

**NEVADA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL (N.S.R.C.)
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, November 18, 2025, at 1:00 pm

PHYSICAL MEETING LOCATIONS:

Vocational Rehabilitation
1325 Corporate Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502
&
Vocational Rehabilitation
3016 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 200, Las Vegas, NV 89102

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jack Mayes (Chair)
Cynthia Gustafson (Vice-Chair)
Drazen Elez, VR Administrator (Non-Voting)
Raquel O'Neill
Dawn Lyons
Sandra Sinicrope
Jennifer Kane
Laura Thompson (Non-Voting)
David Nuestro

STAFF:

Stephanie Itkin-Goodman, Deputy Attorney General
Brett Martinez, VR Deputy Administrator of Operations
Mechelle Merrill, VR Deputy Administrator of Programs
Sheena Childers, VR Bureau Chief
Lisa McCulloch, Quality Control Specialist II
Marla Robinson, Management Analyst IV
Matthew Dorangricchia, VR Northern District Manager
Edward Green, Administrative Assistant III
Uriah Carter, Administrative Assistant II
Bernadine Leblanc, Rehabilitation Counselor III
Jennifer Orellana, Rehabilitation Counselor III

Tammy Riley, Business Dev Supervisor

GUESTS/PUBLIC:

John Gallagher, American Sign Language (ASL) Translator

Ashley Ventura, ASL Translator

Kate Osti, Executive Director of NDALC

Chuck Neuwohner, Chief Program Officer at Opportunity Village

Julie Irish, DP Video Productions

Robin Kincaid, Nevada PEP

Stephanie Crowne

Doralee Martinez

Siayan Karandikar

Keon Mays

Porsche Jones

Lshauna Griggley

Steven Cohen

DRAFT

1. CALL TO ORDER, QUORUM CONFIRMATION, AND AGENDA POSTING VERIFICATION

Jack Mayes, N.S.R.C. Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm. Jenny Richter Livia, N.S.R.C. Liaison, conducted roll call. All Council members were present.

N.S.R.C. Liaison Richter determined a quorum was present and verified that the posting was completed on time in accordance with open meeting law. Mrs. Richter also established that the Deputy Attorney General, Stephanie Itkin, was in attendance as well as Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Staff.

2. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Mayes opened the floor to public comments stating the time limitations to each comment due to time constraints. Legal notice was read, and the meeting phone number was provided.

Ms. Porsche Jones, a member of the public, provided in-person comment regarding long-standing issues with the VR program, including delayed reimbursements, unmet requests for school supplies, communication difficulties with her counselor, and challenges in scheduling meetings. She stated these issues have continued for several years and that her school expenses remain unpaid.

Chair Mayes thanked Ms. Jones for her comments and advised her to contact the Client Assistance Program for advocacy support. No additional comments were received from attendees at the Westbay Office or the Corporate Office. Participants attending via Zoom were then invited to provide public comment.

Steven Cohen then briefly stated he would be sending 20 - 22 questions to staff for review. To read the full comment please refer to Exhibit 1 at the end of the document.

With no further public comments, the Chair moved to the next agenda item.

3. DISCUSSION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SUCCESS STORIES

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Mechelle Merrill, VR Deputy Administrator of Programs. She invited counselors to share client achievements from the 700-hour program.

Counselor Bernadine LeBlanc presented her client, Siayan Karandikar, a 24-year-old with autism who earned a bachelor's degree in math and successfully completed the 700-hour program despite challenges including a car accident, confidence issues, and changes in both his trainer and job coach.

Mr. Karandikar personally expressed gratitude for the program's impact, noting that it provided essential support such as résumé development, interview preparation, and job placement, ultimately helping him secure his current position as an Administrative Assistant I with the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. The council congratulated him on his success.

Counselor Jennifer Orellana introduced her client, Keon Mays, who has been with Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) since 2022. She described his perseverance through personal and family challenges and his progress through training, vehicle modification services, and the 700-hour program.

Mr. Mays shared that the program supported his education, job placement, and readiness for employment, and he now works for the Division of Welfare. Council members congratulated both clients and thanked the counselors for their work before moving to the next agenda item.

4. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2025, MEETING MINUTES

Chair Mayes opened the floor for review and approval of the September 16, 2025, meeting minutes. Members were invited to examine the minutes and offer any corrections or changes; none were noted.

