

Governor's Council on Food Security
Draft Minutes
January 11, 2017

The Governor's Council on Food Security held a public meeting on January 11, 2016, beginning at approximately 1:00 P.M. at the following locations:

Division of Public and Behavioral Health
4150 Technology Way Room 303
Carson City, NV 89706

Department of Health Care Financing and Policy
1210 S. Valley View, Suite 104
Las Vegas, NV 89102

Board Members Present

Kathleen Sandoval, Nevada First Lady
Christy McGill, Healthy Communities Coalition
Cody Phinney, Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) proxy for Richard Whitley, Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
David Weaver, US Foods
Sarah Adler, Nevada State Director, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Rural Development
Steve Fisher, Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS)
Jodi Tyson, Director of Government Affairs, Three Square
Donnell Barton, Administrator of Food and Nutrition Division, Department of Agriculture
Cherie Jamason, CEO, Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Chuck Duarte, CEO, Community Health Alliance
Kenneth Osgood MD MPH, Southern Nevada Health District, Board of Health
Mary Liveratti, President, American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) Nevada State
Jim Barbee, Director, Department of Agriculture
Amy Hill, Government Relations

Board Members Not Present

Matthew Tuma, Governor's Office of Economic Development
Denise Peri, Nevada Fresh Pack, Sales, Walmart

Also Present

Jill Berntson, Deputy, Aging and Disability Services (ADSD)
Beth Handler, Bureau Chief, Bureau of Child, Family and Community Wellness (BCFCW), DPBH
David Ramirez-Silva, WIC Administrative Assistant III, BCFCW, DPBH
Jennifer Bonk, Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (CDPHP) Manager, BCFCW, DPBH
Darlene Dougherty, SNAP-ED Nutrition Specialist and Outreach Coordinator
Laura Urban, Food Security and Wellness Manager, CDPHP, BCFCW, DPBH
Barbara Paulson, Nevadans for the Common Good
Sheri Eggleston, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DHCFP)

Karissa Loper, Deputy Bureau Chief, BCFCW, DPBH
Julia Peek, Deputy Administrator, Community Services, DPBH
Pat Petrie, Director's Office, DHHS
Shannon Richards, Attorney General's Office
Reena Gupta, CDPHP, BCFCW, DPBH

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Announcements

Mrs. Kathleen Sandoval, Nevada State First Lady, called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

Roll call was taken, and it was determined a quorum of the Governor's Council on Food Security (GCFS) was present.

2. ACTION ITEM: Approve Minutes of August 16, 2016 Council Meeting

Mrs. Sandoval asked if there were any corrections to the draft minutes from the August 16, 2016 meeting.

MRS. SANDOVAL ENTERTAINED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 16, 2016 MEETING. A MOTION TO APPROVE WAS MADE BY DR. KENNETH OSGOOD. MS. CODY PHINNEY SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

3. Update on 2017 GCFS meeting dates and times

Laura Urban explained the 2017 meeting dates changed due to Council members' scheduling conflicts. Meeting dates will be the third Wednesday of every month beginning March 2017. A handout with the dates was provided. No comment was made on the proposed meeting dates.

4. Report on Senior Nutrition Programming

USDA Nutrition Programming: Overview of Senior Programming

Donnell Barton presented on senior commodity programs offered through the Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA). There are four programs: the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), Senior Farmer's Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP), the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP), and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).

CSFP works to improve the health of low income seniors who are at 130% or below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). Seniors need to be at least 60 years of age to receive program benefits. \$1.6 million was received last year in federal food value. \$573,375 (36%) was spent on administrative costs for the state and contractor agencies. Three agencies administer the program: East Valley Family Services serves 55 sites and a caseload of 4,600; the Food Bank of Northern Nevada serves 51 sites throughout Carson City, Douglas, Churchill, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Nye, Mineral, Northern Nye, Pershing, Storey, Washoe, and White Pine Counties with a caseload of 2,608; and Elko Friends in Service Helping has a caseload of 75 seniors. Monthly food packages for seniors include meat, fruit juice, canned fruits and vegetables, milk, cheese, dry and hot cereal, pasta or rice, and peanut butter or dry beans. CSFP works with contracted agencies to order a variety of available products through the USDA.

