, we struggle with.

The housing that is being built is unaffordable to our disability community.

We've built a lot of homes, but they're just not accessible to our population. And their income levels.

While they may see the housing as getting better in the front lines, I don't think I'm seeing that at all. And I do wonder where they got their data for that.

Dawn Lyons: This data is from 2021. The next report card ranking might go up in ranking pertaining to affordable housing.

1. **For Possible Action:**

**Discussion and Make Recommendations to Provide Public Comment to ACL Regarding Proposed Changes to the Fiscal Year 25 Program Progress Report.**

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Dawn Lyons: This was part of the meeting materials that were provided. There is a lot that is included in this report. Dawn will provide a summary of this report. Brook from the Idaho SILC sent this to all SILCs. She reviewed and compared side by side the old and new reporting instrument proposed by ACL. And put her notes on it as to what was changed, what was different, and what was a typo, what needed more information.

So she put notes all over it, and I'll just go through and let you know what the biggest deals are to me, I'm not going to go over the minor typos or anything.

The first comment she said that I think is kind of an important one is she says it's missing the Paperwork Reduction Act paragraph at the beginning.

So I wasn't sure if that's something that's required that we want to mention.

That might just be a minor issue too.

But we must consider what we'd like to give comment about to ACL. For us to voice our concerns about anything.

They did take out a section under sub part 1, Administrative Data.

There are all federal funds received and there's different categories, and in the reporting, in the new SPIL, we're including a section for INE funding, but in the report it doesn't have it.

So Brook put, “Do we still include the INE funding here?”

I don't know if that's something that you find important to address or if we can just go with it being left out in the reporting.

Under other Government Funds, it says do we still include state IL general funds?

I think they're lumping it into state government funds.

I don't think splitting it up is what they are doing.

But I don't know if you find that an important distinction.

They removed a section from section C, Grants or Contracts used to distribute the Title VII Chapter 1 Part B funds.

There's a table and under that table, the titles of the columns are Name of the Grantee or Contractor, Use of Funds, Amount of Part B Funds, Amount of Non-Part B Funds, Counties Served and Designated and SPIL is Underserved or Unserved area.

And you're supposed to say yes or no to that.

The comment that Brook made over Counties Served was it says, “Removed consumer eligibility determined by DSE or provider.”

So they removed that, and I'm not sure if that's important to you.

And under the whether it's designated as an Unserved or Underserved area, they also removed CSRs so there was an additional column next to that before it asks, “Were the CSRs capped with a DSE or provider.”

And you were supposed to specify which.

I'm not sure if they took them out because they don't care, or does it matter to us, if it doesn't matter to them, does it really matter to us?

So one of the biggest things that they brought up in our meeting which was our Office of Illustration Program updates from ACL, is section F, which is Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.

And which of the following best represents how you self-identify.

Select one.

There's Female, Male, Nonbinary, Two-Spirit, Neither Male nor Female nor Nonbinary nor Two-Spirit or Transgender.

There's also which of the following best represents how you self-identify?

Select one.

Lesbian or Gay, the next one says Number of Individuals Served Who identify as Straight, that is not gay or lesbian, and Brook put a note saying, “Why do we say that is not gay or lesbian?”

Why not just say not gay or lesbian?

Bisexual, Two-Spirit or in parentheses among AIAN.

I'm not sure what AIAN means.

It's an abbreviation but they don't define it.

Number of Individuals Served who use a different term and then there's free text you can type in.

Individuals Served Who Don't Know or Prefer Not to Answer.

Those are the biggest changes in this PPR.

That's the biggest change they made was all those categories of gender and -- sexual orientation and gender identity.

Does anybody have any thoughts about that?

Brook also made a comment at the end and says, “Keep in mind that this data may not be currently collected so there will need to be changes throughout the data collection process before accurate reporting can be done.”

So if we're breaking this down into this many categories and they are finding these are as many categories as possible that are needed to get proper data for the feds, we're going to have to change how we collect data to include all these categories too, so that we can report it this way.

So that's something that she's asking us to keep in mind when we give our feedback if we give any feedback to ACL.

I want to know what you guys think about that section and if we have any thoughts or opinions on how ACL should be posing that category.

 Do you like their categories?

Do you think it's too many?

What kind if any, feedback should we provide about it?

Do we like how they are being more inclusive?

Ace Patrick: Some of the wording for the categories could be cleaned up.

Mary Evilsizer: There could be an added category, “Does not want to respond.” We have problems with the question about minorities, some people just don't want to answer.

SNCIL offers them the dignity and grace not to respond, even though ACL does want the data, and always includes a note that some individuals simply don't want to respond.

Dawn Lyons: That is included further down in the form.