Raquel O'Neill, N.S.R.C Council Member, moved to approve the minutes as presented, and Cindy Gustafson, N.S.R.C Council Member, seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed, Dawn Lyons, NSRC Council Member, abstained, motion carried.

5. APPROVAL OF THE VR PARTICIPANT SERVICES POLICY MANUAL, UPDATES

Chair Mayes introduced the agenda item and confirmed that a summary of the changes had been distributed earlier that day. N.S.R.C. liaison Richter noted that Lisa McCulloch, Quality Control Specialist II, and Sheena Childers, VR Bureau Chief, would present the updates.

Mrs. Childers stated that the summary outlines proposed manual revisions effective January 1, 2026, and confirmed that members had received the full draft. No questions or accessibility issues were raised. The discussion then continued with Mrs. McCulloch introducing the policy update summary.

Mrs. McCulloch stated that the revisions were based on RSA's 2023 monitoring recommendations. She outlined the first set of revisions for Section 1: Authority, Mission, Equal Rights, and Residency. These revisions enhanced the authority and mission section to include information about data collection, validation, and reporting requirements under WIOA Section 116. Specifically, the manual clarifies that the Division uses an electronic case management system to track and report federal performance measures. No questions were raised, and Mrs. Childers then proceeded to the next section.

Mrs. Childers presented Section 6: Application and Intake, of the VR policy manual revisions, which address the application and intake procedures. She explained that the updates were made in response to RSA guidance, including clarifying when an application is considered submitted, expanding acceptable forms of signatures, and aligning language with internal procedures. The revisions also remove an RSA-prohibited pre-screening questionnaire, clarify that information on the Client Assistance Program and fair hearing rights is provided at the time of application, and add a new pre-intake process requiring rehabilitation technicians to follow up within five days of receiving an application. Outdated language was struck through to reflect these changes. Mrs. Childers asked whether members had any questions.

Member O'Neill asked for clarification regarding parent or guardian signatures for youth in transition, particularly when schools assist students in initiating applications.

Mrs. Childers confirmed that parent or guardian signatures are required for minors under age 18 and for individuals under legal guardianship. She referenced the updated policy language stating that an application may be submitted by the individual or their representative, including parents or guardians as appropriate. She also noted that these requirements are clearly reflected on the agency's website. Council Member O'Neill acknowledged the clarification, and Mrs. Childers invited any further questions.

Member of the public Robin Kincaid asked whether applicants without internet access were still accommodated under the revised policy. Mrs. Childers confirmed

that the policy directs individuals to district offices with contact information provided, and Mrs. Merrill noted that the website includes a support phone number.

A brief clarification was made regarding Mrs. Kincaid's Council membership status. Mrs. Kincaid then raised an additional question regarding the use of the term "person-centered planning," expressing concern that the term may not be clear to the general public.

Mrs. Childers agreed to review whether the term "person-centered planning" is included in the policy's definitions and indicated that it would be added if absent. Mrs. Kincaid expressed appreciation to the presenters for the clarification.

Mr. Elez offered clarification regarding Mrs. Kincaid's Council membership status and apologized for prior confusion. He stated that, although Mrs. Kincaid completed her initial term and applied for a second term, the state-level approval process has been delayed, resulting in an administrative gap. He confirmed that the Council is awaiting final approval to reinstate her appointment. Following this clarification, Chair Mayes indicated that the meeting could proceed to the next section if no further questions were raised.

Member Thompson, communicating through ASL interpreter John Gallagher, requested clarification regarding the policy language describing how individuals may "otherwise request services".

Mrs. Childers clarified that the language refers to cross-referrals within the workforce system and federal requirements allowing individuals to apply for VR services by expressing service needs and signing any document that may be processed as an application.

Member Thompson, communicating through the interpreter, recommended that outdated references to Telecommunications Devices for Deaf (TDD)/ Teletypewriters (TTY) be removed, noting that such technologies are no longer in common use, and that the policy instead reference Video Relay Services (VRS) or 711 relay access. Mrs. Childers agreed to incorporate the updated terminology. With no further questions, Mrs. McCulloch advanced the discussion to Section 7.

