



WV's Partnership to Promote Community Well-Being
Retreat
August 17-18, 2006 – Glade Springs Resort
Meeting Minutes

*Prepared by Michele Bush of the WV Prevention Resource Center
Approved at the October 26, 2006 Partnership Meeting*

ATTENDANCE

Present

- **Partners:** Keith Adkins, Jean Ambrose, Joe Barker, Jason Carlson, Don Chapman, Judy Crabtree, Michelle Foster, Debi Gillispie (Proxy for Cindy Largent-Hill), Sue Hage, Dave Harris, Steve Heasley, Mike Lacy, Helena Lee, Steve Mason, Gig Robinson, Judith Russell, Angela Saunders, Mike Slaughter (Proxy for Bob Musick), Brenda Thompson, Bill Woodrum
- **WVPRC Staff:** Kristi Adkins, Jamie Albert, David Bailey, Lara Berry, Mark Berry, Jo Beyer, Zobeida Bonilla-Vega, Bidy Bostic, Michele Bush, Wayne Coombs, Cathy Coontz, Melissa Crawford, David Dodds, Lynn Evans, Nick Fry, Julia Haines, Melanie Jones, Ed Lanham, Angela Linger, Michelle Markovich, Monica McFarland, Carol Moscar, Bill O'Dell, Valerie Ponder, Brenda Powell, Brenda Richards, Christy Rose, Laura Sarver, Carole Scheerbaum, Judy Sikula, Andy Whisman, Lynn Wallace
- **Others:** Lisa Estep-Bruer (DADA & CREATE), Jim Doria (Epi Workgroup), Mary Emmet (Epi Workgroup), Paula Flaherty (MU Eval Team), Mary Hunt- Lieving (8-17-06) (Benedum Foundation), Tou Lee (Central CAPT), Mike Lowther (8-17-06) (CSAP), Robert Pack (Epi Workgroup), Anu Sharma (Central CAPT), Linda Spatig (MU Eval Team), Anne Swedberg (MU Eval Team)

Absent

- **Partners:** Karen Eskew, Andrew Gillette, Lew Holloway, Gayle Manchin, Karen Salem, Denise Smith

ITEMS DISCUSSED/DECISIONS MADE

Call for Proxies/Call to Order/Introductions: Partnership Chair Mike Lacy called for proxies and then called the meeting to order. Mike Lacy introduced the newly appointed members of the Partnership; Keith Adkins, Jason Carlson, Karen Eskew, Steve Mason, Bob Musick, Angela Saunders, and Brenda Thompson. Mike Lacy had the remaining attendees introduce themselves.

Meeting Packet Review/Meeting Notes Review & Approval: Michele Bush highlighted the contents of the meeting packets. Everyone present reviewed the July 21st Partnership meeting notes. There was no discussion and the minutes were accepted as presented.

HANDOUTS:

- *Meeting Agenda*
- *7-21-2006 Partnership Meeting Notes Draft*
- *Parliamentary Procedure and Robert's Rules of Order Power Point*
- *Parliamentary Procedure and Robert's Rules of Order*
- *A Summary of Motions*
- *Table D: Table of Rules Relating to Motions*
- *SIG YR2 Grant Money (Planning Grants)*
- *Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Program, Guidance for Developing the State Strategic Plan*
- *CSAP Expectations Power Point*
- *Description of County Capacity Assessments*
- *The Substance Abuse Well-Being Index: A Prioritization Approach for WV's Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant*
- *WV's Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Prioritization Process Power Point*
- *7-26-06 Sub-Granting Workgroup Meeting Notes*
- *Logic Model for County A – Tobacco*
- *Logic Model for County B – Alcohol*
- *Example Logic Model for Alcohol*

Parliamentary Procedure: Brenda Thompson gave an overview of Parliamentary Procedure and Robert's Rules of Order highlighting issues such as rules governing an assembly, motions and voting, and commonly used motions. (See handouts: *Parliamentary Procedure and Robert's Rules of Order Power Point*, *Parliamentary Procedure and Robert's Rules of Order*, *A Summary of Motions*, *Table D: Table of Rules Relating to Motions*)

Judith Russell questioned, "Who has the responsibility to determine where the activity stands?" It was determined that this is a shared responsibility, with the Chair to make the final decision. Jean Ambrose gave a history on how the manual came to be called Robert's Rules of Order; Major Robert wrote the book after presiding over a church meeting and discovering that delegates from different areas of the country did not agree about proper procedure.