Ace Patrick: Likes that it is being broken down because so many people, especially the younger generations, are going to be identifying more and more as some of these other gender names and gender categories more so than Ace’s generation was doing.

Sabra McWhirter: Likes the empowering aspect of “fill in the blank” answer options, but if respondents don't see an answer option that applies to them, maybe provide a comment field to describe gender or sexual orientation in a way that's authentic to them.

Dawn Lyons: 11 is number of individuals served who use a different term and you can type in your free text.

And then the 13 was number of individuals served who preferred not to answer.

So there is an “other”.

John Rosenlund: Two points, I wonder if ACL could be asked where they got the input from. Also, in engaging consumers when you're asking these questions, I have found that a good, positive aspect of letting them know you're going to be asking some questions, if they feel like they don't want to answer them, fine, but the true intent is to look at your data and make sure that you're reaching populations.

In the past, the SPIL pointed to this methodology that you look at your data, “we don't have any consumers in this area, are we doing”, doesn't mean you're not reaching people but are you really looking at your stuff and going are we missing something here?

Dawn Lyons: Are we being inclusive enough that we're capturing these populations if they exist in Nevada.

John Rosenlund: There used to be a method of looking at census data and that the state represents this many people and the state’s consumer services should reflect that. The state should challenge itself to be doing outreach in all areas. If we're not serving anybody like in North Las Vegas, you should really question “Why don't we have consumers coming from that area when it takes up a larger number of the population in our state.”

That's what the intent and most consumers even if it's maybe offensive, if you let them know, this is really what we want to be able to do by asking these questions, and that's what the feds are trying to drive us to do.

It does kind of help alleviate that and not make it about, like, “Why do you need all this information about me?”

Ace Patrick: Given the nature of what is happening across the country, especially with the LGBTQ population, the trans community in particular, answering these questions, the data is important, but sometimes answering some of these questions is a bit scary for the community just because of why is it being collected, how is it going to be used, will it be used for us or against us?

So that's kind of why I'm curious about all of this, too.

I understand the need for the data part, and I agree with it, but even I have questions sometimes when I see those questions like how will this data be used or will it be kept private? I'm just thinking about what I'm hearing from other states and how scary it is to even correctly put down how you identify with gender and sexual orientation.

John Rosenlund: He agrees, he doesn't want to give personal information. Like when somebody asks to you participate in a survey and wants your email.

They're right there saying we're going to keep track of what you said.

A lot of people don't respond to surveys when that's done.

You can volunteer it, our consumer data, is completely secured.

Nobody reviews it.

No names are tied to that information, and it's never been used in that way.

Personally, I want to know what the person's goal is.

I don't care what their orientation is.

If you have a disability and you have a barrier and we're trying to get past that that's all that really matters.

A lot of this information doesn't make sense to me in the way that I think.

The intent of it is supposed to be that no one is being excluded.

I would hate to ever see it be used for anything else, unless someone was reviewing on a federal level, reviewing a CSR they would never actually see that down to a granular level, and the last time ACL did a review of Independent Living in Nevada that I participated in, it was over 15 years ago.

They weren't really delving into that information, they were checking to make sure the CSR was complete, there was a signature, signed plan, and so forth.

Dawn Lyons: The question is, do we feel like we’re in a place societally…. where it would even be become meaningful data?

Or do we feel like this is stuff people aren't even going to want to respond to, they're going to be offended by, they're going to put not applicable, or I don't want to say, they're going to be afraid that whoever reads it is going to discriminate against them even if we are keeping it confidential.

Is it going to work like that or are we in a place now where there's pride in how we differ in our identities, and we would like to express that.

And so now we're given that opportunity and we should be counted, and we need to be counted separately.

How does that apply to the Disability Community, but we've been a big kick of intersectionality.

So cultural awareness and intersectionality awareness has been a big push in the last few years.

So I understand why they are saying it.

I just don't know if I feel strongly about it one way or the other to give comment about it.

John Rosenlund: If there were concerns either way, they lean into policy, procedure and projects that allow people to identify. What are you going to explain to the consumer and assure them that their information is not going to be used in that in any negative fashion. What we try to do with Independent Living is, you disclose what's important to you, and all else doesn't really matter. Whether it's ethnicity or whatever. You choose not to answer, that's fine.

We'll fast forward to what we're here to address.

Mary Evilsizer: An IL specialist is sitting there, trying to build up trust enough to tell their story and tell you who they are.

With the SPIL, the SILC, and CILs, we'll gather the data that we're being asked to, but we're all going to respect our consumer.

We can simply ask, “What's your goal or barrier?”

One of the ways that we use our data at SNCIL is to track a lot of different disabilities and a lot of different ethnicities, and then if we see we're low in one area we go and conduct outreach specifically in those areas.