Ms. Barton continued with an overview of SFMNP, which issues coupon booklets to qualifying seniors. Those who are at 185% or below FPL are issued coupons to encourage the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables at local farmers' markets. The booklet contains 15 coupons, each worth \$2.00 (e.g., \$30 total). Ms. Barton reviewed the fiscal components of the program, explaining allocations for administrative costs and food purchases. They are working to encourage farmers to redeem coupons to fully expend remaining funds. There will be a final tally of the number of coupons redeemed and funds remaining on September 15th, 2017. Remaining funds will be used to purchase fruits and vegetables from local farmers which will be distributed through the Three Square Food Bank. Ms. Barton said over 500 seniors are these program benefits. There are 68 participating farmers, 58 of whom have redeemed coupons. There are 23 sites participating in Southern Nevada and 22 sites in Northern Nevada. A common barrier for seniors is getting transportation to and from participating sites.

Sarah Adler asked about the redemption process for seniors.

Ms. Barton explained farmers have signage in their booths to indicate participation in the program. Farmers turn in coupons to the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program for reimbursement.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if there is a master list of participating farmers.

Ms. Barton confirmed the USDA website lists participating farmers as well as where the coupons are distributed.

Christy McGill commented higher redemption rates are achieved when farmer's market managers reimburse the farmers.

Ms. Barton said she would look into Ms. McGill's suggestion.

Cherie Jamason mentioned those eligible for the CSFP live on incomes of less than \$1,000 per month. Many of the seniors served live on an average of \$750 per month.

Ms. Barton explained many of the programs managed by the NDA are entitlement programs, but today she is talking about grant programs serving low-income seniors. Funding received is based on the state's poverty and senior population data.

Dr. Osgood asked how many seniors are accessing the program, and if there is a gap between numbers receiving assistance versus those who are not.

Ms. Barton explained there is a gap, but how wide the gap is cannot be determined due to the program being first come, first served. Seniors just sign a statement confirming they meet the poverty guidelines and are over the age of 60.

Ms. Barton continued with an overview of NSIP, which works in conjunction with the ADSD. A list of interested sponsors is given to the NDA by ADSD, including their preference of commodities or funds "in lieu of." The list of NSIP sponsors is included in the presentation.

Commodities purchased for NSIP include green beans, tomatoes, peas, mixed fruit, applesauce, peaches, pears, and ground beef.

Ms. Barton continued with an overview of CACFP, an entitlement program and one of the more underutilized programs in Nevada. To qualify, adult day care centers must be operated by a public agency, private agency, or a nonprofit and follow eligibility requirements. Requirements include providing community-based programs and nonresidential services to functionally impaired adults and being licensed to provide adult day care services.

Ms. Jamason asked if most CACFP locations cook on-site or buy their meals elsewhere. Ms. Barton replied most of the locations cook on-site due to having to follow the same meal pattern.

Ms. Barton said there are five CACFP sponsors throughout the state, with nine sites and a total of 716 seniors served monthly. All the sponsors are located in Las Vegas. The actual site locations may be in both the North and the South.

Ms. Jamason asked about the number of CSFP sites there are relative to those who are eligible. She said it took five years of lobbying to secure this program for the state. At the time, the number of cases was around 7,500, enough for one box of food every month; and there were 40,000 people that were income and age eligible in the state, and that number would have surely increased by now. This program is the only one available for seniors now and there is a gap of at least 40,000. The gap between those eligible for the program and those receiving benefits is quite vast and significant.

Ms. Barton agreed. They do not see an increase of caseloads; the USDA monitors to ensure 95-98 percent usage for caseloads. If the actual usage is not met, the program runs the risk of losing caseloads.

Ms. Barton announced they received the Administrative Review and Training (ART) grant for the state match between the Division of Welfare and Social Services (DWSS) and Department of Education. This will provide more free and reduced-price benefits for kids under the National School Lunch Program. In December, they were approved for their Medicaid application. This will also be applied to the next school year. They have received Interim Finance Committee approval to hire more people through the ART grant.

Ms. Tyson asked if the Medicaid application award meant Ms. Barton's organization could accept both applications to sign children up for school meals and Medicaid at the same time.

Steve Fisher clarified the similarity to using the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) application to determine if participants are eligible for Medicaid. Organizations can now use Medicaid status to determine eligibility for free or reduced school lunches.

Aging and Disability Services Division: Overview of Senior Programming

Jill Berntson gave her credentials as Deputy Administrator with ADSD. She has been in the Division for 22 years.