Staff Reports:

- **Sub Grant Update:** Laura Sarver provided an update on the 53 sub grants. The total amount awarded was \$1,091,513 for the first 8 month grants. As of the end of June, \$299,493 had been requested and reimbursed to the sub grantees. [See handout: *SIG YR2 Grant Money (Planning Grants)*].
- **Purpose of the Retreat:** Wayne Coombs gave an overview of the purpose of the retreat and made the following points:
 - Make decisions regarding Phase II Implementation sub-grants.
 - There is a continuing challenge with substance abuse; substance abuse is not a stand alone problem, but a piece of a complex problem.

- The problem continues to grow and become more pervasive; we take one step forward and slide back two.
- Instead of working harder we need to work smarter.
- The failure to make significant change continues to occur. We need a fundamental shift in thinking to achieve sustainable change.
- We need to rely on beliefs, science and feedback: utilizing the numbers from the Substance Abuse Well-Being Index; thoughts, feelings, and observations – county prevention partnerships capacity assessment; reports from the external evaluators.
- Commit to a data driven approach.
- This has been challenging to the PRC Staff.
- In the past (the old model) we utilized the competitive grant process. Now (the new model), we use data to show areas that have the greatest substance abuse problems.
- We are going in a new direction and we need to change how we do things. “Take a leap of faith.”
- We need to put the SPF SIG goals established by CSAP to work and to fit in West Virginia.

Counties’ Expectations: A panel consisting of Jamie Albert, Paula Flaherty, Monica McFarland, Laura Sarver, Linda Spatig and Anne Swedberg gave an overview of their perceptions of the counties expectations.

Linda has received comments from approximately twenty project directors and made the following remarks:

- Coalitions will be sustained.
- Collaboration will continue and expand.
- Strengthening the community.
- More informed about substance abuse.
- More services for community.
- Good plan for county.
- Hope to get an implementation grant.
- Some will continue even without money.
- Improve life in counties.
- Without money, no leadership or time to devote to implementing “the plan”.

Monica has received information from site reviews, and direct contact with project directors or local partners and made the following comments:

- Seventeen site visits to date.
- Continue new efforts.
- Excited to expand local partnerships.
- Youth presentations to businesses.
- Value in work – data driven plan; capacity building; diffuse turf issues.
- Local creativity – study circles, networking.
- One county commission has made commitment if an implementation grant is not secured.
- World café format from the RLOs has been replicated.
- Evaluations are not being filled out by everyone attending the RLOs (20% return rate).
- RLOs are well attended.
- Like peer to peer networking.

- Local Partnerships hope that RLOs will continue beyond the planning year.
- Most local Partnerships are meeting monthly as opposed to the required quarterly meetings.
- Lack of connection between local partners and state partners is a concern at the local level.
- Reimbursement grants are a hardship, but Laura is helpful.
- RLO learning is being used in other aspects of their job.
- Internal Review Board (IRB) protocols are not being followed and we need to address this.

Jamie has conducted site visits in three counties to date (Greenbrier, Monroe and Upshur) and made the following comments:

- Dreading doing the site visits; felt like he was going into a confrontational environment. Rather, to his complete surprise, the site visits were a pleasant experience.
- Transition of Partnerships from wow, money, to focusing more on what they can do as a group.
- People coming together; more people participating.
- Monroe and Greenbrier are smaller counties and do not have the data. They know they probably won't get implementation money but, they are still excited about the process.
- Surprising that people are not focused only on the money.
- Worked with the Governor's Highway Safety Program (GHSP). They focused on problem counties and the number of alcohol crashes was reduced. This data-driven process parallels to the SPF SIG process.
- We need to impact the problem and the GHSP sets a precedence to focus on problem counties.