Mrs. McCulloch presented Section 7: Financial Need and Participation, noting that the changes were made in accordance with RSA Technical Assistance Circular 22-03, which prohibits the application of financial need tests or cost-sharing requirements for Social Security Income (SSI) and Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) recipients seeking VR services. She detailed added language

specifying acceptable income verification documents, including tax returns, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) award letters, and current Social Security disability documentation, and clarified that Costs of Living Adjustments (COLA) letters and SSA-1099 forms are not acceptable. The revisions further specify that individuals receiving Social Security benefits due to their own disability, including SSDI and childhood disability benefits, are exempt from financial participation requirements. A citation to relevant federal regulations was added for clarification.

Mr. Elez emphasized that these updates reflect long-standing practice and are being added only for clarity. With no further questions, the group proceeded to Section 8.

Mrs. Childers reviewed Section 8, explaining that RSA requested clarifications to eligibility determination procedures. The updates specify acceptable Social Security documentation for verifying disability benefits used in presumptive eligibility determinations and reiterate that individuals receiving Social Security benefits due to their own disability are presumed eligible for VR services. The revisions also clarified requirements that eligibility determination extensions be time-limited, completed on agency forms, and signed by both the counselor and the applicant. In a subsection, RSA-recommended details were added to the trial work experience (TWE) section, including requirements for signed, time-limited plans developed on agency forms and examples of allowable supports such as assistive technology, personal assistance services, and job coaching. Mrs. Childers asked if there were any questions regarding this section.

Chair Mayes expressed appreciation for the explicit inclusion of assistive technology in the Trial Work Experience. With no further questions, the group proceeded to the next section.

Mrs. McCulloch briefly reviewed Section 10, explaining that the updates pertain to counseling and guidance, the Assessment of VR Needs (AVRN), and the development of the Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE). The primary revision, clarifies requirements for IPE development extensions. The new language specifies that extensions must be time-limited, mutually agreed upon, and signed by both the counselor and the participant using agency-developed forms. Mrs. McCulloch noted that such extensions are generally used when additional time is needed to reach agreement on the vocational goal or necessary VR services. With no questions raised, the group proceeded to the next section.

Mrs. Childers reviewed Section 12.5, noting that the post-secondary education and vocational training policy underwent a substantial overhaul based on RSA's monitoring recommendations. The revisions include a formal exception request process, providing clear instructions for documenting extenuating circumstances, submitting a written request, and receiving counselor assistance when a disability limits the ability to complete the request independently. The section now defines commuting distance as 50 miles one way. Several prior requirements were removed, including restrictions requiring undergraduate courses to be taken at local public institutions, as RSA advised such rules could create unnecessary burdens or disincentives. Language referencing "advanced degrees" was updated to "graduate-level training" for consistency. Updates also clarify funding policies for distance education, out-of-area institutions, and continuing education while streamlining requirements and reducing complex conditional rules. The policy emphasizes that participants may request exceptions whenever standard requirements do not meet their circumstances. Mrs. Childers encouraged Council members to review the revised section in full due to the volume and placement of edits. With no questions raised, the Council proceeded to Section 12.9.

Mrs. McCulloch reviewed Section 12.9, which she noted is one of the briefest sections and includes a single addition clarifying that post-employment services are not available once a participant's VR case is closed due to successful employment; individuals needing further services must reapply and open a new case. She emphasized the need for this clarification.

Mrs. Childers added that this update aligns with sub-regulatory guidance issued nationally by RSA in 2022 regarding the provision of post-employment services. No questions were raised, and the committee proceeded to Section 28.

Mrs. Childers reviewed Section 28: Inappropriate or Improper Use of VR Funds or If Fraud Occurs. She outlined RSA-recommended updates related to improper use of VR funds and fraud. Changes included updating terminology for the Older Individuals Who Are Blind Program to reference the Individualized Written Independent Living Plan (IWILP) and clarifying language regarding future cases. Specifically, language was clarified regarding participants whose cases were closed due to improper use of funds or fraud may reapply; however, if any funds remain owed to VR, future services may be placed on hold until repayment is made.

Chair Mayes asked whether the majority of policy revisions are clarifications rather than substantive operational changes.

Mrs. Childers observed that Section 12.5 substantially reduces burdens for individuals pursuing post-secondary training and anticipates a favorable reception, while acknowledging that the revised post-employment services policy may require stakeholders to adapt to certain changes.

Mr. Elez stated that all policy revisions originate from RSA monitoring requirements and emphasized that RSA has indicated that monitoring closure is contingent upon the formal adoption of these updates.