And we just did something that we were very happy to be involved in. We're involved with the LGBTQ community and just found out that they have a resource directory for LGBTQ.

They've started inviting us to their events and in turn, they are coming to our events.

We know that we're going to be doing the outreach and track the outreach where we get the numbers and people that want to disclose, maybe, maybe not.

But we show our efforts, we show that we support, we show unity, and we show that we're there to support them.

They're there to support us.

This community has been so outstanding in some of the efforts we've taken to Washington, they've been the ones marching with us on the stairs to get attention to different issues.

I'm glad we're recognizing as something different and understanding that it's a tracking tool, but I'm glad we're also understanding that as our community, the Independent Living philosophy, is to bring us your barrier and let's see what we can help you to develop a goal with.

Dawn Lyons: Given the comments in this meeting, it sounds like the SILC does not want to give any comment about any changes that we'd like to see necessarily, and we don't need to necessarily give comment because they have everything included there?

The section on your race and ethnicity, they changed where it used to say, “Two or more races,” to “other”, and you can text what you are, whether it's more than one or something specific other than the ones listed, which are American Indian, Alaska native, Asian, Black or African-American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, Latino or any race or Latino Only and then other and then race and ethnicity unknown.

One comment that Brook made was under Services.

They list all kinds of services, including youth and transition services, it's youth, slash, transition services on there.

But Brook made a comment with the focus on nursing home transition, “Why don't we include a nursing home transition in the list?”

But I think it's because it's youth, slash, transition services that includes that.

There are just a few other changes. Mostly just to make it more inclusive.

There's one other here on section Community Outreach. That table that we usually fill in with what kind of outreach we did over the last year when we report it.

They took out the section for the hours spent doing that.

I think that's wise, because it's really kind of hard to glean any meaning out of the number of hours when you're talking about what type of outreach you're doing and where.

So it makes it harder to separate it and to put them together because we might do the same kind of outreach to two different places and in that case we can list those two places, we don't need to say it was 20 hours and break that down into how many in each.

I think it makes sense to take out the number of hours spent on each activity.

The SILC composition

Brook's comment is, “In the chart, they removed the following requirements.

How many members are on the SILC, how many members of the SILC are individuals with disabilities and not employed by state agency, or Center for Independent Living.

How many members of the SILC are voting members.

How many of the voting members on the SILC are individuals with disabilities not employed by a state agency or center for independent living.”

The categories are now to report or will be the name of the SILC member, whether they have a disability, employed by CILs, state agency, either voting or non-voting, terms start and end date and I think it makes sense to me that they took those confusing parts out and made it much more simplified.

Brook made a comment under SILC staff that, “Not all SILCs have an Executive Director”, and she suggests changing language to be more inclusive.

The language currently proposed says, “Please provide the name and contact information for the SILC Executive Director, indicate the number and titles of any other SILC staff if applicable.

Indicate whether staff are also state agency employees.

Personally I think they covered all the categories there.

Don't necessarily think we need to be more inclusive in that language, but does anybody disagree with that and think we need to let ACL know they are not being inclusive enough in that?

No comments so I will keep going.

Under the training and technical assistance needs and priorities and where you must list priorities, they still have one listed as 704 Reports and Brook said, “Why don't we change this to PPR.”

I don't know that we necessarily need to give comment, but we can.

Anybody think we should?

There are words that suggested differences on the instructions, but I wasn't going to go through those.

It's part of the materials.

You can look at it.

It's just a mirror of the instrument itself so if you have any issues with the instrument then we can go over the instructions.

But since sounds like we don't want to take any action or provide any comment about these proposed changes because we agree with them.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Discussion and Approval of Future SILC Subaward Timing

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Dawn Lyons: This agenda item is here to talk about the timing of the subawards because the SILC should be in alignment with the Federal fiscal Year. Because the state has a year, an annual fiscal year that they award their awards, subawards under, and we should be in alignment with that and do according to our federal fiscal year so that's what we did.

We ended up slowly but surely moving everything to be in alignment with our federal fiscal year as we are awarded from the federal government.

That has caused us some problems because, especially with these delays in budgets being approved federally, our federal grant trickles in so slowly and sometimes we haven't received even our first portion of our award until December.

This time we received it in November.

And it was just a tiny portion of our grant.

And so it wasn't even enough to subaward all the awards that we said we would obligate for.

And so that really puts us in a pickle and puts our sub grantees in a pickle because they needed money as much as we do but if we don't have it we don't have the authority to give it to them yet.

So then it's like it starts whatever we get enough, we're able to send it finally, could be in January, could be in February, and then they have until September to spend that down.

