



# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES  
*Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.*



---

## NEVADA COALITION TO PREVENT THE COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN: FUNDING, DATA & SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** Thursday August 19, 2021. 10:30am-12:00pm (or until adjourned)

**LOCATION:** Division of Child and Family Services; 4126 Technology Way, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Carson City, NV 89706

**TELECONFERENCE ACCESS:** Join the meeting: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Call in number: [+1 775-321-6111](#), Phone Conference ID: 875 159 511#

### 1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions - Cara Paoli

The meeting was called to order by Cara Paoli.

**Members Present:** Cara Paoli, Eboni Washington, Cora Carroll, Michael Allerdyce, Jeremy Wilson, Jennifer Malnar, Brittany Hopballe, Abigail Frierson

**Members Absent:** Holly Vetter, Alexis Kennedy

**Guests:** Ross Armstrong, Beverly Brown, Dylan Nall, Eileen Hough, Catherine Huang, Michelle Vargas, Cameron Shorkey, Gabriel Di Chiara, Jennifer Spencer

**DCFS Staff Members Present:** Kathryn Roose, Hayley Jarolimek, Esther Rodriguez-Brown, Lorena Bojorquez

Roll call was taken, and a quorum was present.

### 2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

### 3. For Possible Action: Review and Approval of June 17, 2021 meeting minutes - Cara Paoli

Cara Paoli opened the floor to discussion on the June 17th meeting minutes before voting to approve.

No discussion on the meeting minutes.

**Action:** A motion was made by Jeremy Wilson to approve the June 17, 2021 meeting minutes, motion was seconded by Eboni Washington. No objections, no abstentions, approved unanimously.

No further discussion on this item.

### 4. For Information Only: Fiscal Impact of SB274, Kathryn Roose, Ross Armstrong

Ross Armstrong stated that there is no fiscal impact to SB274 because it does not mandate the creation of receiving centers or services. SB274 is a permissive bill that requires the Division to develop regulations to allow for the licensure of receiving centers, but the LCB (Legislative Counsel Bureau) must be paid to formally write the regulations. As such, Mr. Armstrong explained that the goal of SB274 is the creation

of receiving centers and a model that is not like detention center while still safe, secure and healthy for CSEC victims. Mr. Armstrong indicated that the two counties did provide some guesstimates for what they believe the cost will be if they were to operate a receiving center and provide those services. Nonetheless, Mr. Armstrong reiterated that there is technically no fiscal impact of SB274 although the system envisioned in the future does have a fiscal impact. Mr. Armstrong asked the subcommittee to be aware that the typical state budgetary timeframe occurs such that the Division's budgetary requests will be developed early next year and will be turned into the department in early summer for review and for final submission in August. Mr. Armstrong informed the subcommittee that should they wish to ask for legislatively appropriated funds, the ask needs to be ready by early spring of 2022 in order to be considered for the governor to ask the legislature.

Ross Armstrong explained that because the state is not inundated with funds, the systems need to be built brick by brick, and SB274 gives DCFS the legal authority to decide how to build those bricks. Mr. Armstrong next informed the subcommittee that DCFS tracks caseloads for regular foster care, specialized foster care, advanced foster care, adoptions and guardianships. As such, Mr. Armstrong suggested creating a CSEC caseload, which would ultimately build in sustainable funding, as well as a funding mechanism for the three child welfare agencies. Mr. Armstrong indicated that the actual services would likely be reliant upon Medicaid funding and philanthropy as well as grants. Mr. Armstrong further indicated that there is not a requirement for the county to operate the receiving center, and as such, Mr. Armstrong does not intend to incorporate a licensing requirement for a receiving center to be government operated. Rather, Mr. Armstrong explained his belief that community-based would be the best option for these receiving centers.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown informed the subcommittee that the three out-of-state centers, one in Georgia and two in Washington, are run by community agencies, non-profits that have an agreement with the state. Ms. Rodriguez-Brown explained that they are operated by community agencies because it is easier for the entities to obtain grants and services. Ms. Rodriguez-Brown indicated that this is also better for the children given that many of these children have a strong mistrust of the state.

Cara Paoli indicated her interested in delving deeper into the research that Ms. Rodriguez-Brown has done on the out-of-state facilities, indicating that this could help facilitate the process of setting up these centers in Nevada.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown informed the subcommittee that she could send a video to the group that includes a virtual tour of the Georgia facility which although still having the detention facility look on the exterior, has been completely redone on the inside. She added that Nevada should steer clear from having the center resemble a detention facility as it can be triggering for many youth. Ms. Rodriguez-Brown further informed the subcommittee that she could share the annual budget of the Georgia facility with the group.

Ross Armstrong discussed the fact that it is unrealistic to expect that JJ (Juvenile Justice) funds can be used for the new facilities as costs will be comparable to what is spent by JJ. Mr. Armstrong indicated that the DHHS (Department of Health and Human Services) Director's Office has an account of donated funds used for emergencies which could potentially serve as a funding stream as it is for victims of human trafficking.

No further discussion on this item.

##### **5. For Possible Action: Review and Approval of Inclusive Language Documents - Eileen Hough**

Esther Rodriguez-Brown informed the subcommittee that the documents regarding this topic had been sent to the group for review and indicated that a vote is not needed on this item. Ms. Rodriguez-Brown

further indicated that the CSEC Coalition will review this regardless of the subcommittee's recommendation to move forward or not.

Eileen Hough explained that she is a voting member for the CSEC Coalition and works within the Department of Public and Behavior Health (DPBH). Ms. Hough explained that all state agencies were asked to use an equity lens in all systems, policies, and practices. Ms. Hough informed the subcommittee that this discussion involves engagement in being more thoughtful in the way that the clients served are treated to ensure that they are respected, treated with dignity, and feel a sense of inclusion. Ms. Hough stressed the importance of all departments being in unity in ensuring that language used is inclusive when describing populations. Ms. Hough indicated that the subcommittee's documentation is well-written, for the most part, with first-person language. Ms. Hough explained that the crux of today's discussion is the shift to first-person language, which is defined by describing a situation rather than a condition as this removes a person from being described as the cause of their situation. Ms. Hough gave several examples of terms to avoid and preferred terms to replace these terms. She indicated that any documentation, including marketing materials and requests for funding, include the preferred terms rather than the terms to avoid. Ms. Hough suggested that subcommittee members take some time to look through the provided materials and see how their work may be impacted and then have a further discussion as a group in the September meeting. Ms. Hough then opened the floor for questions.

Cara Paoli questioned the best way to go about this and suggested perhaps Eileen Hough highlight the words of which she would like the subcommittee to be aware and then allow them to find alternative suggestions.

Eileen Hough indicated the words "at risk" and "high risk" were words that she had substituted when describing a population and suggested something along the lines of "youth who are disproportionately impacted" to use in their place. Ms. Hough further explained her own practice of refraining from using adjectives such as "high-risk" and "at-risk" when describing adolescents or youths. Ms. Hough also explained the removal of the words "vulnerable" and "underserved" in her own documentation and also replacing them with "disproportionately impacted." Ms. Hough also suggested changing the word "victim" to "survivor" to the subcommittee, as well, while indicating because she did not work with the same populations the subcommittee does, she understood that this may not be an option in all cases or circumstances.

Eileen Hough next discussed the terms to avoid when describing ethnicity and race and the importance of replacing these terms with preferred terms. Ms. Hough explained that when doing fundraising or writing up data reports, these are times when perhaps the preferred terms could be used. Ms. Hough explained to the subcommittee that her group almost did not get funded due to use of the word "vulnerable," but once the word was removed, the group did get funded. Ms. Hough used this to illustrate that these words do have an impact. Ms. Hough also indicated that there is controversy surrounding the word "stakeholder" as tribal groups can find that particular term offensive because of the historic connotation; Ms. Hough suggested using the word "partner" in its place.

No further discussion on this item.

**6. For Possible Action: Funding Research - Cora Carroll, Esther Rodriguez-Brown**  
**a. Identifying possible funding streams for direct service to victims, prosecution, and tracking of offenders as well as the CSEC database**

Esther Rodriguez-Brown reported that she and Cora Carroll had done some research and brainstorming on funding resources.

Cora Carroll reported that in her research, she had looked at some of the local funding options of other states, found that federal funding for a database was not very fruitful, and explained that there are a lot of private funding options for supportive-type services, which could be beneficial for direct services as well as some potential funding for database support, as well.

Cora Carroll explained that the federal funding opportunity for current initiative was through the OVC (Office for Victims of Crime) for advancing the use of technology to assist victims of crime. This provides funding to organizations that demonstrate innovative strategies to create, expand, or enhance the use of technology in innovative ways to interact directly with crime victims and/or to provide information, referrals, crisis assistance, and longer-term help. The deliverables of this include direct service provision to crime victims; community outreach events and materials; resources for service providers and criminal justice stakeholders; and a final report describing project activities and other findings. Ms. Carroll opined that depending on how the structure is designed, this could also be used to help fund the database used to track youth. Ms. Carroll further indicated that this OVC funding could improve outcomes for child and youth victims of human trafficking. Ms. Carroll explained that the OVC grants are three-year grants and such, have more requirements, including in-depth reporting requirements, in order to set up a database. Ms. Carroll indicated that as a result of these requirements, some research would need to take place in order to ensure that these requirements could be met. Ms. Carroll further discussed the possibilities for other needs, such as services for victims and minor victims of human trafficking. Ms. Carroll discussed the push from DOJ (Department of Justice) to provide services for victims of human trafficking, explaining that they've awarded nearly \$101 million to combat human trafficking.

Cora Carroll next discussed the availability of private grants. Ms. Carroll informed the subcommittee of the availability of the Ford Foundation grant, which focuses on social inequalities; the Lily Endowment, which provides support to Girls, Inc. and Child Advocates; and the Annie E. Casey grant, which supports foster care and juvenile justice. The Annie E. Casey grant will also fund data collection and analysis in addition to projects for new approaches and practices. Ms. Carroll also suggested the Gates Foundation, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the Margaret A Cargill Philanthropies as additional options for private funding opportunities.

Cora Carroll informed the subcommittee that many states and local jurisdictions have moved to fund CSEC initiatives indirectly, citing California, Oregon, and Texas as examples. Ms. Carroll further explained that Georgia uses TANF funding to support CSEC initiatives and suggested that this could be a possible option for Nevada as well.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown requested that Ms. Carroll send her the PowerPoint presented at the meeting for upload to Google Drive, which would allow all subcommittee members to access it.

No further discussion on this item.

**7. For Possible Action: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) - Catherine Huang, Abigail Frierson, Cara Paoli**

**a. HMIS Presentation by Catherine Huang**

Esther Rodriguez-Brown informed the subcommittee that Catherine Huang would be participating more in a discussion format rather than a presentation format and reminded the group that all of the information has been shared in the previous meeting.

Catherine Huang clarified that she works for Clark County Social Services, which serves as the collaborative applicant to HUD (Housing and Urban Development) for funding. This includes services such as transitional housing, permanent housing, supportive services only projects, and projects that are

funded for HMIS (Homeless Management Information System). Ms. Huang informed the subcommittee that partners from Bitfocus are available today to answer questions and provide a demonstration of the HMIS system. Ms. Huang discussed whether a standalone database would be required to enter information for the CSEC system and indicated that one is currently in use for domestic violence partners and that it is a separate administrative cost to operate a standalone database. Ms. Huang explained that although the database looks the same, the difference is that no other service providers have access to the standalone database.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown asked the members of Bitfocus to focus on specific variables, such as where and from whom youth are receiving services, what those services are, the resources of those services, how long they have been receiving services in their presentation, and the outcomes of those services in addition to the usual variables such as demographics.

Michelle Vargas, Solution Consultant for Bitfocus, stated that the database is a cloud-based system for which Bitfocus provides the hosting and all maintenance and updates. Ms. Vargas explained that the design philosophy of the system is driven by the idea that everything should be as user-friendly as possible. Ms. Vargas next provided an overview of how to use the system. Ms. Vargas noted that most screens are customizable, and that the system is fully HUD compliant and compliant with regulations for all local, state, and federal funding streams. Ms. Vargas also informed the subcommittee of the ability to mark a client as private giving access to only certain staff.

Cameron Shorkey reiterated the fact that the data screens are highly customizable and informed the subcommittee that the screens in the presentation have been customized to meet HMIS requirements.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown asked whether the system could be customized to allow entry of clients who do not have social security numbers.

Michelle Vargas indicated that this is something that can be customized within the system.

Cameron Shorkey explained that the social security number field could be removed entirely, as well.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown indicated her understanding that domestic-violence agencies have a separate network and questioned whether that could be done for the proposed database as client safety would be a concern and asked for confirmation that access roles could be determined to allow access to only certain individuals regarding sensitive information.

Michelle Vargas confirmed that this was the case.

Gabriel Di Chiara informed the subcommittee that these could be monitored, as well, to see who is logging into the sensitive data.

Cameron Shorkey added that in the custom reports, there is a section to search for funding services and then pull specific information for the funding sources.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown questioned if requirements and parameters of agencies that will be accessing the database could be created.

Michelle Vargas confirmed that this was the case.

Cameron Shorkey added that some of that was dependent upon whether or not the HMIS is joined or if there is a separate system and explained that there is more control with a separate system.

Gabriel Di Chiara confirmed that this was correct and indicated that this is one of the reasons why it is helpful to have a separate system.

Cara Paoli commented that the system seems very comprehensive and very user-friendly.

No further discussion on this item.

**b. Report out from Clark County & Washoe County**

Catherine Huang indicated that Washoe and the northern communities are using this system.

Cara Paoli indicated that the Our Place program has a few people that are users, but the system is not used often and that there have been reports of some issues with the tech support from Bitfocus.

Gabriel Di Chiara reported that Bitfocus is currently working closely with the Our Place program in hopes of connecting with someone from tech support on the side of Our Place. Mr. Di Chiara acknowledged Bitfocus' understanding of the existence of an issue and assured the group that Bitfocus is working diligently to resolve the issue at hand.

No further discussion on this item.

**8. For Possible Action: Upcoming Tasks and Next Steps**

Cara Paoli opened the floor to discussion on the upcoming tasks and next steps.

Esther Rodriguez-Brown requested that the subcommittee reopen the conversation with the SAC (Statistical Analysis Center) at UNLV (University of Nevada Las Vegas) in hopes of the staff there handling more of the administrative side of things and working in conjunction with the subcommittee.

No further discussion on this item.

**9. For Possible Action: Future Agenda Items - Abigail Frierson, Cara Paoli**

There was no discussion of this agenda item.

**10. For Information: Next Meeting: October 21, 2021. 10:30am-12:00pm (or until adjournment)**

Cara Paoli informed the group that the next meeting would take place on October 21, 2021 at 10:30 a.m.

**11. Final Public Comment and Discussion**

There was no final public comment.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.