Ms. Berntson began the presentation by reviewing US Census data from 2015. The population of individuals in Nevada aged 60 years and older is 59,000, with a trend of increasing exponentially each year. Of that population, over 53,000 live below the FPL, an increase from 2014. Ms. Berntson provided an overview of congregate and home-delivered meal data. These programs are funded through the Older Americans Act (OAA). In federal fiscal year 2017 (FFY 17), \$1.6 million was available for congregate meals and \$4.1 million for home-delivered meals. Ms. Berntson explained that, at first glance, one might assume that congregate meals are served the most but receive the least amount of funds while home-delivered meals appear to be the opposite; however, this is not the case. While there are more people receiving meals at congregated sites, this is not a duplicated number. Seniors who go for a congregated meal might only attend once, while a person receiving a home-delivered meal can receive an ongoing meal five times a week until they are either institutionalized or pass away. In FFY16, an average of 50,000 congregate meals were served per month, while an average of 119,000 home-delivered meals were served per month.

Dr. Osgood asked if congregate meals are delivered once or multiple times per day.

Ms. Berntson clarified the congregate meal is served on-site and the home-delivered meal is served at the senior's home. Most of the congregate programs serve one meal per day.

Dr. Osgood asked if a large afternoon or dinner meal is served.

Ms. Berntson replied the meal is a dinner serving, but can be served at any time throughout the day.

Dr. Osgood asked if there is a gap based on the data, pointing to only 30% of the eligible population being served.

Ms. Berntson agreed. Even though 53,000 are eligible, only about 26,000 are either receiving a congregate or home-delivered meal.

Jodi Tyson mentioned the difficulty of identifying the number of impoverished seniors who are institutionalized or live with family.

Dr. Osgood asked if ADSD has data to determine the physical health of those utilizing these programs.

Ms. Berntson answered no. Surveys have been conducted to determine daily nutritional needs, but have not accessed specific health needs.

Dr. Osgood said he asked because Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) is trying to assess actual health status in their community health assessment. They have an extremely high disease burden. Lack of calories, proper nutrition, and exercise is a significant contributor to senior health burden. They are beginning to determine what tools can address the problem. He points to the trend of higher health care costs and predicts health institutions will not be able to catch up to the increasing cost unless the health burden is reduced.

Chuck Duarte recommended looking at a sample of Medicaid clients receiving benefits and then evaluating their claims data. Claims data might not be the best indicator of health status but some diagnostic information could shed light on disease burdens.

Dr. Osgood said that if the goal is to reduce the disease burden through improved nutrition, then collecting information on the disease burden would be helpful.

Ms. Berntson mentioned she may have national survey results that satisfy Dr. Osgood's request. She will send the information to Ms. Urban to distribute to the group.

Ms. Berntson then continued to discuss the importance of these services. She discussed the importance of addressing chronic diseases such as cardiovascular disease, high blood pressure, and diabetes. Seniors on a fixed income may not be able to purchase healthy foods such as fruits and vegetables, or have the resources to take care of grandchildren or pets living in their homes. Seniors also have limited access to food due to lack of transportation. They may not be able to go to the grocery store or to prepare the meal themselves. Ms. Berntson reviewed the cost of institutionalizing a senior in a home compared to having the senior stay in their own home. She mentioned lack of healthy food or inability to prepare food may lead to seniors being institutionalized.

Mr. Duarte asked if the state Medicaid agency has data reflecting the number of people residing in nursing facilities due to food insecurity.

Ms. Berntson said she does not have that data, but it would be helpful.

Ms. Berntson continued her presentation. ADSD is funded through OAA, Title III-C, and the Frail Elderly Waiver. Other programs funded through OAA include the transportation program, the homemaker program, and farmer's market coupons. Another program funded through ADSD is the Senior Companion Program, which provides isolated seniors with the assistance they need. The Frail Elderly Waiver helps prevent the likelihood of being institutionalized by providing help with bathing, eating, and dressing. This program currently serves 1,900 seniors; a waiting list does not exist for this program. Through collaboration with Mr. Fisher and DWSS, they have trained waiver staff to process SNAP applications. Looking forward, there is a budget enhancement request of \$750,000 each year in the biennium to fund home-delivered meals. Currently, Nevada is last in the nation for Meals on Wheels (MOW) meal reimbursement. A bill draft request is being proposed by Nevadans for a Common Good to allocate funds to ADSD to support home-delivered meals. Other states have different methods of funding senior nutrition. Nevada could consider providing home-delivered meals paid through the Frail Elderly Waiver. Dental care is also important for seniors but is not currently covered by Medicare. In some other states, nonprofit organizations partner with universities to provide dental care in senior care homes and community settings.

Mr. Duarte commented that Community Health Alliance is partnering with Renown to provide mobile dental services at the senior center in Sparks. He said there is a huge demand for services but not enough funding to close the gap.