That's not fair, in my opinion, so my thought was what do you guys think -- we should still do our fiscal agent award on the federal fiscal year because that's how we need it, but -- that's a different kind of award.

We're not spending money we don't have.

If we do subawards out to the community or to the centers for Independent Living or however we decide to do that moving forward, I would like to propose that we start later when we know we actually have enough grant money to award those subawards so that we can give them a year from that date rather than starting in October and them not even getting money until half a year later.

I would like to hear feedback from the Centers for Independent Living here to see if they have any opinions on when it would work best for them, we used to grant out the following year since we had that next year to spend down what we obligate.

I don't know if you want to go a whole year without an award of some kind if we were to award anything just to wait for that year to start or should we start it in January and go from the calendar year then instead since that's typically when we finally get enough money to do our subawards is January.

Mary Evilsizer: SNCIL works on a federal fiscal year, but we have some projects that work on a state fiscal year and tracks everything closely, and it wouldn't matter when we got the funds.

And I do understand not having the funds to distribute.

With SNCIL’s accounting process, it's accrual accounting, and we -- if we got a guarantee, let's say in January, February, we're okay with that because we can track it.

If it was for a year we can still track to the next year.

So I don't know if the feds put the SILC on a two-year basis where you can roll over, you have funding for two years, that's what they did with the CILs because it used to be you had one year and you had to spend everything down by the end of the year.

But now they're a little bit more lenient, giving us two years, or that was approved for SNCIL, it was for a scholarship to send students and parents to the NCIL conference. The $10,000 was to help individuals transition from nursing homes or homeless situations or help individuals to stay in their homes.

So we had a short term to spend that $10,000 because we don't know when we're going to get requests in.

It's on a day-to-day basis. But, honestly, we can work with whatever the SILC can do, because we do understand getting funding later.

Jennifer Kane: Federal Fiscal Year is October 1 - September 30.

State Fiscal Year is July 1 - June 30.

Dee Dee Foremaster: RCIL works with both the Federal and State fiscal years. They do not have a preference.

Dawn Lyons: Asked if it would work to make the change gradually… maybe if we have an award to give out next year, we start it in January, from January through December, and then the next year after that, if we have an award to give out we do it according to the state fiscal year.

And then the year after that, we go back to our following federal fiscal year?

Should we do it that way?

Should we do it gradually if we change it?

Dee Dee Foremaster: RCIL will match whatever schedule is needed.

Dawn Lyons: The state is not saying we have to do anything.

They told us we needed to be on time, so we gradually went back and changed it so that we were giving out our awards on the federal fiscal year that we were supposed to have awarded them.

But that's what's causing the problem now is we're not actually getting our federal awards until late.

There's nothing we can do about that other than adjust our timeline.

Dee Dee Foremaster: I know it’s hard for us because when they don’t come on time, then we must work for quite a few months sometimes with nothing.

Dawn Lyons: That's one of the reasons why I was suggesting we gradually move it out, but do we want to eventually get to the point where we're back on the following fiscal year since we have that additional year to spend what's obligated?

Mark Tadder: If we're moving it back in four or six-month intervals, does that mean eventually we're going to lose a year of funding by doing it that way?

Dawn Lyons: Exactly, it really affects the Centers more than anyone else.

But the thing is we're not being on time as we are, because we don't have the authority from the feds yet to give you the money on time.

So if we pushed it back to January, we could keep it there and just say let's just do January to December from now on.

And that way we're not really pushing it back any further than it's having to be pushed back as it is.

So that's an option too.

Mark Tadder: I would say tentatively that's what we would prefer for Northern Nevada but -- we don't have a whole year of funding.

But I would have to check with our accountant folks and business manager.

I would think that would make more sense.

Because if they can't give us the money we might as well start the program in January anyway.

Dawn Lyons: I like that idea best anyway coming from a SILC perspective because then if you need an extension, we can give it to you.

If we were to go back to the following fiscal year, from October to September, then it would have to be a hard deadline of September because that's how long we have to spend it.

Mark Tadder: That is hard enough already on the SILC so we're very busy that month wrapping everything up.

It might be better to spread it out.

Mary Evilsizer: I think that's a good way to go.

The only thing I would ask, we're not going to get our funds because we send the kids to NCIL in July but we start in May, because we do the competition for the essays and then get the essays and so the marketing for it is going to be late this year or we're not going to get it this year, I would just need to know to either put a hold on the marketing or to keep going with the marketing.

Dawn Lyons: But the feds are unpredictable at this point.

I'm going to bet that we will have it by February at some point, and we'll be able to subaward your grant at that time.

Unfortunately, you've been the one who's had to wait longest since we know that you don't start spending it until May.

But I would be willing to bet that you'll have it before you need it this year.

