

Draft Minutes of the Wednesday, March 10, 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

Wednesday, March 10, 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.

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 1:09 pm 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 (joined at 1:16)

Diane Thorkildson

Lisa Torres

Also Present:

Laura Urban

Connie Lucido

Sara Rogers

Cyndee Joncas

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 said the evaluators were welcome to send any revised score to her via email. NOFO improvement suggestions will be presented to the GMAC at a future meeting. The recommendations for this current NOFO process will be presented at the next GMAC meeting.

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

(Discussion, Information) Office of Food Security

The workgroup resumed proposal evaluation.

Shirley Trummell suggested including a question on future NOFO applications concerning the length of time a program has been grant funded.

Ms. Urban discussed the lack of adherence to the NOFO application requirement that 50% of the budget go to purchasing food.

Ms. Lucido suggested adjusting the award budget amount to reflect that requirement. After the review by the GMAC the agency can work with the program to see if the revised amounts work.

Ms. Urban would like to include the county level projections from Feed America for food insecurity for 2020 with the recommendation presentation to the GMAC. The numbers could be compared to the locations for the current proposals.

Ms. Urban will work with Ms. Lucido at a future time to navigate poorly written, but greatly needed services proposals.

Ms. Lucido said it is important to provide a coverage area map to the GMAC that could demonstrate needed services to be provided by a proposal that may not have been highly ranked.

Ms. Urban said it may be important for future NOFOs to set aside a percentage of funding for smaller organizations with smaller capacity.

Ms. Lucido said future NOFO scoring matrixes could include a question regarding “food deserts”

Ms. Trummell said Three Square aims to increase the capacity of six agencies. The agency’s efforts contribute to the sustainability of other agencies.

Ms. Urban commented on the importance of the data collection piece in allocating funding.

Ms. Lucido said one of the ways to sustain funding is to have the performance measure indicators to show the effectiveness of the funding and show the legislature and the public where the funding goes. The agency will need to have conversations with the applicants regarding their data collection capacity. The Grants Management Unit serves to preserve the integrity of the funding.

Amber Bosket said the removal of the request cap opens the door for applications to make large requests.

Ms. Urban said historically this sort of funding has not had a cap. Having a cap or some sort of allocation formula should be included in the NOFO and should be a conversation with the GMAC. The original NOFO that was sent out had the cap included, it should not have been there and was removed. Ms. Urban asked Ms. Lucido if there has ever been a cap.

Ms. Lucido said not that she is aware of.

Diane Thorkildson said not in the past 6 years.

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. Thorkildson asked for information regarding the possible effects of not funding certain applications on proposal sustainability.

Proposal 6:	Dignity Health – St. Rose Dominican
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or ‘pros’ that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Laura – 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.</p> <p>Amber – strongest element working with local farmer, abstract strong.</p> <p>Adrienne – well written overall, unique, outside of typical food pantry model, collaboration with local farmer, successes and capabilities described well.</p>
Now, let’s chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Amber – 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.</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>Amber – 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.</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>Discussion was stopped so that the meeting could be ended.</p> <p>Discussion resumed Wednesday, March 10, 2021.</p> <p>Laura – was comprehensive enough, would like to know what else they plan to measure beyond fruit and vegetable consumption data, do they have the capacity to collect that data?</p> <p>Adrienne – provided good overall structure of the project.</p> <p>Amber – how well does program meet the needs, concerned only fruits and vegetables, no other food types.</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>Clarify how many meals will be provided?</p> <p>What is the cost per meal?</p>

Proposal 7:	Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Diane – well done proposal, met all NOFO requirements, long-standing partner with this funding source, reliably deliver on all scopes of work, positive aspect is the prescription for fruits and vegetables, good connection with primary care providers to facilitate prescriptions for food</p> <p>Shirley – agreed, well written application,</p> <p>Lisa – well written, touched on all components, good expansion</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Shirley – re: expansion goal 2 - only mentioned Carson City, are they going into Douglas, Storey, and Lyon Counties?</p> <p>Diane – had same question</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>Diane – reasonable, met NOFO guidelines, nothing excessive or out of place.</p> <p>Lisa - agreed</p> <p>Shirley – agreed</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>Shirley – questioned whether program would expand to other three counties</p> <p>Diane – listed other counties on objective 2.1, but other places just say Carson</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Will program expand into Douglas, Storey, and Lyon Counties?

Proposal 8:	Jewish Family Services
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are	<p>Adrienne – bringing services to the community that they are serving, will help with utilization, ability to collect good data.</p> <p>Laura – already have HMIS system to help manage client referrals, they work closely with the community, smaller scale project, very client centered, individualized plans,</p>

associated with the project.	tools to measure impact, food insecurity, quality of diet, and increased self-sufficiency Lisa – eliminated transportation barrier, great data collection tools.
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	Adrienne – discussion of project and community partners weak, small targeted population may not reach all who need services. Laura – also felt small scale could be a negative. Lisa – needed more information re: going a step farther (providing resources), what other partners will be incorporated?
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?	Adrienne – yes, is reasonable and applicable Lisa – asking for a fairly low amount, will be on site Laura – agrees.
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.	Adrienne – yes, in some areas more so than the narrative. Laura – good measurable outcomes. Lisa – agrees, more detail in goals and objectives than in narrative.
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Clarify partners?