Laura works with each of the 53 sub-grantees on fiscal related issues and made the following comments:

- Reimbursement process can be difficult.
- There is a lot of paperwork working with 53 sub-grantees.
- Works with sub-grantees on barriers.
- Established coalitions hit the ground running.
- Newer groups were slower with the process.
- A lot more community involvement.
- Agencies are working together that never did.
- RLO process is well accepted.

Jean Ambrose questioned, "Is the intent to visit all sub-grantees?" – Monica responded that all counties will receive a visit and this will be completed by the end of October. The idea was that all paid staff, the project director and a local partnership member was to attend and then disseminate the information from the meeting. In some cases more local volunteers are attending than paid staff. These site visits allow for immediate feedback and the completed consensus report is left with the local Partnership.

Keith Adkins questioned, "Who decided who got the money?" - The Partnership decided and then letters of intent were accepted. However, only one application was accepted from each county. The amount of the sub-grants was determined by an inverse population formula. As McDowell and Mason counties did not apply for a planning grant; the money allotted for them

was put back into the pot and redistributed using the formula. It should be noted that strenuous efforts were made to recruit these counties, and representatives from McDowell County have attended some of the RLOs.

Angela Saunders asked “Is there confusion in the field on what is going to happen?” – Jamie responded, in the beginning the primary reason to be involved was for the implementation money. The first year’s focus has been on capacity building and the community partnership members’ focus moved toward what we can do as a community. PRC staff has emphasized that not everyone will get an implementation grant. People feel like their plans are not going down the tube just because they do not get an implementation grant; feel like they can continue to grow as a community. Linda responded that there are variations in understanding and perspective.

Mary Hunt-Lieving questioned, “What are study circles?” – Monica responded that they are locally driven and facilitated focus group discussions; open study circles; broad discussions. Through the discussions people have been pushed along to action.

Judy Crabtree stated that she has been attending Region II RLOs and questioned, “Why can’t neighboring counties with similar problems apply together?” – This was previously decided by the Partnership. Judy further stated “Some counties liked the 80/20 idea with 20 percent for counties to continue capacity building.”

Mary Hunt asked, “How do you keep the data driven process going?” – We keep collecting data to reinforce the process.

Steve Heasley requested more information on what the county partnerships look like. – Monica responded that they are all over the map. Synar compliance checks helped get state police to the table. Site visits are running from 2.5 to 6 hours and were originally slated for two hours. This seems to reflect deep interest in the project. Community Partnerships are growing and not just in one community within the county. There were 21 categories, on the original list, of possible people to include in the partnerships. The Community Partnerships are mapping strategies to get needed people to reflect the community. Wayne further responded that geographical issues affect how counties partnerships grow/meet etc.

Prioritization and Funding Decision Model: A panel consisting of Melissa Crawford, Zobeida Bonilla-Vega, Mike Lowther, and Andy Whisman presented information on setting priorities and making funding decisions. (See handouts: *Description of County Capacity Assessments, Logic Model Samples, Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Program – Guidance for Developing the State Strategic Plan, The Substance Abuse Well-Being Index: A Prioritization Approach for WV’s Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant, WV’s Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Prioritization Process – Power Point*)

Melissa Crawford gave an overview of the prioritization process thus far and discussed the Sub-Granting Workgroup Prioritization Timeline.

Mike Lowther spoke on the expectations of the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention for SPF SIG grantees and made the following comments:

- We expect you to reduce substance abuse and reduce consequences.
- Encourage you to continue to think about state infrastructure to support communities; not necessarily money but technical assistance and capacity building.