Mary Evilsizer: And if not, we'll continue with the marketing, and it will all work out. But thank you for giving us notice and appreciate it.

So moving forward with a positive attitude, we can't push or predict the feds, and in the end, if you must cancel, we'll make sure that our candidates are treated well in some way or recognized in some way.

February, March, April, as you know, we don't start the expenditures until May.

Dawn Lyons: Just to address the issues with this year's award period, since we are awarding you so late this year, if you needed an extension to complete that, that would be fine.

We could work on that, too.

I just want to make sure we're planning appropriately moving forward after this, because of this issue coming up the of last few years with the federal bank.

I appreciate the funding for the housing, the nursing home transitions, and helping individuals maintain their household.

Because with that little bit of money you can do so much to help people.

So if we might need an extension because we don't control who's coming through the door at any given moment.

And we help individuals as much as we can when they come and try to move their lives and help them to set their goals to move their lives forward.

Mary Evilsizer motioned for the SILC to start awarding their subawards in January of the calendar years from now on, January through December. Ace Patrick seconded. Members voted and the motion was carried.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Evaluation and Make Possible Council Recommendations Regarding the Current FFY24 SPIL Objectives and Budget

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Dawn Lyons: This is about how we evaluate our SPIL, because in our current SPIL, one of our objectives or indicators was that we would come up with a new quality assurance method or we would investigate improving our quality assurance as far as how we're evaluating our SPIL.

But as I investigated other SPILs and other states and how they do things, the states that didn't have so much money that they could hire an outside consultant or auditor to come in to evaluate their SPIL for them which we don't have that kind of money, most states did it the same way.

It's just having a list of our targets and our timelines and just reviewing it every quarterly meeting.

I propose that we go ahead and continue to do that unless anyone has any other ideas or thoughts on that, or if anyone has any questions, please pause there.

I think everyone agrees that we're doing it the best possible way, we're using best practices as far as we can uncover or as far as I've been able to research from other states and other methodologies unless we come by a million dollars somewhere and we're able to get an outside auditor, I think we can just continue what we're doing.

I don't necessarily think we need to take a vote on that.

I just wanted to get everyone on the same page, make sure we all think that that works the best.

John Rosenlund: Would like to be included in the ongoing discussion.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Discussion and Recommendations from Council Members Regarding the Evaluation of the Current State Plan for independent Living (SPIL)

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Dawn Lyons: Regular evaluation of our current state plan, and since we had the year extended for our SPIL, for an additional year throughout federal fiscal year 24, we really didn't add necessarily any more indicators or action items.

We just wanted to continue the things that were continual throughout the SPIL.

I included the objective sheet from last meeting because it's the same topics. And nothing has changed necessarily.

But I believe that we are on track and we're continuing to be on track, and if you guys have had a chance to go through those items, please let me know if you have any thoughts on them or if you think that we're lacking in some area.

Or if you think we need improvement.

I thought there would be way more discussion on this than we're having.

Maybe I need to be more specific.

Dee Dee Foremaster: I mentioned the fact that access to healthcare should probably be in the SPIL. I'm concerned about medical offices having accessibility.

I am concerned about the fact that doctors often don't take the time that is needed to explain things to people with disabilities, and so I think it's important that we do have some healthcare things in the SPIL so that we can maybe make it more accessible for people with disabilities. An example of helpful things could include having a walker or something to hold onto when a patient steps on to a scale.

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh: Feels that the SILC could support that.

Dawn Lyons: We have been kind of incorporating some of that.

If we did not have some category in our SPIL goals or objectives that healthcare access didn't fall under, then we wouldn't have been able to even apply for that when we were looking at the healthcare workforce funding that was coming through our Designated State Entity.

Even though they did go with regional reps instead and that was a big, long issue, we've had discussions also with those regional representatives about this issue, and we have been pursuing education and just collaboration on trying to assist with healthcare becoming more accessible for people with disabilities.

It is still in our goals and objectives.

We just don't have something specific about healthcare and accessibility in our indicators, but moving forward, since you are on our SPIL workgroup, that would be something you could bring up at our SPIL workgroup that you would like to see a specific indicator on that. Although it does fall into broad categories.

Mary Evilsizer: It does fall into broad categories.

There's so much work to do in that area, and I think awareness, education, and training our consumers to speak up when they go to physical therapy and the door is too heavy, they are fighting the door, they have a walker, they don't have automatic doors.

We get calls at the center for people complaining that their physician's office cannot accommodate them, and we will call the offices, but it's got to be all of us together speaking up when it happens and bringing awareness.

I like the idea of the walker or cane when you're asked to step on the scales. Bringing awareness to the medical field to be inclusive, because most of their patients need assistance, we have a large aging population that needs assistance of different kinds or just awareness for accessibility.

