

**LEAD/REACH SUBCOMMITTEE FOR
Governor's Council on Food Security
[Draft] Minutes
September 6, 2017**

The Governor's Council on Food Security held a public meeting on September 6, 2017 beginning at approximately 1:04 P.M. at the following locations:

Division of Public and Behavioral Health
4150 Technology Way Room 301
Carson City, NV 89706

Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services
6161 W. Charleston, East Hall
Las Vegas, NV 89146

Board Members Present

Cherie Jamason, Director, Ending Hunger Initiatives,
Food Bank of Northern Nevada (FBNN)
Catrina Peters, School Nutrition Services Manager,
Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA)
Kenneth Osgood, MD, MPH, Southern Nevada Health
District (SNHD) Board of Health
Sarah Adler, Member Representing Community-
Based Services (Rural Nevada), Governor's Council
on Food Security (GCFS)
Jodi Tyson, Director, Government Affairs, Three
Square Food Bank

Board Members Not Present

Kathleen Sandoval, Nevada First Lady
Robert Herzdik, CEO Bitfocus Inc.
Amy Roukie, Administrator, Division of Public
and Behavioral Health (DPBH)

Also Present

Kirsten Coulombe, Deputy Administrator, Administration Services, DPBH
Karissa Loper, Deputy Bureau Chief, Bureau of Child, Family and Community Wellness (CFCW), DPBH
Michelle Walker, Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Section Manager, CFCW, DPBH
Laura Urban, Food Security and Wellness Manager, Office of Food Security (OFS), Chronic Disease
Prevention and Health Promotion (CDPHP) Section, CFCW, DPBH
Darlene Dougherty, Nutrition Specialist and Outreach Coordinator, Division of Welfare and Supportive
Services (DWSS)
David Ramirez-Silva, WIC Program Officer 1, CFCW, DPBH
Reena Gupta, Public Health Associate, CDPHP, CFCW, DPBH
Aurora Buffington, Public Health Nutrition Specialist, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension

1. Call to Order, Roll Call

Cherie Jamason, Subcommittee Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M.

Roll call was taken and it was determined a quorum of the GCFS Lead/Reach Subcommittee was present.

2. Approve Minutes from the July 19th, 2017 Subcommittee meeting.

SARAH ADLER MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. DR. KENNETH OSGOOD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Overview of Subcommittee goal.**

At the May 19th GCFS meeting, the Council motioned for the creation of the LEAD/REACH and GROW/FEED Subcommittees. The Subcommittees are tasked with reviewing and updating the document, *Food Security in Nevada: Nevada's Plan for Action*, (herein referred to as the Food Security Plan) and to make priority recommendations to the GCFS.

The Subcommittee's task today is to review REACH activities, discuss progress, and make activity revision recommendations as appropriate.

4. **Provide updates on REACH goals and strategies and make recommendations for *Food Security in Nevada: Nevada's Plan for Action*.**

REACH Goal #1: Change the current models of purchase (commodities) and distribution of nutritious foods to increase economies of scale, and link frequency of deliveries and availability of local food to the specific needs of communities throughout the state (rural, urban, and food deserts).

1.a: Conduct a comprehensive benefit analysis study of the current state and nonprofit commodity/food delivery system that includes cost efficiency, frequency of delivery, and recommendations.

Catrina Peters confirmed the update provided in the worksheet is accurate. The NDA issued the *2014 Food Distribution Survey*. A PDF document is available for review on NDA's website. She believes some of the report's recommendations have been implemented, for example The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) switching to a food pantry model.

Jodi Tyson suggested the NDA add an addendum to the report. The addendum should include an update to the report's recommendations and next steps, including working more closely with food banks and other providers.

Ms. Jamason and Ms. Adler agreed.

Ms. Adler asked the food banks if they have any additional distribution system updates.

Ms. Tyson stated each of the food banks has a community report. She suggested links to these regional reports be included in the update.