Ms. Berntson concluded her presentation by mentioning providing one meal to seniors is not enough and expansion of programs is needed to provide more meals.

Dr. Osgood asked if Ms. Berntson has been in contact with anyone with the Southern Nevada Health District in the last few months since the completion of the community health assessment and the start of the improvement plan.

Ms. Berntson said no.

Dr. Osgood mentioned Adele Solomon is the coordinator of the assessment. He said there is a lot of synergy and crossover potential in Southern Nevada. He suggested Ms. Berntson reach out to Ms. Solomon to maximize program outreach.

Ms. Jamason asked Ms. Berntson what it will take for the Frail Elderly Waiver to include home-delivered meals in Nevada.

Ms. Berntson replied there will need to be an amendment to the waiver and funding to support the services.

Dr. Osgood said there is a website containing data and resources, healthysouthernnevada.org, that could interest Ms. Berntson in this endeavor.

Ms. Adler praised Ms. Berntson's staff for being proactive in community discussions and solutions. There are many challenges including food preferences, cost of food preparedness when a chef is only needed a few days in the week, and challenge of collaboration between neighboring cities.

Ms. Jamason commented on the cost savings of serving seniors who lack meal access in nursing homes versus serving them in their own homes. The additional funds from the savings could be utilized to address other risk areas.

Ms. McGill appreciates the link Ms. Berntson introduced between the importance of dental needs and nutrition. One barrier is the lack of providers who will accept Medicaid, with some states looking at mid-level providers to provide the needed services. What other states have found by looking at these mid-level providers was a decrease in costs at the dental offices.

Due to Sarah Keeney not responding, her presentation was pushed back.

Meals on Wheels Update

Barbara Paulsen presented the Meals on Wheels program (MOW). She is a member of Nevadans for the Common Good. They have two goals: to train and educate citizens in public life and to bring diverse people together in order to work toward the betterment of families and communities. The top priority for the group this year is home-delivered meals. Nutrition is very important in the maintenance of good health, preventing and delaying the progression of disease. Many seniors fall into these categories. MOW is invaluable in providing nutrition to these seniors on a daily basis but it also provides social contact. Many seniors on this program

participate for an extended period, for the rest of their life, or until they are institutionalized. The meal provided is invaluable in keeping the senior out of the hospital. Barbara recounts a study explaining most hospital readmissions occur due to social factors rather than medical factors. It is more cost effective to feed a senior once a day for a year than have them end up needing a hospital stay, even for one night. A waiting list for MOW in Southern Nevada was found to be 900 seniors. Providers have stated the need is much greater for home-delivered meals. Ms. Paulsen also mentioned the effect poor dental health has on overall health. Nevadans for the Common Good wants to bring attention to Nevada's 51st ranking in providing state funding to cover 50% of the costs of these types of programs. This lack of funding causes undue stress to the organizations providing these services, because they inevitably must scrounge the remaining funds from their limited budgets. The group is excited for the enhanced budget as a first step in increasing the availability of these programs. Funding for MOW at the federal level has not increased in many years. She also mentioned insufficient funding has caused a longer waiting list. This type of program is not one where people can afford to wait very long. A key objective for the group is to do anything possible to eliminate the waiting list.

Barriers and Solutions for Seniors Accessing SNAP

Sarah Keeney presented barriers and solutions for seniors accessing the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). MAZON is a nonprofit organization working to end hunger among people of all faiths and backgrounds in the United States and Israel. MAZON's initiative is to alleviate food insecurity and improve nutrition among low income seniors by reducing barriers for enrolling in SNAP. For SNAP, only 42% of eligible seniors participate in the program. Ms. Keeney summarized the common misconceptions that prevent seniors from applying for SNAP. She also proposed two main policies, the Elderly Simplified Application Project (ESAP) and Standard Medical Deductions. ESAP is a project dedicated to increasing elderly participation in SNAP by streamlining the application and certification process. ESAP would be targeted at elderly households with no earned income. The waiver would be granted for a period of five years, waiving the certification interview requirements for that time period, and extending the certification period for 36 months. Currently, seniors would recertify every 12 months in Nevada. ESAP utilizes a simple two-page application, reduces administrative and client burden, provides a longer certification period, and eliminates the need for a certification household interview. The Standard Medical Deductions improves access to SNAP for seniors. Seniors would be able to deduct any medical expenses over \$35 to lower their income level when applying for programs requiring certain income level eligibility. Certain states increased their medical deduction limit to \$90.