- Encourage agencies to see where their funding might be used to help communities implement plans.
- Communities do not just belong to SPF SIG and the Block Grant, but to the state of West Virginia.
- Employ a data driven process at the community level, state level and repeat this process over time.
- Focus on the problem that you want to reduce.
- Focus SIG money on greatest problems that can show reduction.
- Need the Epi Workgroup to continue after SPF SIG dollars are depleted.
- Target resources to big problems shown by data.
- Use data to lead to priorities; start with data to help deal with politics and policies; data helps filter emotions and opinions.
- What you are doing needs to make logical sense to get the plan approved.
- Communities' job is to analyze risk and protective factors to drive down rates of use. This is going to have to be done with other peoples'/agencies' money as well.
- Communities have the opportunity to access other resources.
- Federal funding – Federal Drug Free Community Grants; Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued in January 2007 and 750 communities will be funded at \$100,000 for five years.
- Local capacity is the key to success.
- The things that make the news are often not the issues. The news covers things that don't happen that often; i.e. meth vs. teenage drinking and driving.
- The biggest problems are often embedded in culture and we are in denial.
- It does not always take a lot of money to make an impact.
- We need to shift thinking on norms – priorities need to change.
- You should continue to foster all communities.
- Focus on the areas that can contribute the most to reducing problems.

Angie Saunders indicated that counties were collecting data and all we have is the data collected by the Epi Workgroup. She questioned, “How do we make decisions on who gets funded before we see the county level data?”

Mike Lowther responded, “You need a logical plan; how you do it is up to you. Look at what is about to be proposed...problems most significant.”

Angie Saunders responded, “My issue is that we asked them to collect data and we aren't using it.”

Monica McFarland replied, “The Organizational Capacity Assessment and Community Readiness Survey is all we asked the counties to collect.”

Mike Lowther commented, “There is no way to compare county collected data fairly. Not all counties are collecting the same data and there is no way to compare the data.”

Andy Whisman discussed the Substance Abuse Well-Being Index (SAWB Index) and made the following comments:

- Counties are putting together logic models.
- Logic models are a resource used to aggregate high need.

- If a county is not high need across the board, but has the highest problem in an area, should they be included? This is to be discussed in the small group breakout.

Zobeida Bonilla-Vega gave a description of the three assessments used to measure county capacity; the Empowerment Domains Assessment, the Fiscal Assessment, and the Performance Assessment.

Monica McFarland described the performance assessment of the Community Prevention Partnerships, based on RLO participation.

Helena Lee questioned, “Did the communities know that they would be measured on this?”

Monica McFarland replied, “Yes. We did not have the tool developed, but they knew it was a capacity issue.”

Andy Whisman discussed how the measurement of capacity was divided into four categories. A median score was used to determine who advanced to the next stage. Thirty counties fell into the range identified for sufficient capacity. He indicated that he took the highest capacity and recalculated the median score in the SAWB Index. The median score remained relatively the same which gave a good showing that this is a robust indicator. Andy identified the following advantages of High Need Sufficient Capacity:

- Applied equally and impartially to all counties.
- Filters out limited or low capacity.
- Allows previously low need counties to advance.
- Well documented and easily explainable.

Steve Heasley commented that he would rather this be referred to as Community Prevention Partnership Capacity; as opposed to county capacity. He questioned “How was the County Prevention Partnership Empowerment Domains Assessment done? What makes a five a five?”

Andy Whisman responded, “A semantic differential approach.”

Steve Heasley questioned, “How objective was this process?”

Andy Whisman responded, “It was subjective, but done by people schooled in the process.”

Mike Lacy reported that the Sub-Granting Workgroup requested that all Community Development Specialists interpret the 0-6 scale the same way.

Wayne Coombs commented, “I am not sure that there is an objective way to measure this.”

Zobeida Bonilla-Vega added, “The developer of the 9 domains checked validity however, it is difficult to do this for the capacity and empowerment assessments.”