Dawn Lyons: This is a great topic and could be an agenda item for future meetings. This could be the subject of a story through Public News Story.

She opened the Objective Tracking sheet. The ongoing Objectives include: are providing our subawards, which we've done, supporting the Independent Living program as we put in our budget, and we've done that.

The CILs and John have been providing quarterly reports to us.

We've been collaborating with community partners statewide regarding legislative issues for disability and Independent Living Philosophy, advocacy being education, and outreach.

That is something we've been doing, and our Legislative Subcommittee should be meeting again soon.

The SILC website, we add partners to it as they request, and those have been coming in regularly.

It might have been a little bit ambitious to put that we would have at least 10 partners listed and that we would add at least 2 to each quarter because not every quarter do we have two requests to add a resource, but the length of our web page could get long and I don't want to overwhelm people so that might be something we want to change for our next SPIL.

So far I think we're pretty much on track with that.

All conference attendees will relay training to the Council or relay their takeaways from those conferences, which we've had agenda items for that. And you guys shared your APRIL information with us, so we've been doing that. The staff is going to telecommute to maintain our autonomy. To put the ducks in a row to make sure that happens.

And with the governor's new back to the office mandate, it was a big deal.

So we made sure we took care of that with our last meeting vote, so we have it on the record.

That's all that's on our ongoing objectives and indicators that we're working on. So I think we're on track.

And I think we're still working just as hard this year as we did the previous three years.

I don't necessarily think we have deviated from our purpose or from our three main goals.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Discussion and Make Recommendations Regarding Renewing SILC’s Annual Contract with Public News Service

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Dawn Lyons: I wanted to let you guys know that Jake from Public News Service had sent out an invoice asking us if we would like to renew for another year that gives us another eight articles through the year for $3,500 which is the rate that nonprofits are given from them.

But then he sent out an email after that saying early birds, if you pay your invoice before the end of the year, you get a five % reduced rate.

And I emailed him back and said that's not fair we can't even talk about it until January at our meeting.

He said don't worry we'll give you that 5 percent discount rate. It would only be $3,325 as opposed to $3,500 this year if we want today to renew.

So in that light, I would like some suggestions about what articles we should start with at least, if not come up with the whole list of eight topics that we'd like to do this year.

But at least to get one of them started so if somebody could recommend a topic that we should have them do an article on, I would appreciate it.

Mary Evilsizer: Thank you for the opportunity. I worked with him, he's an excellent writer. I would like to recommend that we do a story on affordable and accessible housing. SNCIL has had some individuals that we wanted to transition from a nursing home to the community, and the way that the market is and the way the community is, there's a lot of fear involved now moving out, and then we can't find housing.

So we've been working with someone for three years, and because of the housing market, though some people are eligible to transition, they can't because of the lack of housing.

So if he could maybe do a story on the lack of affordable housing for individuals that are trying to transition, also for individuals that are homeless or at risk of being homeless, because right now, we just have such a limited market as to where to guide them to even find housing.

Dawn Lyons: I think that's a very timely subject because it is at the top of our list for our consumer concerns and barriers.

Lisa Bonie: Asked what the return has been pertaining to how many people have been reached with these reports.

Dawn Lyons: I do send those reports out that Public News Service sends us, to SILC members.

I can post some of those reports on the SILC’s website and can let the members know when I do it. The members will be able to see what the return has been, how many articles have been exposing SILC’s stories, and how many people that would reach.

Because Public News Service does send Dawn that reporting, and it's been quite a bit.

Public News Service is anticipating a large increase in their reach this year as opposed to last year.

So it looks like it's going to get even better.

I will send that to the members and make sure it gets posted on our website.

Dawn asked for a motion to approve another year's worth of Public News Service at their discounted rate, and that housing and homelessness will be a first subject matter to create an article on.

Dee Dee Foremaster: Would also like the article to include the rural areas as well.

Story suggestions:

Housing possibly nursing home to housing.

PCA shortages

Access to medical care

Dee Dee Foremaster motioned to approve the renewal of SILC’s contract for another year for $3,325, and that the first story will be about housing and homelessness.

Mary Evilsizer seconded.

Members voted and the motion was carried.

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh: Would like the next story to be about the shortage of PCAs.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Discussion and Approval of Member Attendance at Upcoming Conferences

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Dawn Lyons: Would like to see about three SILC members volunteer to go the the ADSD Conference coming up April 16th through the 18th in Reno and to be part of some kind of SILC initiative, whether that’s just being there as a “vendor” or as a presenter. She is thinking of presenting a training on Independent Living that she helped present back at the SILC Advocacy Conference.

John Rosenlund: The deadline for submitting presentations is January 16th and he would like to be part of the presentation about the key aspects of Independent Living versus other models and that all points lead back to advocacy.

Dawn Lyons: Thanked John and mentioned them getting people from behind the scenes as well as from the community so that the presenters are not all SILC members.

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh would like to attend the conference and be part of the panel.

Sabra McWhirter would like to be part of the planning.

Dawn will put that proposal in by the deadline.

She will talk to Mark Tadder about being part of the panel as well.

Obioma Officer would like to be part of the presentation.

John Rosenlund: Suggested having consumers take part in the presentation to speak about their own experiences in Independent Living and that could make it a more powerful presentation and training. He will be reaching out to some consumers. If that works out and we go that route with assistive technology collaborative, we could lend that into that process.

But that might be something to think about even for the other CILs, consumers that have went through and developed Independent Living goals and seen how that can be used and empower them to make decisions and be in that control position instead of somebody doing it from a medical model.

Dawn Lyons: Some of those personal stories, are so much more moving and inspirational to ADSD employees even because they may not understand Independent Living until they hear the story.

Mary Evilsizer: Asked if there would be funding for consumers to come to the conference.

Dawn Lyons: There is some funding and will get together with Mary.

Autumn Blattman: ADSD will have some scholarships available.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Discussion and Appointment for New Legislative Subcommittee Chair

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh: Steven Cohen resigned as Chair of the Nevada Legislative Subcommittee and Julie appointed Dr. Sondra Cosgrove for the position of Chair. Dr. Cosgrove has accepted the position of Chair.

1. **For Possible Action:**

Discussion and Approval of Future Meeting Agenda Items and Meeting Date: April 10 & 11, 2024

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

Standing items

Healthcare

More articles for Public News Service

Medicaid rate determination strategy

1. **Public Comment:** (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. To provide public comment telephonically, dial **+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)**. When prompted to provide the meeting ID, enter **929 904 1434** and passcode **707401**. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person. Persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name and provide the secretary with written comments.)

**1/10/24 Public Comment:**

Mary Evilsizer: SNCIL’s Board is recruiting candidates for our Board with a specific skill set. First we are looking for individuals that are very interested in promoting the Independent Living Philosophy and have personal experience with a disability.

We are looking for a skill set of Human Resources, we take our employment handbooks and regulations for employment very seriously.

We are also looking for an individual that meets all those criteria with business law.

So if any of you know any of your colleagues or peers in the community that have a passion for the disability community, that have expertise in those areas, we really would like to invite them for an interview.

I am going to be posting up on our website, it's a fact sheet on what's required for a board membership, and then the types of skill sets that we're looking for.

Dawn Lyons: Requested the recruitment information from Mary to send out to SILC’s listserv.

Mark Tadder: I am the Associate Director for the NNCIL, and would love to talk to Julie or Jennifer, a little bit further about this program because I have some ideas and I'm also President of the National Federation of the Blind in Nevada and like to have some representation in this as well.

We do things like the Bell Academy which teaches kids enhanced Braille skills during school time.

Cindi Swanson: Very excited that Mary Evilsizer, Peter Whittingham, and Dee Dee Foremaster want to be part of the Employment First Coalition. I've been a beginning partner of Employment First.

I hope Jennifer Kane listened to all the good things that were talked about, for example, people on 700 should not be removed from Social Security.

There are so many errors being made because of people not understanding.

I'm thinking some of those folks at 700-hour might have been taking medicines and might have hearing aids and all those things are impaired related work expense.

And Jennifer when you're talking about people at ten, yes, absolutely.

We must get them ready to understand that they're going to be working and their parents need to know they can, so I'm so excited about what you're doing.

And while I'm a volunteer, I would love to be at that table.

Jennifer Kane will send her information to Mark Tadder.

Julie Weissman Steinbaugh: It has been a very productive meeting.

**1/11/24 Public Comment:**

Peter Whittingham: I am the Chair of the Down Syndrome Organization and we service not only persons with Down's Syndrome, but a wide cross-section of the Developmental Disability Community including autism as well.

And one of the frequent complaints I get, is the lack of knowledge and education from our members, families, about the services that are available to them and their children.

So we've started a series of meetings with subject matter experts that can provide information to our service population monthly.

We will utilize the services provided by the Council for Developmental Disabilities lunch and learn series. We will introduce that to our members so they can get access to that through the web and cam series.

But in addition to that, we are also doing a monthly meeting where we will develop a calendar of different topics and presenters at those meetings.

I am asking if you have services that meet the needs of some of our service population or members, give me a call or you have my email address, you can get that from Dawn.

As I listened to Jennifer yesterday we talked about the range that the grant coverings from 10 to 25, it echoes in my ear from parents talking about from birth to 9, that they don't have services for that group, and then, of course, beyond 25.