Dr. Osgood stated at the time the Food Security Plan was written, there was a substantial amount of dysfunction that obstructed the integration of the distribution system. It has been resolved for the most part, but there is still work to be done. These regional reports may help supplement the information outlined in the NDA report and help identify remaining gaps to assess next steps.

Ms. Jamason stated the food banks will now be distributing TEFAP commodities. The food banks can provide a report once the new model is underway. She suggested attaching all the commodity distribution state plans to the Food Security Plan.

Ms. Adler asked about program metrics. She asked if it is possible to conduct a pre/post assessment of TEFAP.

The group discussed TEFAP metrics including cost efficiency, frequency of distribution, and pounds of produce and donated foods accompanying commodities.

Ms. Peters suggested the metric of pounds of fresh produce distributed through TEFAP. There is a similar measure under FEED activities.

Ms. Adler asked if there is a state plan for every commodity food program.

Ms. Peters stated there is a Food Distribution Program for Indian Reservations (FDPIR) state plan, but there may be more than one due to various sponsors. She believes there are state plans for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) and the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP) as well.

Ms. Adler suggested using these state plans as an organizing structure. They could be reviewed periodically with regional food banks to see if there are efficiencies to be gained. These plans can also be included in the revised Food Security Plan and reviewing these plans could be included as a recommended new activity.

Ms. Tyson suggested holding off on reviewing the TEFAP State Plan until the new model is underway. She stated Three Square Food Bank would be interested in taking a deeper dive into reviewing the CSFP. She suggested developing a working group to review CSFP and FDPIR.

Ms. Peters stated CSFP and NSIP are much smaller programs than TEFAP; the suggested workgroup could review both programs at once.

Ms. Jamason stated implementing agencies of CSFP have an annual opportunity to request additional caseloads. When Nevada was given the opportunity to offer CSFP five years ago, Nevada was allocated a certain number of caseloads, which was about 7,600 for the entire state. The need for this program has increased substantially over the years. The Food Bank of Northern Nevada (FBNN) attended a CSFP conference and every state was granted an increase in CSFP caseloads except Nevada.

Ms. Tyson suggested the state plan reviews should occur in early 2018 to align with the reauthorization of the Farm Bill. This way the GCFS has the data to inform federal leaders of the need in Nevada.

Dr. Osgood asked if the CSFP service gap is measurable. Is there data available?

The Subcommittee agreed this data may come out of the Nutrition Programs Gap Analysis for Older Nevadans, as well as the recommendation of increasing Nevada CSFP caseloads.

Ms. Adler asked if activities around increasing CSFP caseloads should be under FEED.

Ms. Jamason confirmed. She added it also relates to LEAD as it is a policy issue.

Ms. Adler suggested undertaking a periodic review of commodity distribution plans in conjunction with key agency partners, including regional food banks.

Dr. Osgood asked Ms. Tyson if Three Square distributes any food to the Southern Paiute Tribe.

Ms. Tyson replied no.

Dr. Osgood stated a representative of the Southern Paiute Tribe should be at the table. He asked how the Southern Paiutes get their food supplements and if their program gaps align with the rest of the population.

Darlene Dougherty stated the Southern Paiute reservation is served out of California.

Ms. Adler stated there are issues with food security and getting nutritious foods to the Native American reservations. The fragmentation of the federal nutrition programs is exacerbated because program operations are very siloed on the reservations. It would be a huge undertaking for the Council to remedy. The FDPIR program may be a gateway to enhancing collaboration. She suggested a convening of FDPIR partners, including the regional food banks.

Ms. Jamason stated the food banks can only work with 501c3 organizations.

Ms. Dougherty suggested engaging the Intertribal Council. Each tribe has the option to implement their own FDPIR program.

The group discussed adding an activity related to convening FDPIR sponsors and key partner agencies to review the FDPIR state plan.

Ms. Tyson suggested a similar convening for the CSFP and NSIP programs, but added it cannot be done in the same day.