Mary Emmet questioned, “Is there inter rater reliability?”

Andy Whisman responded, “No, but teams worked together to check each others’ work and check the meaning of the ratings. Is it perfect? No, but with what we had to work with it was not possible.”

Gig Robinson commented, “We need to be comfortable with this.”

Mike Lacy questioned, “Where have I missed in this process where we (Partners) adopted these priorities? When did Partners adopt the four priorities as means to make decisions?”

Andy Whisman responded, “Partners have not voted to adopt SAWB Index and what we will fund as priorities.”

Gig Robinson added, “We tabled all but the vote on prevention resources.”

Steve Mason stated, “Counties provide information as opposed to data.”

Angie Saunders questioned, “Did the Feds give you the Index?”

Andy Whisman indicated that the Index was developed based on an Index utilized by Colorado. Our Index is based on a subset of their substance abuse domains. They had nine indicators and we expanded our Index to include 33 indicators.

Mike Lacy commented that the Partnership will make the decision on the priorities. He reviewed the options available for consideration by the Partners. The Partners need to review specifically what allocation decision options are available. Wayne indicated that this can be found in the power point handout beginning on page 15.

Mike Lacy indicated that it was time to break into small groups. He informed the group that the primary duty assigned to each breakout group is to discuss whether to use all four categories when deciding which counties or to use one, two or three of these. He asked that everyone return at 4:00 p.m. to report out.

Jean Ambrose questioned, “Is there a process to weigh grant dollar amounts based on population?”

Andy Whisman replied, “No, this has not been decided yet.”

Small Groups Report Out:

Group I (Dave Harris, Mike Lacy, Helena Lee, Gig Robinson, Jim Doria, Linda Spatig, Jo Beyer, Bidy Bostic, Cathy Coontz, Nick Fry, Monica McFarland, Carol Moscar, Bill O’Dell, Brenda Richards, Christy Rose, Anu Sharma) Reported out by Jo Beyer:

- The Partners indicated that they wanted to have a fair process, that the process is data driven and they have the ability to defend the process, and that other needs be considered when looking at the process.
- The Community Development Specialists indicated that the communities understand that they are not assured of continued funding. Technical assistance will continue for low capacity counties. The CDSs felt confident that they could relay the high need/high capacity process to their communities.

Group II (Jean Ambrose, Don Chapman, Michelle Foster, Steve Heasley, Steve Mason, Mary Emmett, Anne Swedberg, David Bailey, Lara Berry, Wayne Coombs, David Dodds, Melanie Jones, Laura Sarver, Carole Scheerbaum) Reported out by Steve Heasley:

- Accept the SAWB Index.

- Outliers such as Pendleton county, if act together; can find funding to address the problem.
- Discussed set-aside for outlying counties; reached consensus to not do this.
- Discussed how to better coordinate the pool of resources other than SIG dollars.

Group III (Keith Adkins, Joe Barker, Jason Carlson, Judith Russell, Mike Slaughter, Jamie Albert, Mark Berry, Zobeida Bonila-Vega, Ed Lanham, Angie Linger, Valerie Ponder, Judy Sikula, Lynn Wallace, Andy Whisman) Reported out by Andy Whisman:

- Accepted SAWB Index as it is.
- Just began talking about the next step.
- Special case funding for the county with the highest underage drinking problem.

Group IV (Judy Crabtree, Debi Gillespie, Sue Hage, Brenda Thompson, Bill Woodrum, Robert Pack, Paula Flaherty, Kristi Adkins, Lisa Bruer, Michele Bush, Melissa Crawford, Lynn Evans, Julia Haines, Tou Lee, Michelle Markovich, Brenda Powell) Reported out by Sue Hage:

- Accepted SAWB Index as is.
- Ability to make decisions on other issues such as Pendleton County.
- Partnership meetings need to have more time for open discussion after small group report out. This is an opportunity for all voices to be heard.