Ms. Adler asked about a pilot program allowing for ordering food online using SNAP benefits. This kind of service could help seniors tremendously.

Ms. Keeney said she did hear about this program but does not believe Nevada is part of the pilot.

Amy Hill mentioned Walmart has been involved in this pilot and affirmed that Nevada is not one of the states participating. There are currently 16 states involved, but they plan to involve other states.

Mr. Fisher said it was a funding opportunity from Food and Nutrition Services (FNS). Online retailers had to apply to participate in the pilot. Mr. Fisher was working with a company called Thrive Market, who applied but were not selected. Mr. Fisher will send the initial email to the group and keep everyone updated.

Mrs. Sandoval asked Ms. Keeney who to contact about the ESAP waiver.

Mr. Fisher said he will work with the regional FNS office to look into ESAP more.

Mrs. Sandoval asked Mr. Fisher about SNAP outreach targeting seniors.

Mr. Fisher explained the program is attempting to do a better job of accessing seniors by placing eligibility workers in places such as hospitals and utilizing community partners, such as food banks and farmer's markets, in helping to outreach to the senior population.

Ms. Jamason mentioned the Food Bank of Northern Nevada does outreach to seniors when delivering the commodity program as well as in senior centers on a regular basis in rural locations.

Ms. Keeney said many states are successful in identifying socially-connected seniors, such as visiting senior centers. The homebound seniors make up the majority of seniors who are eligible for programs but not participating. Innovative ways such as a gatekeeper program are needed to increase senior participation. A gatekeeper program trains volunteers from a community to act as a neighborhood watch to look out for seniors in their individual neighborhoods by helping them sign up for programs they are eligible for and could benefit from.

Jodi Tyson mentioned the Senior Share Program that Three Square Food Bank operates. Most of the agencies require seniors to travel to the agency for the brown bag food benefits; however, there are a few agencies traveling to the senior's house to drop off the food. The Senior Share Program is willing to initiate the application process on behalf of the senior when transportation is an issue. The American Association of Retired Persons advertises the call center number so seniors can call and receive assistance completing the application over the phone. Three Square has been successful in finding and assisting isolated seniors in mobile home parks. There are currently 55 senior mobile home parks, and Three Square possesses phone lists for all of them. This is also being done for low income senior housing. Three Square is now at the Social Security office, resulting in the highest month of enrollment during their first month at the new location. The Department of Motor Vehicles is another location at which the food bank wishes to have a presence.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if they collaborate with home health agencies such as therapists.

Ms. Keeney replied her organization had one agency that worked with home health agencies who contracted with individual employees. They were very surprised at the number of contracted employees who were eligible for the programs and did not know.

5. Report on and make recommendations regarding Action Plan survey results

Ms. Urban said it was requested at the last meeting to conduct a survey to identify potential work plan priorities for a 2017 annual Action Plan. The top priority was to adopt a policy to authorize Child Nutrition Programs, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs, and Women, Infants, and Children Programs to utilize all the available nutrition opportunities established by USDA.

Ms. Jamason asked if the responders knew what has already been done. She asked how the responses can be evaluated based on the work currently being done.

Ms. Urban responded by opening the issue to the Council to determine how to proceed. Some of the comments did suggest a need for clarification, definitions, and updates on statistics.

Ms. Jamason said just looking at SNAP participation numbers cannot determine proper conclusions due to various factors such as employment data. She wondered if it would be more useful to pull more data other than the action items and work plans to identify what really needs the council's focus, as well as identify the factors contributing to the lack of program utilization.

Ms. Adler said although it would be great to refine the data, too much analyzing can hinder the overall focus of the survey. She asked what the Action Plan for moving the priorities forward would be.

Ms. Jamason said there is an Action Plan that was created but not attached to the handout.

Mrs. Sandoval summarizes the previous comments to identify two points: more data is needed to determine what priorities have already been done and it needs to be determined what additional data is available to the council.

Ms. Jamason clarified the pitfall of using the excuse of needing more data to do nothing. Being selective and understanding a few of the factors could be useful. At the very least, understanding what the Action Plan looks like is important.

Ms. Adler wondered how this prioritization will translate to action. Even going back to the Action Plan of four years ago might have difficulties due to the structures of the present.

Mrs. Sandoval clarified that part of the survey was to determine what direction the Council wanted to go in the future.

Ms. Jamason points out that for the number one priority, additional data is not needed.

Ms. McGill agreed on reviewing the prior plan, finding out what has already been done, and then continuing forward.