The group agreed these suggested new activities would go under REACH. The "recommendations" in 1.a language will come from these workgroups and may be incorporated under FEED. The workgroup will be tasked with looking at the distribution system for federal nutrition programs.

The Subcommittee agreed this would be a new activity.

Ms. Jamason asked about metric development.

Ms. Urban stated once the full Council approves the revised Food Security Plan, and any suggested changes, she will work with the CDPHP Evaluation Team to develop an evaluation plan.

1.b: Develop a comprehensive client/community food supply assessment to determine what organizations, agencies and groups are providing services as well as the frequency and schedule of deliveries to determine efficiencies and opportunities for streamlining food distribution processes.

Ms. Adler asked if the food banks' databases align with this activity.

Ms. Jamason stated there are many food pantries not within either of the food banks' networks. Many of these pantries are supported by faith-based organizations.

Ms. Adler asked if there is a comprehensive list of these food pantries.

Ms. Jamason answered no.

Ms. Tyson stated in Southern Nevada, there are few pantries not affiliated with Three Square Food Bank. She provided an overview of a client analysis conducted by Three Square, which allows them to identify service gaps in their network.

Ms. Adler commented Three Square Food Bank is already fulfilling this activity for Southern Nevada. She asked Ms. Tyson if the analysis concluded with recommendations for next steps and if the Council can provide any support.

Ms. Tyson stated clients travel further for animal protein and dairy products. She suggested identifying a mechanism to build capacity in smaller pantries, so they can provide these foods to their clients.

Ms. Peters asked if the pantry list provided in the *2014 Food Distribution Survey* is a comprehensive list.

Ms. Tyson stated the list is made up of food bank partner agencies and TEFAP agencies. Some agencies only provide TEFAP and do not distribute food from the food bank.

Ms. Jamason added partner agency lists change regularly, so they should be updated accordingly.

The Subcommittee discussed how comprehensive the assessment should be; it was determined this assessment would only include agencies within the food banks' network.

Ms. Tyson added the word "comprehensive" is also associated with what the assessment would look at, including client satisfaction, agency distribution schedules, etc.

Ms. Jamason stated it will be challenging to continuously update a partner agency list. She suggested the food banks provide an agency list annually.

The Subcommittee recommended including links to the Nevada food banks' agency and program lists on the GCFS website.

Ms. Jamason asked if there would be too much overlap with 2-1-1.

Ms. Tyson indicated ensuring 2-1-1 resources are updated regularly is already a FEED activity.

Ms. Peters mentioned there has been an effort to link summer food programs with correct dates and times on 2-1-1.

Dr. Osgood suggested this be linked with the 911 referral program in Southern Nevada.

Ms. Tyson stated the completion of the *2014 Food Distribution Survey* does not align with the original intent of the activity. This activity is related to the food banks and should be revised to be more specific. She suggested including regional reports and analyses from the food banks as an update. These can be provided annually moving forward.

Ms. Jamason stated this activity aligns with the food asset map in REACH activity 1.c.

Ms. Adler proposed revising the activity to state, "Develop and periodically revisit a comprehensive client/community food supply assessment to determine what organizations, agencies, and groups are providing services as well as the frequency and schedule of deliveries to determine efficiencies and opportunities for streamlining food distribution processes." She asked if this activity should also include dialogue around these assessments and if the recipients of the "One-Stop-Shop" Grant are a part of either food banks' service network.

Ms. Jamason answered that most of the "One-Stop-Shop" Grant agencies in the north are partners with FBNN.

Ms. Tyson answered the "One-Stop-Shop" Grant agencies in the south are somewhat involved with Three Square Food Bank. She also stated having a discussion around distribution systems may be difficult. She mentioned the value of the Feeding America *Hunger in America Report* and suggested a link to this report be included in the Food Security Plan update. She added Feeding America may discontinue issuing the *Hunger in America Report*.

Ms. Adler stated the *Hunger in America Report* aligns more with the FEED goals.

Ms. Jamason asked if there is an interest in conducting a statewide comprehensive food security assessment if Feeding America plans to discontinue the *Hunger in America Report*.

Dr. Osgood and Ms. Tyson voiced their support of conducting a statewide food security assessment. They would like the GCFS to take the lead on this assessment.

Ms. Peters pointed out state program distribution efficiencies should continue to be assessed.

Ms. Jamason agreed. She asked if a separate study should assess the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH).

Ms. Tyson stated the July 19th LEAD/REACH meeting minutes outline a similar suggestion under LEAD activity 1.h.

Dr. Osgood suggested expanding LEAD activity 1.h language to include the SDOH.

Ms. Jamason stated the evaluation plan in LEAD activity 1.h would not be enough. It should be an assessment rather than an evaluation plan.

Dr. Osgood and Ms. Tyson agreed.

Ms. Adler asked if addressing the SDOH is within the scope of the Council. She stressed the need for an interagency workgroup made up of state and non-state agencies to work alongside the Council. She suggested this continue as an activity within the Food Security Plan.

Ms. Tyson stated the *Hunger in America Report* specifically targets food pantry clients and asks questions about the SDOH, which are very valuable. The report should include these questions if the Subcommittee recommends the comprehensive report as an activity.

Ms. Peters asked who would pay for the assessment.

Ms. Tyson stated the University of Nevada, Reno and University of Nevada Las Vegas could provide support. The food banks can also help with administering surveys.

Dr. Osgood suggested a phased approach. The first phase would be to determine the report methodology.

The Subcommittee discussed revision of LEAD activity 1.h. Ms. Adler suggested "Utilize the Feeding America *Hunger in America Report* and additional analyses to determine characteristics of the food insecure population in Nevada." A subcomponent of this activity could be to determine the feasibility and methodology for conducting a statewide food security needs assessment in Nevada.

Dr. Osgood stated the activity language should also include assessing other factors related to food insecurity, specifically the SDOH.

Ms. Jamason suggested the revision, "Create a regular report on evaluating food security and the SDOH."

The Subcommittee clarified there is a recommendation to have activities for two (2) separate reports: (1) a comprehensive assessment of the food insecure population in Nevada and (2) a Nevada-specific report on the SDOH. It was also recommended to have these assessments done on a regular cycle.

Ms. Jamason received an e-mail from Feeding America confirming the discontinuation of the *Hunger in America Report*. The Service Insight data tracking system is an investment being made by many food banks to understand the key dimensions of services. She stated Feeding America is working on consistent data collection throughout their food bank network. Feeding America will move forward with a new three-pronged approach, including (1) working on the Service Insights Initiative (client data-tracking), (2) building infrastructure to generate regular, reliable, time-efficient, and cost-effective insight based on the people served, and (3) securing information on reach and characteristics of those not served by the Feeding America network.

The Subcommittee agreed the revised Food Security Plan should include a comprehensive food security report to replace the *Hunger in America Report*. It was mentioned the GCFS may consider developing a task force to oversee the development and implementation of the report.

Ms. Peters asked about the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program-Education (SNAP-Ed) 2017 Needs Assessment.

Ms. Dougherty stated food security is a fragment of the assessment, but there is other data that can be used.

Ms. Jamason stated a food security question was added to the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS) in 2016. She suggested questions about the experiences of hunger also be added.

1.c: Use food asset maps to develop a coordinated distribution delivery process, establish a network to enable a truck to reach several areas in a single trip and ultimately provide more food to communities.

Dr. Osgood asked if this goal is achievable.

Ms. Adler commented yes, but she is not sure it is a priority now.

Ms. Peters stated this topic was prioritized at the time to make use of backhauling.

Ms. Jamason stated the FBNN conducted a study on backhauling and found little interest among farmers.

Ms. Adler stated there must be a conversation with the NDA on their capacity to support this activity and GROW activities.