Gig Robinson motioned to adopt *The Substance Abuse Well-Being Index: A Prioritization Approach for WV's Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant*. Bill Woodrum seconded the motion. Steve Heasley made a motion to amend the previous motion to include Pendleton County. Mike Lacy indicated that it was not time to make an amendment. Gig Robinson indicated that this is included in the original document on page 4; "...and other considerations by which the Partnership has established these priorities, and an implementation funding rationale." Gig Robinson's original motion passed unanimously.

Mike Lacy indicated that Steve Heasley could have made his original amendment and that he could now make a motion.

Steve Heasley motioned that the 15 counties identified as high need and sufficient capacity with the addition of Pendleton County be eligible for funding. Jean Ambrose seconded the motion.

Judith Russell motioned to table this until tomorrow. Dave Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned until 9:00 a.m. Friday, August 18th.

August 18

Call to Order

Chair Mike Lacy called the meeting to order.

Travel Expenses

Judy Sikula gave an overview of the reimbursement process for travel expenses.

Handouts: *Travel Expense Account, Travel Reimbursement Form*

Allocation Decision Options

Andy Whisman gave an overview of possible allocation decision options. (See *WV's Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Prioritization Process – Power Point*)

Mike Lacy indicated that it was time to break into small groups. He informed the group that the primary duty assigned to each breakout group is to discuss funding allocation options. He asked that everyone return at 11:00 a.m. to report out.

Small Group Breakout

Group I (Jean Ambrose, Joe Barker, Jason Carlson, Judy Crabtree, Mike Slaughter (proxy for Bob Musick), Jim Doria, Jamie Albert, Mark Berry, Jo Beyer, Julia Haines, Melanie Jones, Michelle Markovich, Monica McFarland, Brenda Powell) Reported out by Jean Ambrose:

- 15 grants at \$107,000 might not be enough of an impact.
- Invite 15 high need counties to apply for up to \$160,000.
- If top ten apply for \$160,000, stop there. If not, go down until the money is gone.

Group II (Keith Adkins, Michelle Foster, Steve Mason, Gig Robinson, Brenda Thompson, Mary Emmett, Linda Spatig, Kristi Adkins, Biddy Bostic, Wayne Coombs, Cathy Coontz, Tou Lee, Carol Moscar, Christy Rose, Laura Sarver, Judy Sikula) Reported out by Michelle Foster:

- Target non-competitive 15 high need, sufficient capacity counties for \$107,000 each.
- Leverage other dollars and other resources to put with SPF SIG funds.
- Steve Mason indicated concern regarding workforce development, and paying people enough; making sure we consider this in our funding decisions.

Group III (Sue Hage, Steve Heasley, Helena Lee, Bill Woodrum, Paula Flaherty, David Bailey, Dianne Batt, Zobeida Bonilla-Vega, Lara Berry, Lisa Bruer, Nick Fry, Brenda Richards, Carole Scheerbaum, Anu Sharma, Andy Whisman) Reported out by Bill Woodrum:

- 15 high need, sufficient capacity counties with up to 15 grants with money amount dependent on applications.
- Recommendation – Sub Granting Workgroup can decide the particulars.
- All Partners should get copies of the summaries and budgets.
- What is the greater role of the Partnership? – coordinate prevention planning.

Group IV (Don Chapman, Debi Gillespie, Dave Harris, Mike Lacy, Judith Russell, Robert Pack, Anne Swedberg, Michele Bush, Melissa Crawford, David Dodds, Lynn Evans, Ed Lanham, Angie Linger, Bill O'Dell, Valerie Ponder, Lynn Wallace) Reported out by Melissa Crawford:

- Modification of Option I – Recommended not doing 15 equally funded grants, but rather sending a letter to the 15 counties inviting them to apply. The counties could ask for up to \$200,000 and reviewers would determine how much would be awarded.
- Recommendations for Sub Granting Workgroup – Applicants to make oral presentation. The peer review panel would be comprised of members of Community Prevention Partnerships from non-funded counties. The plan would be for a five year period with a budget for the first year.