Mrs. Sandoval agreed that data is still needed to identify which areas of the Action Plan are in danger of underutilization and which areas need to be tackled. She also cautioned looking at

priority number two more closely and determining if it deserves to be ranked second. Feeding children is important, but because of the substance of the priority it deserves to be second. Mrs. Sandoval points to the possibility of the survey responders not having access to the statistics and data of what the Council has already accomplished.

Ms. Jamason pointed to the fourth priority and clarified progress is already being made.

Mrs. Sandoval proposed the next step should be assessing what has already been done, what departments are already working on which priorities, and looking at in which areas the Council can take the lead.

Mrs. Sandoval proposed Ms. Urban research what is currently being added to these areas, what progress has been made as a Council, what progress each of the partners of the state have made, what areas the Council can support, and in what areas the Council can take a lead.

MRS. SANDOVAL ENTERTAINED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE ABOVE ACTION. A MOTION TO APPROVE WAS MADE BY CHERIE JAMASON. JIM BARBEE SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

6. Discuss and make recommendations on legislative priorities

Clark County School District Breakfast Program Pilot

Ms. Tyson clarified this bill was a product of an advocacy partnership between Three Square Food Bank and Food Bank of Northern Nevada. They brought the bill forward hoping to get support from the Council. She said the Breakfast Pilot Program has room for growth, aligning with earlier discussions. The pilot program also addresses the second ranked priority of the current Action Plan through SB503. At the time SB503 was being implemented, Three Square Food Bank was awarded a three-year grant with funds from the White House through Share our Strength. Share our Strength looks at the number of children on free or reduced lunch (FRL) who eat lunch as well as breakfast. The goal is to see 70% of children participating in lunch also eating breakfast. She explained they have increased participation from 40% to 56%. To reach the gold standard, Clark County would have to serve 90,000 breakfasts each day. The participation needs to be increased by eight or nine thousand children. This goal can be achieved by launching a pilot to lower the FRL state requirement threshold from 70% to 60%. There are 39 schools in Clark County hovering between 60-69% FRL. Together, Clark County School District and the food banks want to establish a pilot program to provide those schools with grant incentives to help with staffing and equipment. This would be for 25-27 of those original 39 schools, to determine if participation for breakfast would increase as well as increase county and state participation rates in breakfast. This one-year pilot program would take place in the third year of implementing SB503. The \$2 million the state authorized NDA to make available to school districts were not made available as leverage as part of the \$550,000 per year for the three years that Three Square has available. Three Square would have to cash match \$275,000 to get the remaining \$275,000 each year. The organization has been using General Fund for the first and second year. For year three, if they administer grants to the schools, Three Square can leverage that as match.

Ms. Tyson said the bill is labeled as SB82 and was submitted by Assemblyman James Oscarson. She spoke with the Governor's office and Mrs. Sandoval to see if it could have been worked into the Governor's recommended budget.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if there was a copy of the bill to view.

Ms. Tyson responded she did not have a copy of the bill because it is only a request (BDR) at this time.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if anything has gone to the Legislative Council Bureau.

Ms. Tyson answered it is on the state website but has not been drafted yet. Assemblyman James Oscarson was asked to hold onto the bill in case funding was included in the recommended budget.

Ms. Tyson said it would be helpful to have a letter of support from the Council, stating this program study would help identify a strategy for increasing federal nutrition program participation which is a shared priority.

Mrs. Sandoval said there was an understanding by the Legislature that funds for SB503 would only be provided for two years, and starting in the third year schools would be responsible for acquiring funds going forward. It was understood they would not ask for additional funding from the Legislature. Mrs. Sandoval said as a nonprofit, she would not feel comfortable asking the state to match a grant she applied for and is responsible for. She is concerned they would set a precedence in terms of using the funds specifically as a match for other nonprofits to not do the same thing.

Ms. Tyson said this is done often. She indicated many use state funds to help with 50% matches for federal grants.

Mrs. Sandoval clarified they use state funds, but would these funds specifically go to Three Square Food Bank? She then asked for clarification.

Ms. Tyson clarified yes.

Mrs. Sandoval stated most state funds cannot be used for federal match. She said she supports the implementation of the pilot but has serious concerns asking the Legislature for more money for one nonprofit organization.

Ms. Tyson said it would be listed as an appropriation request and she understands if the Council would like to remain neutral. The result would expand the pool of schools by expanding original legislation, increase the participation in those programs, and bring more federal funds to the state.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the school district would be making a fiscal contribution.