The national Down's Syndrome Society NDSS, is celebrating this year March 21st through 23rd which is significant to persons with Down's Syndrome, they are running from Los Angeles to Las Vegas starting on the 21st and will end on the 23rd at the welcome sign in Las Vegas.

I will be their coordinating partner in Nevada, and it will be wonderful for us as service organizations serving the disability community to many could come out and welcome them because they're running not only for persons with Down's Syndrome but to bring attention to the disability community.

So if anybody has an interest and wants to participate and other ways to support, they can contact me.

Mark Tadder: NNCIL has added the following programs: We have started a one on one peer support group for people with blindness and low vision on Thursday afternoons, weekly, using volunteers and some of our staff to train people to bring them up to speed on devices like iPhones, Android phones, iPads, laptop, Mac or the Windows computer or Jaws screen reader to make an appointment you have to call the center switchboard and speak to Mona.

We do half an hour or hour depending on what level of training they want, and it's first come, first serve.

We've also moved our Thursday peer group. It is now the Friday peer group from two to four on Zoom. The link is on our website on NNCIL.org. This is a blind and low vision peer support group, mostly for people who are new to vision loss, to meet other blind people, learn about how independent living works and how they can live independently with the different services and just with peer support.

It's a very popular group.

We have people who have been coming to these three or four years now, and it's a warm place for people who are very uncomfortable with a new situation.

If you have anybody who is blind, who has low vision anywhere in the state, direct them towards us and you can reach out to me at the center, and I would be happy to answer those questions for that.

We also have our cooking classes getting ready to start again at our center.

We're also hoping to expand it into Carson City.

We must get the location squared away but there is an adaptive cooking class for people who are blind and have low vision to learn how to continue to cook so they can stay independent and live in their homes. Popular class.

Sign up for the Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living newsletter.

We talk about great events every month in the newsletter, and you can find a link to join that at NNCIL.org.

1. **Adjournment (For Possible Action):**

Julie Weissman-Steinbaugh, Chair

1/10/24 Meeting Adjourned at: 3:57 pm

1/11/24 Meeting Adjourned at: 3:58 pm

**Accommodation Requests and Meeting Materials:**

* The following complete link for the meeting is included below:
* <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9299041434?pwd=NmM5Tk1Od3ltRzg1enhRYTU3WDdUZz09&omn=85279087577>
* Items may be taken out of order, combined for consideration, and/or removed from the agenda at the Chairperson’s discretion. The public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The public body may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. The public body may place reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but may not restrict comments based on viewpoint. Action may be taken on all items discussed, provided there is a quorum of voting members present.
* We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify Wendy Thornley in writing at 3416 Goni Rd, suite D-132 Carson City, Nevada 89706, email wthornley@adsd.nv.gov or call at (775) 220-7941 as soon as possible.
* If at any time during the meeting an individual who has been named on the agenda or has an item specifically regarding them included on the agenda is unable to participate because of technical or other difficulties, please email Wendy Thornley at wthornley@adsd.nv.gov and note at what time the difficulty started so that matters pertaining specifically to their participation may be continued to a future agenda if needed or otherwise addressed.
* Please be cautious and do not click on links in the chat area of the meeting unless you have verified, they are safe. If you ever have questions about a link in a document purporting to be from ADSD, please do not hesitate to contact wthornley@adsd.nv.gov for verification.
* This meeting may be recorded to facilitate note-taking or other uses. By participating you consent to recording of your participation in this meeting.
* To request document translation or interpreter please contact wthornley@adsd.nv.gov

 Si quiere este documento traducido, por favor escriba a wthornley@adsd.nv.gov

* Supporting public material provided to the Nevada Statewide Independent Living Council members for this meeting may be requested from Wendy Thornley at wthornley@adsd.nv.gov and is/will be available at any meeting locations and the SILC website <https://www.nvsilc.com/meetings/>

**AGENDA POSTED AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:**

Notice of this meeting was posted at the following Aging and Disability Services Office at 3208 Goni Road, Building I, Suite 181, Carson City, NV. 89706. Notice of this meeting was posted on the Internet through the Statewide Independent Living Council website at <https://www.nvsilc.com/> and Nevada Public Notices website at [https://notice.nv.gov](https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=e92e5499cb272963JmltdHM9MTY4NjYxNDQwMCZpZ3VpZD0xNGI5ODlmZS05NDliLTZhNGQtMDE3Yi05YjkyOTUxZjZiNTgmaW5zaWQ9NTE4Ng&ptn=3&hsh=3&fclid=14b989fe-949b-6a4d-017b-9b92951f6b58&psq=nevada+public+posting&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9ub3RpY2UubnYuZ292Lw&ntb=1)