Chair Mayes noted that there were no further questions, then asked for a motion to approve the update of the VR Participant Services Policy Manual. Motion was made by Vice-Chair Cindy Gustafson, seconded by Member Dawn Lyons. All in favor, none opposed, none abstained, the motion carried.

6. APPROVAL OF 2025 NSRC FINAL DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT

Chair Mayes opened the floor DP Video Production Julie Irish presented updated content, including new imagery, revised funding statements, updated council member information, refreshed performance metrics, expanded business development and service provider data, and enhanced highlights of camps, partner initiatives, and client success stories. She noted pending items such as the Chair's letter, updated collaboration sections, a legislative update, and additional success stories.

The Council reviewed the final draft of the 2025 NSRC Annual Report. Members expressed support for the report, and N.S.R.C. liaison Richter and Mr. Elez confirmed that Council approval was required before submission to the Legislature, Governor, and RSA. With no questions or concerns raised.

Chair Mayes asked for a motion to approve the 2025 NSRC Annual Report final draft. Member Dawn Lyons made a motion, Member Raquel O'Neill seconds, All in favor, none opposed, none abstained, the motion carried.

7. DISCUSSION OF THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER ON TRANSITION: COLLABORATIVE (NTACT: C)

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Jennifer Kane, N.S.R.C Council Member, for an informational update regarding the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition–The Collaborative (NTACT-C).

Council Member Kane reported that NTACTION-C had received renewed federal funding for a five-year term beginning October 2025, ensuring ongoing national support for states in secondary transition work. She outlined the center's mission, the federal review leading to continued funding, and its four primary areas of support: data collection, technical assistance and professional development, youth and family engagement, and implementation of career pathways. Although the national capacity-building institute will not convene this year, Nevada VR and the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) may participate in a regional alternative or hold their own planning session to continue interagency coordination. Member Kane expressed appreciation for the continued availability of NTACTION-C as a critical resource.

Chair Mayes thanked Member Jennifer Kane for the update and, noting that there were no questions, advanced the meeting to the next agenda item.

8. DISCUSSION OF THE DISABILITY INNOVATION FUND (DIF) GRANT UPDATE

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Deputy Administrator of Programs Mechelle Merrill.

Mrs. Merrill reported that development of the Nevada TRIP mobile applications for both iOS and Android platforms is nearly complete and has progressed to the platform submission and review stage, with public release anticipated in early next year. She confirmed that desktop and mobile web versions remain fully accessible during this period. Program enhancements include expanded gamification features designed to increase youth engagement, such as a planned educational "arcade," additional badge-earning opportunities, and interactive elements featuring the program mascot. Mrs. Merrill further noted that the program is scheduled to expand to Douglas, Nye, and Pershing counties in the spring, bringing total implementation to six counties, and that the program is currently offered in English, Filipino, and Spanish. Mrs. Merrill also reported increased national and international interest in the Nevada TRIP website, which she stated potentially suggests other entities in the United States and abroad may see ideas from what our program is doing.

Council Member Jennifer Kane, a Nevada TRIP project leader, encouraged Council members to explore the site through the visitor pass and to support outreach by following and sharing Nevada TRIP content on social media. Council members provided positive feedback and recognized the program's impact. It was noted that app store approvals may take several months, and updates will be provided upon finalization. With no questions from the Council, Chair Mayes advanced the meeting to the next agenda item.

9. OTHER REPORTS

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Kate Osti of the Nevada Disability Advocacy and Law Center's (NDALC) Client Assistance Program (CAP).

Mrs. Osti acknowledged submission of the Client Assistance Program client statistics for Fiscal Year 2024–2025 (October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2025), offered to answer any questions regarding the report, and expressed willingness to provide a future presentation to the Council on CAP's services and activities.

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Dawn Lyons, Executive Director of the Nevada State Independent Living Council (SILC).

Mrs. Lyons reported that the SILC has officially attained 501(c)(3) nonprofit status and is preparing organizational updates and a major amendment to the State Plan for Independent Living, with stakeholder engagement and subcommittee work expected to begin early next year. She noted that SILC continues to make progress on current state plan objectives, announced the January meeting schedule, and identified ongoing concerns related to housing, transportation, and the potential impacts of a federal shutdown on services and funding for individuals with disabilities.