Ms. Tyson responded the schools will contribute the extra money needed to feed the children. She said they [Three Square] are not actually paying for the meals themselves. The school will be paying for the meals. She said not all the children will be reimbursed at the free rate. Part of the study is whether or not it is feasible for the schools to feed 40% of children that could be a reduced price or a paid price if they make the program free for everybody. They must come up with out of pocket expenses for the actual meals that are not fully covered by the reimbursement rate.

Mrs. Sandoval asked how the success of the program will be measured and about the counties' commitment to the program.

Ms. Tyson explained it is the food bank's goal to increase participation by 7,800 children a day, getting them closer to the gold standard of 90,000 breakfasts served each day across the [Clark] county.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the schools will be able to sustain the program after the pilot.

Ms. Tyson responded yes, pending the results of the pilot.

It was established this would not be changing the mandate of the state, it is a voluntary pilot program with the Clark County School District, who is ready and willing to participate. The authorization itself is not to reduce the threshold to 60%; it is to provide the needed funds. The understanding is the schools could go to 60% on their own, but if they do not have the support in terms of grants for equipment and extra labor then they would not be able to continue at the level of the Breakfast After the Bell (BATB) standard.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if this is an appropriation bill because a mandate change is not being requested.

Ms. Tyson responded yes. It is a pilot.

Mrs. Sandoval clarified a bill is not necessary for a pilot, so the bill is request for funding.

Ms. Jamason commented if the Council supported the pilot and recommended that Clark County School District make the match for one year, then schools could utilize their available resources. If the pilot is more successful than expected, then schools will be able to make a profit from what they originally put in the match. Clark County is a leverage for full state participation. Two years of funding has already been invested in Clark County's success. To have schools match the funding to increase participation makes sense.

Ms. Barton commented it is the school's food authority who receives the vendor reimbursements. They cannot use those federal reimbursements to make up the difference between a paid meal and a reduced meal. They must use another source to make up that difference since they are not allowed to use those funds. They can use the reimbursement funds to do program improvement. If they see this pilot as program improvement, then this would be an allowable use of the funds. There are 45 schools in Clark County this year with 60-69% FRL participation. Of those schools, two are Provision II schools and five are

Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) schools. Children in those schools are eating for free already. The schools' reimbursement for a Provision II school will depend on how many children are reduced in pay based on their base year. The school districts are already going to be making up that difference with those schools. As for CEP schools, if the number of 62.5% was not met, they must make up the difference with the paid meals. Districts know if they can get 62.5% participation, they will be able to feed all their kids for free and will be able to get the reimbursement back. Ms. Barton has not heard Clark County is fully committed in getting all their schools to participate. She has heard it will be up to the principals whether the schools will participate.

Ms. Tyson said Ms. Barton's last comment was true. They pulled 39 schools when they looked at the list. They pulled CEP and the provision schools that were already there. Schools such as behavioral schools and second chance schools were also pulled out due to not serving lunch of any kind, resulting in 32 schools. Rosanne Richards, Deputy/Head of Superintendent of Instruction and Principal is engaging the superintendents to conduct recruitment at the 25-27 schools. They have asked to get the draft list of 25-27 schools by the time the bill is implemented.

Ms. Barton commented she has the final update for BATB for the 2015-2016 school year. She said she will submit to Ms. Urban to redistribute after the meeting.

Mr. Duarte commented he is not comfortable endorsing a bill in which the details of the commitment from the Clark County School District has not been shared properly.

Mr. Barbee commented Council members were on the record saying they would not come back and ask for more money to address this issue. He admitted anyone can submit a bill and ask for the appropriation, but the Council should remain neutral during the process. Mr. Barbee asked if the School District is supportive of this, and if the schools are willing to identify other funds within the district.

Ms. Tyson responded no, the schools have not discussed identifying other funds. There have been other meetings regarding reorganization, and it has been discussed the program will cost more than they have anticipated and budgeted. She does not know where the district can get additional funds.

Ms. McGill asked what Three Square Food Bank has used for match in the past.

Ms. Tyson responded previous match funding came from the General Fund. They have funded the implementation of BATB at \$550,000 to-date. They are guaranteed \$275,000 if they can match the same amount. Last year, they had the option to use a little more money for billboards. This resulted in using \$285,000 from the General Fund this year.

Ms. McGill said she appreciates the sentiment of the pilot but believes it is important to stick to the Council's previous commitment of not asking for more money.