Ms. Peters stated the NDA conducted two (2) annual surveys collecting what produce is grown, where, and how much. The NDA produced a report and made it available to the public, but there was no interest. The purpose of the survey was to increase the use of local food in schools. She suggested assessing other barriers associated with the use of local foods. Local farmers can get a premium from local restaurants, so they are not interested in selling to institutions. Farmers can sell unprocessed produce to local restaurants, unlike schools.

Ms. Jamason commented one of the findings was the lack of aggregation centers in Northern Nevada.

Ms. Adler stated GROW activities are not a high priority. She asked if GROW activities were realistic and proposed the revised Food Security Plan not include a GROW section.

Ms. Jamason suggested a food insecurity resource and asset map as opposed to a grown food asset map.

Ms. Adler stated activity 1.c, as written, may not be necessary since the NDA has already conducted two (2) assessments.

The Subcommittee agreed to not include this activity moving forward.

Ms. Jamason suggested adding “Develop a comprehensive food supply assessment and map...” to REACH activity 1.b.

1.d: Establish a “one-stop-shop” for agencies to acquire produce and other foods from regional food banks and expand nutritious food options beyond what is available for free through commodities programs.

Ms. Peters asked about the original intent of the activity.

Ms. Tyson stated when this goal was created, both she and Ms. Jamason thought it should focus specifically around virtual programs, not brick and mortar programs. It was more about having an online application for pantry-goers, to apply for WIC, SNAP, etc. as they were getting their food. This was not included in the original language. She added the food banks have increased pounds of produce distributed to partner agencies.

Ms. Adler stated REACH activity 1.d, as written, it is not about the virtual one-stop shop. This aligns more with FEED activities. This activity is about increasing client access to fruits and vegetables via food pantries and food bank programs. Based on Ms. Tyson’s update regarding the increase of pounds of produce distributed by the food banks, she believes this activity is complete. She stated FEED activity 2.d “Strengthen partnerships and increase efficiency to implement a one-stop-shop for all assistance programs” aligns with the virtual one-stop-shop mentioned earlier.

Laura Urban stated increasing fresh produce is also a component of FEED activity 2.a, “Expand partnerships between regional food banks and commodities programs to effectively utilize and deliver all USDA commodities programs along with fresh produce.”

Ms. Adler stated she believes the food banks serve as the one-stop-shop mentioned in REACH activity 1.d.

Ms. Jamason asked if they should expand this activity beyond produce, specifically to include animal protein and dairy products.

The Subcommittee discussed the “One-Stop-Shop” Grant.

Ms. Dougherty asked if there are any nutritional requirements for food purchased with One-Stop-Shop Grant funds.

Ms. Jamason answered no, it is very broad.

Ms. Adler asked about the original intent of REACH activity 1.d.

Ms. Jamason stated the purpose of REACH activity 1.d was to get more produce and nutritious foods out to the community.

Ms. Adler suggested enhanced collaboration with the agencies receiving funds from the One-Stop-Shop Grant.

Ms. Jamason stated in the north, most agencies are already partners of the FBNN. These agencies receive food from FBNN.

Ms. Adler suggested revising REACH activity 1.d to, "Continue partnerships and progress in diversifying nutritious food options available from food banks."

The Subcommittee discussed the possibility of placing the revised activity under FEED and decided the activity, as originally written, is complete.

Ms. Tyson stated at the time the Food Security Plan was written, there were issues with commodity food programs, which have since been resolved. Now there are opportunities to expand nutritious food offerings. One example is delivering more shelf-stable options for Child Nutrition Programs to rural communities during the summer and fall, as it is difficult to get trucks out to rural areas in the winter. They can deliver these foods along with pantry foods. This is a better option for pantries without capacity to store or make fresh meals. This would increase a community's access to healthy foods and allow rural agencies to offer more nutrition programs. She provided the example of Tonopah. Three Square Food Bank does not offer the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) in Tonopah, but if they had shelf-stable meal options, Three Square Food Bank could drop off SFSP foods when making deliveries to food pantries twice a month. This is not done traditionally. She asked if this aligns with the activity.