Chair Mayes expressed appreciation to Kate Osti and Dawn Lyons for attending the meeting and delivering their presentations, and then advanced the meeting to the next agenda item.

10. OPEN MEETING LAW TRAINING

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Stephanie Itkin-Goodman, Deputy Attorney General (DAG) to present Open Meeting Law (OML) annual training.

DAG Itkin-Goodman, provided the council a comprehensive overview of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 241 and emphasized the State's commitment to transparency and public access. The training covered the applicability of OML to public bodies and subcommittees, quorum and deliberation requirements, prohibitions on serial communications and informal discussions of board business, and common pitfalls such as email "reply all" and sequential communications. DAG Itkin-Goodman reviewed agenda and notice requirements, including posting timelines, required language for action items, public comment procedures, accessibility and accommodation obligations, and rules for remote and hybrid

meetings. She also addressed closed sessions, emergency meetings, litigation and administrative action exceptions, recording and minute requirements, handling disruptive behavior, and the consequences of OML violations, including voided actions and potential Attorney General investigations. The presentation concluded with guidance on disclosures, conflicts of interest, abstentions, quorum impacts, and best practices for compliance, along with resources for further reference.

Following the Open Meeting Law training, Chair Mayes thanked DAG Itkin-Goodman for the presentation and asked a clarifying question regarding how long a public body should wait to cancel a meeting if a quorum is not achieved.

DAG Itkin-Goodman advised that there is no specific statutory timeframe, but that after a reasonable period, if a quorum is not present, the meeting cannot proceed. Hearing no additional questions from members, the Chair expressed appreciation to staff, specifically recognizing Mrs. Richter for ensuring compliance with posting, notice, and disclosure requirements, and then proceeded to Agenda Item 11.

11. DIVISION REPORTS

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Drazen Elez, VR Administrator for Divisions Reports.

Mr. Elez addressed concerns related to the recent federal shutdown and stated that VR funding and services were not disrupted. He explained that the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) provided technical guidance to support continuity of services and that Governor Lombardo supported the Bureau of Disability Services and related Social Security–funded programs to prevent staff layoffs. Mr. Elez noted that VR funding is mandatory under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title IV of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), which generally protects it from shutdown impacts. He also confirmed that Congress has approved the federal fiscal year 2026 VR grant, with notification expected soon, and stated that receipt of the award will further protect the agency from potential future shutdown impacts. Mr. Elez then transitioned the presentation to Mrs. Childers.

Mrs. Childers presented the Nevada State Rehabilitation Council Division Reports, highlighting staffing, performance goals, and key program indicators. She reported an overall vacancy rate of 8.86 percent, with 8.33 percent in General VR and 14.2 percent in BSBVI, noting that recruitment efforts are ongoing and that an internship is planned to address a long-standing orientation and mobility specialist vacancy. Mrs. Childers reviewed progress on NSRC goals, reporting that while competitive

integrated employment outcomes for FFY 2025 fell short of the target (425 achieved versus a goal of 575), the agency exceeded expectations in Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS), serving 2,571 students, and significantly surpassed its goal for transition student applications with 1,122 applications against a goal of 250. Supported employment participation also exceeded the annual goal, with 788 open supported employment consumers compared to a target of 550. Additional indicators included average caseload sizes of 98 for General VR and 60 for BSBVI, a 700-hour program update showing 23 active participants and completed employment outcomes, and an update on fair hearings, with six requests during the federal fiscal year representing less than one percent of active cases, including one hearing scheduled and one request rescinded.

Mr. Elez provided updates on recent legislative approved positions, explaining that new client-facing roles (for example, counselors and technicians) will be housed in existing Reno and Las Vegas offices to avoid creating additional service locations, while non-client-facing administrative teams will eventually relocate to a new facility once it is ready, freeing space for hiring front-line staff; hiring and service impact are anticipated in approximately five to six months, with a focus on restructuring processes to significantly reduce intake and eligibility timelines. He also reported progress on major initiatives, including the WEX Card project, which will replace paper authorizations with client-issued debit cards to streamline purchasing, increase client choice, and modernize service delivery, with rollout underway and expected in summer 2026 statewide in partnership with the Employment Security Division. Additionally, he noted that development of the Disability Benefits 101 website has begun, with an anticipated go-live in early 2027. In response to a question from Chair Mayes regarding potential elimination of the U.S. Department of Education, Mr. Elez clarified that VR services are authorized and funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and would continue regardless of departmental restructuring, with any impacts likely limited to federal oversight placement rather than service delivery.