Final Discussion and Vote:

Mike Lacy asked for someone to make a motion.

Motion by Bill Woodrum

Bill Woodrum moved to use high need, sufficient capacity SAWB Index to fund up to 15 grants to the high need counties on page 13 of the Power Point presentation (Barbour, Cabell, Clay, Fayette, Kanawha, Logan, Marshall, Mercer, Mingo, Morgan, Nicholas, Ohio, Raleigh, Randolph and Wood).

Helena Lee seconded the motion.

Mike Lacy called for discussion on the motion.

Brenda Thompson asked for how group envisions which of the 15 counties and how much money for each.

Bill Woodrum commented to use process that CSAP used for the states where CDSs give communities notice to start working on plan and the PRC would work with applicants to get an approved plan/application/proposal.

Monica McFarland indicated that our date for finished plans is not until January 2007.

Andy Whisman clarified that applicants can use what they have right now (components) to submit a proposal for an implementation grant.

Bill Woodrum restated/asked that the entire Partnership give the Sub-Granting Workgroup authority to make decisions regarding implementation grants, but other Partners are invited to participate in the review process.

Wayne Coombs reminded everyone that CSAP must approve our plan before we move forward.

The motion by Bill Woodrum passed.

Motion by Judith Russell

Judith Russell moved that the 15 counties be invited to submit proposals up to \$200,000 with justification through the budget and grant application kit submitted to the PRC and to be reviewed by the Sub-Granting Workgroup and any other members of the Partnership that want to participate.

Dave Harris seconded the motion.

Bill Woodrum asked for discussion on the subject concerned that counties will ask for the ceiling amount of \$200,000.

Judith Russell clarified that if all applications come in at \$200,000 then the Sub-Granting Workgroup would have to use some mechanism(s) to reduce the grant amount.

Steve Mason mentioned the challenge that it is difficult to reduce the grants.

Steve Heasley commented that it was better to tell counties that there was \$1.6 million available and ask for proposals and see what we get. Leave money amount open ended.

Jean Ambrose raised the concern that proposals could be accepted up to \$160,000 and fund them in order of the index – asking for a simplified process. She is concerned about the ability to do the review process in the time allotted.

Motion to Amend by Brenda Thompson

Brenda Thompson moved to amend the motion. She moved that the 15 counties be made aware of the \$1.6 million available and ask them to submit a proposal; to delete the words \$200,000 from original motion and just give the cap of the entire award.

Bill Woodrum seconded the motion.

Robert Pack suggested that the language allude to awards would be between \$100,000 and \$107,000.

Helena Lee indicated that they give a range in their award notices and suggested that if you give an amount it would be applied for. The plan should focus on need and what they need to carry out their plans.

After some confusion on the wording of Brenda Thompson's amendment it was restated.

Brenda Thompson moved to amend the motion. She moved that the 15 counties be invited to submit proposals, and that they be made aware that each is one of 15 counties invited to make proposals for part of a state allocation of \$1.6 million. Justification will be provided, by each grant applicant, through the budget justification and grant narrative submitted to the Sub-granting Workgroup and then to the entire Partnership for approval.

Dave Harris seconded the motion.

The motion made by Judith Russell and amended by Brenda Thompson carries.

Bill Woodrum voiced concern on how Partners can be contacted to vote on recommendations from the Sub-Granting Workgroup. It was verified that email communications and electronic voting is approved in the By-Laws.

Steve Heasley moved that the 15 local Partnerships be instructed that a ten percent match in year one with a ten percent increasing match each year will be required of the counties.

There was no second to the motion.

Mike Lacy suggested that we look at rescheduling the October Partnership meeting as several Partners will not be able to attend.

TO DO: Melissa Crawford to check into rescheduling this meeting.

Gig Robinson moved to adjourn.

Brenda Thompson seconded the motion.

The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned.