

# Draft Minutes of the Friday, February 26, 2021

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)

Director's Office, Grants Management Unit (DO-GMU)

Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services– Proposal Evaluation

Friday, February 26, 2021, 10:00 a.m.

## Meeting Video/Teleconference Information:

Per Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006, there will be no physical location required for this video/teleconferenced meeting. Public comments by teleconference are welcome.

Microsoft Teams meeting - Join on your computer or mobile app – [Click here to join the meeting.](#)

Or call in (audio only): 1 (775) 321-6111; access number 216150075#

Materials: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/>

## I. Call to Order

(Welcome, Roll Call, Announcements) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am by Connie Lucido. Ms. Lucido took roll call and established the attendance of the NOFO evaluators.

### Evaluators Present:

Adrienne De Lucci  
Shirley Trummell  
Amber Bosket  
Diane Thorkildson  
Lisa Torres

### Also Present:

Laura Urban  
Connie Lucido  
Lily Helzer  
Zarmish Tariq  
Blake Thomas  
Cyndee Joncas  
Sarah Rogers  
Debra Kawcak

## II. Public Comment #1

*Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.*

There was no public comment.

## III. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services – Evaluation Summary

(Discussion, Information) Office of Food Security

Laura Urban presented a summary document on her shared screen. The total award amount is \$2 Million. The award period will cover dates State Fiscal year one - July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022 and State Fiscal year two - July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. The Wellness/Hunger Services Notice of Funding Opportunity was available for public and private non-profit agencies to apply. Ms. Urban shared the purpose and objectives of this funding.

The budget funding limitation states: All subrecipients must allocate 50% of requested funds towards procurement of foods that support a healthy diet. Up to 40% of the requested funds may be used for case management and personnel. Up to 10% of the funded amount may be reimbursed for indirect costs. The Office of Food Security will fine tune the budgets of the top applicants to be in alignment with this requirement.

Ms. Urban presented the proposal ranking Score Summary on her shared screen. A total of \$4,059,232 in requests was received. Ms. Urban invited questions or comments from the evaluators.

Amber Bosket asked if \$2 Million was available per year. Ms. Urban replied, yes.

Ms. Urban explained the evaluators were asked to score each proposal and indicate their recommendation of no, partial, or full funding. The color coding indicated on the Score Summary document translates to red = no funding, yellow = partial funding, and green = full funding.

Ms. Urban presented the State Coverage document representing the state coverage by the applicants. It is a requirement of this funding that there is regional coverage. Based on table there is adequate regional coverage. The Division of Public and Behavior Health (DPBH) personnel will map the coverage.

Ms. Urban invited comments or questions. There were none.

#### **IV. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services - Proposal Evaluations and Reviews**

(Discussion, Information) Office of Food Security

Ms. Urban directed the evaluators' attention to the worksheet, explained the process for review options, and invited any general comments.

Ms. Bosket said she would like to discuss each proposal at least briefly.

Adrienne De Lucci agreed and said it would be fair to discuss each one.

Ms. Urban said it may not be possible to review every proposal at this meeting due to time limitations, but further meetings could be scheduled if more time is needed.

Diane Thorkildson said it is likely more time will be needed. She made a general comment that all of the scopes presented were output focused rather than outcome focused. She would like to see more data on the actual affect such as behavioral or food security changes.

Ms. Urban said when the next funding period arrives it would be helpful to have a webinar to talk about the scope of work and required indicators. More consistent guidelines are needed.

Ms. Bosket agrees with a more formalized approach to quantifying the outcome measures.

Ms. Urban invited evaluators to send suggestions for changes to future funding opportunities by email or she can meet with them to discuss.

Ms. Bosket said many of the applicants were missing information about the second year. It would be good if that information was included in future funding opportunities. The need for data collection could be a stumbling point for smaller programs who can't fulfill the requirements.

Ms. Thorkildson said a blend of bigger and smaller programs is best. Bigger programs help reach efficiencies and save some dollars and smaller programs can meet some specialized needs.

Ms. De Lucci agreed a blend is best so that smaller organizations don't get pushed out.

Ms. Urban commented it can be difficult especially due to limited state funds and the need to go to the Legislature and give information regarding the impact.

Ms. Thorkildson said this is her third time reviewing funding proposals and she loved the number of new entries to the food security provider pool.

Ms. Urban said it would be good to include more generalized information regarding attached documents of partnership such as MOUs or Letters of Support.

Ms. Bosket commented the process to obtain and attach official partnership documents vs. unofficial is huge. She felt she obtained more information from each project narrative than the scopes.

Ms. Urban asked if cost per meal has been discussed in the past?

Ms. Thorkildson said cost per meal has been discussed. Feedback from past grantees is that it is not a fair question because some programs can scale to efficiency and come in at a much lower per head cost than a small program in a rural area. It has been difficult to develop a fair way to capture that information.

Ms. Bosket commented the other proposals came in at under \$2 (except one for \$4.50 and one for \$7.50) per meal. Maybe in the future there will be a way to bring balance.

Ms. Thorkildson commented it has been a point of conversation and contention every time.

Ms. Urban made a general comment that while the NOFO does recommend foods that support a healthy diet there is no requirement for fresh produce; shelf stable foods are acceptable.

Ms. Bosket asked if future NOFOs could clarify language regarding a "well rounded diet".

<b>Proposal 1:</b>	<b>Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada</b>
Abstract:	
<b>Evaluation Review</b>	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<b>Diane</b> – long term partner under this funding, good grant outcomes in previous years, inclusion – concept of purchasing food truck like vehicles and using as mobile outreach vehicles, good data gathering, well established partnerships. <b>Laura</b> – collaboration with Food Bank to avoid duplication of services. <b>Lisa</b> – service area, regions and communities covered, partnership with Food Bank.

<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p><b>Lisa</b> – no clear objectives re: how often meeting in trailers, trailers not in funding, unknown other funding, some areas unclear re: number of individuals served and food budget, video not realistic, technology may not be available in rural areas and may be a barrier.  <b>Laura</b> – partnership with Food Bank of Northern Nevada not clear.</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> - \$20,000 may not be enough for outreach vehicles.  <b>Shirley</b> – NOFO states budget must be 50% for food, proposal budget for food not 50%, only one community partner, \$20,000 may not be enough for outreach vehicles.</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – scope is comprehensive, could be fine tuned re: specifics related to how often trailers will be used, how many clients hoped to reach, video views &amp; behavioral outcomes, all scopes of work were output focused and it would be better to have the focus on outcomes.  <b>Lisa</b> – vague on number of people served, information was missing, video information vague.  <b>Diane</b> – would nutrition education services be eliminated from budget?</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Definition of education nutrition?  Eliminate food nutrition videos from budget?  Clarify partners?  Is additional funding secured for vehicles?</p>

<p><b>Proposal 2:</b></p>	<p><b>Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada</b></p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	
<p><b>Evaluation Review</b></p>	
<p>In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – long term community service organization, huge infrastructure capacity.</p>

<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p><b>Shirley</b> – recommended no funding, only one community partner, only addresses seniors, coverage area unclear - Southern Nevada vs. Clark County (Nye County is part of Southern Nevada).  <b>Amber</b> – The application should have a box checked indicating areas served.  <b>Diane</b> – Clark County is checked.  <b>Lisa</b> – recommended no funding, poorly written application, collaborative partners vague, existing meals on wheels program, application does not meet needs stated in funding opportunity.</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – budgeted 13% for food, huge indirect line, federally negotiated indirect rate but not appropriate for this funding source, recommended no funding.  <b>Lisa</b> – budget has little funds going to direct services vs. indirect/personnel.</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – project limited so scope is limited but does address activities to provide services indicated, indicates services will be provide to homebound seniors in Southern Nevada, funding opportunity is for all ages.  <b>Shirley</b> – not even accurate if aren't including Clark County, looks like only talking about Las Vegas, not all of Clark County nor even Southern Nevada.  <b>Amber</b> – individuals served measure was hard to compare and cross reference.</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – most likely this application will not be eligible for funding, but if it was then the questions above would need to be answered.</p>

<p><b>Proposal 3:</b></p>	<p><b>City of Mesquite</b></p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	
<p><b>Evaluation Review</b></p>	
<p>In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – creative, grass-roots community-based solution to problems experienced Mesquite and Bunkerville.  <b>Shirley</b> – agrees, likes the help given to local restaurants and businesses.  <b>Lisa</b> – aid to struggling businesses and strengthening community as a whole good.  <b>Amber</b> – good that assistance will be given to a far reach.</p>

<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – new venture, received some CARES funding, if/when everything goes back to normal, if before end of 2 year cycle, does community will, ability, and need to continue program exist? Will restaurants partnered with have capacity to continue to partner after operations return to normal? If program is COVID specific may not be able to pivot or change.</p> <p><b>Lisa</b> – agrees, case management component good.</p> <p><b>Amber</b> – due to length of recovery project would probably remain relevant.</p> <p><b>Shirley</b> – food banks are limited in service, low income needs for food will still exist</p> <p><b>Laura</b> – asked if Mesquite is a rural area?</p> <p><b>Amber</b> – hour and half from Las Vegas and a relatively small community.</p> <p><b>Shirley</b> – community has pride, close to Utah border, government cares for population, restaurants are not chain entities.</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	<p><b>Lisa</b> – will program be able to adapt and continue when pandemic is over?</p> <p><b>Diane</b> – new case management position may be underfunded, maybe position is aligned with other positions in the city structure.</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b> – comprehensive except unclear measure indicators, good that they will be using volunteers for drivers, bolstering their community spirit by engaging with folks to care for their fellow residents.</p> <p><b>Lisa</b> – comprehensive and has good detail, quarterly report evaluation could be stronger.</p> <p><b>Amber</b> – good that it reaches Bunkerville.</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Is program able to adapt and continue when pandemic is over?</p> <p>Is case manager salary adequate?</p> <p>Abstract says 6 meals but everywhere else says 5 meals?</p>