Ms. Adler asked what agencies/organizations, besides the USDA, would be engaged to increase food diversity. She provided the example of Walmart, which donates fresh produce to FBNN for their Mobile Harvest Program.

Ms. Jamason stated Walmart has a policy which allows them to only donate to food banks affiliated with Feeding America.

Ms. Adler asked if there are other players of that scale to engage. She asked Ms. Tyson where Three Square Food Bank gets fresh produce.

Ms. Tyson stated produce comes from Riverside Food Bank in California. A truck goes to Riverside daily and most of what comes back is fresh produce. Three Square Food Bank has also prioritized community donations for fresh produce.

Ms. Jamason stated Nevada has access to more produce than other states because of the relationship with the California Association of Food Banks and the Arizona Food Banks.

Ms. Tyson and Ms. Jamason stated produce donations are circumstantial. If droughts continue it may affect the amount of fresh produce coming to Nevada food banks.

Ms. Adler asked Ms. Tyson if Three Square Food Bank is redirecting donated dollars to purchase animal protein and dairy products due to the increase in pounds of fresh produce delivered. She asked if the Food Security Plan has a role in supporting the regional food banks in diversifying food choices.

Ms. Jamason stated yes, there are approximately 20 states that receive state dollars for food purchases, including Oregon, New York, Pennsylvania, Maine, and Massachusetts. There are resource-poor states due to lack of local food manufacturing. State dollars are a means to purchase foods. Throughout the country, every food bank has food donations, which account for about 80% of what is delivered to the public. The food banks use donated and state dollars to diversify food offerings, as they cannot control what is donated.

Ms. Tyson stated a study conducted in 2010 showed clients wanting more fruit and vegetable options from pantries. She was excited to see the latest study showed animal protein and dairy products as the most wanted items.

Ms. Jamason asked what should be done with REACH activity 1.d.

Ms. Adler stated they can declare victory for REACH activity 1.d. The focus on nutritious food and food diversity aligns with FEED activities.

The Subcommittee agreed.

Goal #2: Develop the technology to connect and share data among multiple state agencies, regional food banks, community agencies, and faith-based organizations for efficient and effective targeting of services and populations.

2.a: Use data and information from the shared software system to track client services, program utilization, and target new distribution points based on needs.

Ms. Jamason asked if the software mentioned is Clarity.

Ms. Tyson confirmed yes.

It was further confirmed Clarity and the Client Management Information System (CMIS) mentioned at the last LEAD/REACH meeting are the same data system.

Ms. Jamason stated the language specifically states “*use* data and information.” She does not believe they are there yet.

Ms. Tyson stated there are several southern Nevada agencies using Clarity, as it is required for receiving Homeless Service Funds. The agencies using Clarity in Southern Nevada have given Three Square Food Bank access to their data, so they do not have to collect census forms separately from the information they already collect. She stated this activity needs to be revised, because there are not enough agencies using the database. At the July 19th LEAD/REACH meeting, Cody Phinney reported more agencies using Clarity. She recommended keeping this activity to ensure agencies are on the same client database so the

GCFS can measure progress. She suggested the revision of "Expand use of a single database system to track client services, program utilization, and use of distribution points." This would facilitate REACH activities 1.a and 1.b and LEAD goals on evaluating progress.

Ms. Jamason suggested identifying a baseline and a benchmark goal for the use of Clarity statewide.

Ms. Tyson stated this would be a good use of the Food Security Funds within the Fund for a Healthy Nevada.

Ms. Adler stated there are many activities of the revised Food Security Plan that will require funding.

Ms. Jamason added a comprehensive Geographic Information System (GIS) map of food assets and resources would also be a good use of funds.

Ms. Tyson asked if the activity should specifically recommend the use of the Clarity system.

Dr. Osgood recommended not to, as the implementation of the goal is still in its infancy.