With no other Questions, Chair Mayes moved to the next Agenda item.

12. DISCUSSION ONLY COMMENTS BY THE COUNCIL

Chair Mayes opened the floor to Members of the Council to provide comments.

Jennifer Kane, NSRC Council Member, reported that, following the reopening of the federal government, Nevada is required to submit its end-of-year annual performance report for the Nevada TRIP (Transitions Roadmap Through

Innovative Partnerships) grant by December 11th. She offered to share the full narrative report or a shorter two-page executive summary with the Council, as well as relevant project data, if there is interest, noting that she and Mechelle Merrill are leading the grant work and would be happy to provide additional information. No further Council comments were offered, and the Chair moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

13. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Mayes outlined public comment procedures, including time limits and participation order, before opening the floor to Steven Cohen, Member of the Public, for his public comment.

Steven Cohen provided public comment, expressing concern regarding the Section 504 lawsuit and requesting an update at a future meeting, potentially in addition to questions he had submitted earlier. No additional public comments were offered.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mayes expressed appreciation to all participants for their hard work and attendance and, not needing a motion, formally adjourned the NSRC meeting at 3:22 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES SUBMITTED BY URIAH CARTER, AA II

EDITED BY: JENNY RICHTER LIVIA, NSRC LIAISON

Jenny Richter, N.S.R.C. Liaison

Approved By:

Jack Mayes, Chair

EXHIBIT 1



Steven Cohen

Steven.Cohen@Alumni.UNLV.edu

November 18, 2025

Via E-mail

To Jenny Richter Livia, Council Liaison
For the attention of:
Nevada State Rehabilitation Council

Re: Public Comment

Hi Jenny,

Please see below.

Some of the questions aren't fully covered by the Division report agenda item as written, but my full list of questions, with one exception where I can't fully read my handwriting, is as follows:

- 1) What is the Academy recertification period for staff?*
- 1a) What activities are included as part of the recertification (e.g., changes to the Policy and Procedure Manual, as are on today's agenda)?*
- 1b) How is the Academy structured by staff type?*
- 1c) What additional Academy activities do Supervisors and up go through?*
- 1d) What Academy activities are Rehab specific, and which are State mandated for most employees, regardless of status (e.g., Information Security)?*
- 1e) What Academy activities are designed to be completed by a Tech, which are designed to be completed by a VRC, and which require the general intervention of a Supervisor and up?*
- 2) Once a case is open, to what level do the open staff engage with the client?*
- 2a) What were Best Practice delay expectations prior to the Government shutdown? After?*
- 2b) Which delay activities can be client initiated, which can be Agency (used synonymously with Division) initiated, and which can be mutually initiated?*
- 2c) What are the essential elements of an IPE that apply to most cases?*
- 3) Does the DIF flowchart apply to open cases, prospective cases, or both?*
- 4) How are warm handoffs to Regional Centers being addressed, given their relevant service waitlists?*

N.S.R.C. Meeting Minutes
November 18th, 2025

- 5) *What are the relationships between Agency strategic planning and the Federal report and Council goals and indicators?*
- 5a) *If goals and indicators are not on track, what strategies are deployed between interim development periods to either improve the existing one (s) or change them entirely?*
- 6) *What professional experience would staff consider themselves to have with neurodivergent clients or prospective clients?*
- 6a) *What strategies are being deployed to view neurodivergence as individualized, as opposed to generalized?*
- 6b) *A BDR concerning the Program will be pursued during the 2027 Session. Is the Agency willing to collaborate on the same? Why or why not?*
- 7) *What is the status of the TPCA vendor pool following COVID?*
- 8) *What are the current data points concerning the 700 Hour Program?*
- 8a) *A BDR concerning the Program will be pursued during the 2027 Session. Is the Agency willing to collaborate on the same? Why or why not?*
- 9) *What role does the Agency see AI playing in the disability economy?*
- 10) *What is the status of the findings and related LOI most recently initiated by the Legislature?*
- 11) *What is the Agency's difference between job development and advocacy?*
- 12) *What is the Agency's position on the potential Administration initiative to reallocate CAP structurally to each State?*