<b>Proposal 4:</b>	<b>Communities in Schools</b>
Abstract:	
<b>Evaluation Review</b>	

<p>In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.</p>	<p><b>Amber</b> – good to serve Elko, good history of establishment, program specified more students than other age groups.  <b>Laura</b> – questions re: is backpack program best strategy for feeding children on the weekends, many organizations moving toward school pantry program, if more efficient way of going about it then look at that model.  <b>Adrienne</b> – good job highlighting increased need due to pandemic, rural disparity in Jackpot.</p>
<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p><b>Laura</b> – programs have shifted to pantry model because it's more cost effective, has this program considered a school pantry model? This program is partnered with FISH, focus of grant is self-sufficiency for individuals but no discussion of referrals, or specific programs not mentioned just called wrap-around services, might not have an existing process for collecting data.  <b>Adrienne</b> – left case management piece vague, not enough info on how data will be collected.  <b>Amber</b> – performance measures not addressed, limited info re: number of meals served through pantry services.</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	<p><b>Amber</b> - requested funding vs. services to be offered was high per meal, cost per meal seems off base, budget not specified in abstract.</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.</p>	<p><b>Amber</b> – info for second year not included, vague and redundant.  <b>Adrienne</b> – scope is in line with narrative but is too general, not enough specific details, states "Ongoing" as answer to Timeline, not specific enough.</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Is a school pantry model in consideration?  Number of meals served through pantry itself?  Better explain outcome measures for food pantry, such as times clients will be served?</p>

<p><b>Proposal 5:</b></p>	<p><b>Desert Springs Methodist Church</b></p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	

<b>Evaluation Review</b>	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p><b>Adrienne</b> – great job at identifying needs in communities, they reviewed statistics and did background research although it wasn't asked of them in that section, strong evidence of success and community support.</p> <p><b>Amber</b> – no food pantries in their zip code, in higher Social Economic Status (SES) part of town, statistics did not indicate a need for food banks, but important to expand food services into locales not classified as underserved, great need sometimes exists in areas with few available services, target population is 125,000, strong evidence of success and community support.</p> <p><b>Diane</b> – likes that zip code information was used to identify areas of need.</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p><b>Adrienne</b> – didn't talk about organization or address what was asked per se, did not describe any relevant experience, major accomplishments or qualifications, more information re: are services duplicated needed, MOU with Culinary Academy of Las Vegas missing.</p> <p><b>Laura</b> – do they have the existing infrastructure to get started when funding period begins, data collection and evaluation piece could be stronger.</p> <p><b>Amber</b> – more detail needed re: what existing services are available in the area.</p>
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<p><b>Amber</b> – budget reasonable, under \$1 per meal, funding request is expansion of capacity so seems reasonable, reached a good number of families in the area, more information needed re: data collection capabilities.</p> <p><b>Adrienne</b> – budget is reasonable.</p>
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	<p><b>Laura</b> – does such a small organization have the capacity to collect needed data?</p> <p><b>Adrienne</b> – lack of specific details re: how project will unfold.</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>What existing services are in the area? Is this a duplication of services already available? Details needed re: stronger data collection and evaluation.</p>
<b>Proposal 6:</b>	<b>Dignity Health – St. Rose Dominican</b>
Abstract:	

<b>Evaluation Review</b>	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<b>Laura</b> – evidence-based program, have appropriate partners in place, using community health workers, collaborating with a local farmer, abstract outlines outcomes, is an existing program but new focus to address chronic disease. <b>Amber</b> – strongest element working with local farmer, abstract strong. <b>Adrienne</b> – well written overall, unique, outside of typical food pantry model, collaboration with local farmer, successes and capabilities described well.
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<b>Amber</b> – MOUs not attached, had letters of support, established partnerships not clarified, lacked detail under community organization and partnerships details, types of food being provided should be clarified, program is only offering fruits and vegetables, no carbs, proteins, dairy, may not solve calory deficit.
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<b>Amber</b> – cost of food baskets from local farmer significant impact on budget due to collaboration with local farmer, 4.50 per meal to obtain food from local farmer.
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	<b>Discussion was stopped so that the meeting could be ended.</b>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Clarify how many meals will be provided, what is the cost per meal?

The rest of the proposal reviews were tabled until the next meeting.

**V. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services - Proposal Recommendation Review**

(Discussion, Information) Office of Food Security

Not discussed – tabled until the next meeting.

**VI. Public Comment #2**

*Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.*

There were no public comments.

**VII. Additional Announcements and Adjournment**

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Future meeting dates and times were set for Monday, March 8, 2021 10:00 am to 12:00 pm and Wednesday, March 10, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

*This notice was mailed to groups and individuals as requested and posted on the DHHS website at: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/> and on the State of Nevada Public Meeting Notice website at <https://notice.nv.gov/>. Meeting materials will be available to the public online prior to the meeting or contact the Grants Management Unit via phone at 775-684-3470 or by email: [gmu@dhhs.nv.gov](mailto:gmu@dhhs.nv.gov).*