Ms. Jamason asked the group if there were additional recommendations for LEAD/REACH activities.

The group discussed the *2015 National Commission on Hunger Report*, which Ms. Jamason shared at the meeting.

Ms. Jamason suggested an activity reviewing recommendations from the *National Commission on Hunger Report* to determine what is appropriate for Nevada.

Ms. Dougherty recommended establishing which recommendations have already been accomplished.

Ms. Tyson referenced LEAD activity 2.c, "Research and develop a menu of policies/regulation options to promote food security in Nevada." She suggested an activity related to convening a policy workgroup to develop a legislative agenda focused on food security. Specifically, in the first month of each non-legislative year, the GCFS Chair requests a workgroup to develop a legislative agenda that prioritizes state and federal legislature pertinent at that time.

The Subcommittee agreed and established that the workgroup's first task would be to review the recommendations of the *2015 National Commission on Hunger Report*.

Ms. Adler suggested the development of a parallel working group for the GCFS to help with implementing the revised Food Security Plan.

Ms. Peters asked if this workgroup would be required to adhere to Open Meeting Law (OML).

Ms. Urban replied yes, if the workgroup is tasked with making recommendations to the GCFS, then it must adhere to Open Meeting Law.

Ms. Urban stated the July 19th LEAD/REACH minutes show the Subcommittee agreed another workgroup was not necessary.

Ms. Adler re-emphasized another workgroup is needed. The GCFS cannot accomplish the activities of the Food Security Plan alone.

Ms. Tyson stated the primary role of the GCFS is to be the Governor's advisory council on policy. Policy is the core of the GCFS's purpose. She stressed the importance of the GCFS having a policy agenda. There is not enough time in the GCFS meetings to do this.

It was confirmed the GCFS Executive Order states the primary goal of the GCFS is "...the implementation of the plan which is intended to improve the quality of life and health of Nevadans by increasing food security throughout the state."

Ms. Adler stated the only way the GCFS can implement Food Security Plan activities is through their staff. Even if GCFS members begin delegating tasks to their staff, the GCFS is missing the inter-agency collaboration. The Council needs boots on the ground partners who will help implement the Food Security Plan.

Ms. Jamason stressed the need for an on-boarding process for members.

Ms. Adler stated these meetings have shown progress has been made. Progress will continue if the GCFS explains clearly the importance of doing the work outlined in the Food Security Plan and doing it together. She stated the Subcommittee meetings have been very productive; it is easier to have collaborative conversations in a Subcommittee meeting than in a formal Council meeting.

The Subcommittee suggested revising activity 2.c to, "Establish a working group to research, develop, and recommend a menu of policies and/or regulation options to promote food security in Nevada." The Subcommittee agreed this would be an ongoing workgroup. Policy work will not just happen during legislative sessions.

The Subcommittee confirmed they are recommending developing two (2) working groups. One (1) policy workgroup, and one (1) multi-agency work group (per LEAD activity 2.b).

Ms. Adler asked if there should be a workgroup for implementing each goal.

The Subcommittee agreed to wait on this suggestion until the Food Security Plan is revised and approved by the full Council.

Ms. Tyson stated there are many plans that will affect the Food Security Plan, for instance the Affordable Housing Plan and the Nevada Diabetes Action Plan. She suggested developing a visual to show the Food Security Plan is not working in a vacuum and how the work of other

councils and groups will impact the work of the Food Security Plan. Ms. Tyson offered to help with the development of this visual.

MS. JAMASON ENTERATED A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FURTHERANCE OF THE REORGANIZATION OF THE FOOD SECURITY PLAN. DR. OSGOOD MOTIONED. MS. ADLER SECONDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Identify action items and goals for third Subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Urban stated she will update the plan per the Subcommittee's recommendations. The revised Food Security Plan will be presented at the November 15th GCFS meeting for the Council's consideration and approval.

6. Adjournment

Ms. Jamason adjourned the meeting at 4:55 P.M.

DRAFT