Proposal 9:	Just One Project
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	Diane – good connection with school district and use of neighborhood-based distribution sites using school property, apartment complexes appear to be are low income housing, good partnership with Project Maryland excellent connection and benefit to families served. Lisa – agrees, familiarity of neighborhood schools may be comfortable for families, well written proposal, meets needs of each specific neighborhood Shirley – agrees, Maryland Project unique and great to include in proposal.
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that	Shirley – question re: how long has the program been grant funded - not answered,

may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	Diane – concerned re: vagueness of mission statement, agency may seek funding just to seek funding, would have been good to see the focus “food insecurity issues” reflected in mission and vision statements.
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?	Shirley – was food budget 50% of entire budget? If the program doesn’t receive all funding would they still be able to hire a manager? Diane – doesn’t know, total ask is \$268,000, food budget is just under \$130,000 so it’s just under that 50% mark, they are asking for full coverage for the manager Lisa – doesn’t know, no other concerns, budget seems reasonable. Amber – could look at other funding sources to answer hire manager question. Diane – only other information listed was ‘in-kind food donations’.
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.	Diane – scope of work does what it’s supposed to do, however in comparison to other scopes of work it is relatively short and does not include much detail, does describe what they say they will do. Lisa – looks short and simple but does cover what project will do, no issues with it. Shirley - agrees
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Is sustainability assured if manager position is not funded? How long have they been grant funded?

Proposal 10:	Keystone Enrichment Foundation
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or ‘pros’ that you feel are associated with the project.	Amber – unique rural location, listed as servicing Clark County but really serving area that has no service, closest grocery store is 40 miles, no restaurants, no food sources in the city, underserved population (Sandy Valley), partnerships with Three Square and Desert Springs Methodist church really important, good longevity, they intend to expand the partnerships , not the strongest written but ultimately one of the strongest with regards to reach, achievability, person running program is uniquely qualified as has worked in hospitality and food services and in the produce department at Smith’s, could have portrayed the service area as low income low access “food desert”, instead classified service area geographic area Laura – good that data was included showing great need such as low employment rate of residents Adrienne – highlighted need in rural location

<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p>Laura – program referral was not to other federal nutrition programs, was focused on recreational programming for the children and addressing domestic abuse, when self-sufficiency is discussed does this type of program qualify?</p> <p>Amber – funding request is not centered on educational and outreach component, budget addresses food insecurity, thinks the program would like to have that type of outreach</p> <p>Laura – is program referral piece missing from application?</p> <p>Adrienne – confused by that as well, written in narrative as if going to build those programs but written in scope as if going to refer, not clear either way</p> <p>Amber – quality of composition of proposal may not be very good but should weigh overall program, purpose of proposal, and targeted need population.</p> <p>Shirley – referrals must be supported by transportation resources to be accessible.</p> <p>Amber – agrees that although composition of proposal may not have been the best, inaccessibility is a large factor to keep in mind, proposal would bring food pantry to this area, ask is for a small proportion. Strong consideration is designation as USDA food desert in an actual desert. This funding it to increase capacity, food pantry is already established.</p> <p>Laura – proposal committed to collecting data, what is the impact if don't have capacity to track data?</p> <p>Connie – must have data to demonstrate integrity to legislative and public.</p> <p>Laura/Amber – may partner with Three Square to track data</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>Amber – reasonable, \$1 per meal, able to achieve goals with requested budget.</p> <p>Laura – no concerns, did not include year 2 budget.</p> <p>Adrienne – no concerns.</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>Amber – relatively vague and short but narrative is adequately descriptive</p> <p>Laura – if proposal is selected then agency would work with them</p> <p>Adrienne – met matrix requirements but a bit vague</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Clarify program referral process.</p>

Proposal 11:	Money Management International
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Laura – current sub-recipient, diligent re: data, always meets goals, good program model, connector between smaller programs, reaching families and seniors, data collection is good.</p> <p>Amber – proposal written by a professional, comprehensive.</p> <p>Adrienne – agrees, history of success in implementing, strong collaboration.</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Amber – did not include MOUs, doesn't list any grant funding sources, asking on behalf of partnerships, all contracted out, no funds go to MMI, they are an overseer, is this a normal process? Size of ask is a concern, campus moving was a problem, evaluate a reduced budget.</p> <p>Shirley – proposal says Southern Nevada, is that just Clark County?</p> <p>Amber – yes, Clark County</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>Amber - Budget summary didn't differentiate between staffing and operating costs, budget summary not complete, did not include year two budget summary</p> <p>Adrienne – did not include year two.</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.	Amber – detailed enough, no issues
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Can be budget be revised – scaled down?

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 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.