Ms. Adler commented she believes experience needs to drive future action. She said the Council could go back to the Legislature and explain that in order to feed more children and

maximize reimbursement, additional funds would be required. Ms. Adler's main concern is naming a single nonprofit in an appropriation request.

Ms. Jamason commented as a Council body, they support BATB. It would be great to hit the benchmark of school participation. There are a lot of factors to be considered, and she does not disagree with many things mentioned.

Ms. Tyson said she realized this was a long shot since no one else has brought a similar request to the Council meetings. It does seem there are many people who support identifying ways to maximize BATB by including more schools to help reach a better participation rate.

Mr. Duarte commented he is supportive of BATB and improving the participation rate. However, the school districts should exhaust all resources before coming to the state to request additional funds. This was the understanding he had with the original bill. To go forward with the pilot without knowing what the school districts have done to attempt to fund the pilot does not sit well with him.

Ms. Tyson clarified Three Square approached the school districts to determine what is needed to reach the grant goal. The school districts did not approach Three Square in an effort to get more funds.

Mr. Barbee commented one way the Council can help is to send out a statement encouraging all school districts to look for creative ways to increase participation in BATB beyond the mandate on their own.

Mrs. Sandoval asked what would be the response if the Legislature asked why Washoe County is not getting assistance similar to what is being asked by Three Square Food Bank for Clark County.

Ms. Tyson said it would be Clark County has the greatest impact on the state's participation rate. Clark County also has the highest number of schools between 60-70% FRL participation and the highest operational costs.

Ms. Barton said there are 26 schools between 60-69% FRL participation, not including Clark County, within seven other school districts.

Ms. Tyson commented they would have to get seven additional schools to satisfy the pilot.

Mrs. Sandoval commented as a Council they can approach the seven other counties to see if they are interested in participating.

Ms. Tyson asked if she should amend the recommendation to follow Mr. Barbee's suggestion in making the general statement of the Council's support for the schools to expand the program.

David Weaver commented the Council represents the entire state and not just a segment of the state, even though Clark County is the most populous area and drives the majority of

participation numbers. If the bill goes to appropriation, it needs to read as the state of Nevada and all its components. As a Council member and as an individual, David Weaver cannot agree with the current agenda item.

Mr. Barbee referenced the second ranked Action Plan activity as a way to have the Council support Three Square's effort in presenting the bill to the Legislature.

Ms. Jamason asked if Mr. Barbee supports the bill's intent, just not the fiscal component.

Mr. Barbee clarified he does not support the portion where the Council would renege on their word and ask for more money for Three Square Food Bank. He would like all schools to participate in a similar pilot to increase statewide school participation. He suggested utilizing statements mentioned earlier and the second ranked Action Plan activity as proof the Council supports school districts increasing their participation.

Ms. Tyson said she appreciated the Council's support of the goal to increase Nevada's participation in federal nutritional food programs.

Senior Food and Meal Systems Study

Ms. Tyson commented there are many systems and programs involved in senior nutrition which are unknown to the organizations administering the programs. In Nye County, the cost per meal is \$12 per senior. The cost is high due to lack of proper storage and inability to order food in small batches, from companies like US Foods, a week at a time. If the Council prioritizes strategies addressing challenges communities face with seniors, then they could find ways to achieve long-term success, but they need immediate relief. Director Whitley would like to dedicate funds to conduct a study to identify strategies and assess the need among Nevada's seniors. Assemblyman Thompson is ready to submit his bill. Leadership would like to see the study completed by April 1, 2018 to make recommendations to the Legislative Committee on Health Care. The policy recommendations developed could be included in community priorities for the 2019 legislative session. The food banks see this as an opportunity for an actual study with recommendations that are programmatic, but also policy-oriented. Ms. Tyson clarified the study will be taking place and invited feedback, and said that a vote was not necessary.

Ms. Liveratti asked about the purpose of the bill if Director Whitley already has funding available.

Ms. Tyson clarified there was a bill created in the last legislative session to review the reimbursement rates and ensure access. Those recommendations were asked to be submitted to the Legislative Committee on Health Care. The current bill directs DHHS to provide the policy recommendations from the study to the legislative committee in the interim, so the committee can prioritize those bills in the next session.

Ms. Liveratti asked if legislation would earmark some things they want the study to cover.

Ms. Tyson replied yes, it is listed on the third page of the brief. It would connect the layers of federal nutrition programs with clear policy recommendations.

Beth Handler and Cynthia Routh Smith stand in front of the council.

Ms. Handler clarified on behalf of Director Whitley, there are funds available via a Request for Proposal (RFP). It will be an open process and not an earmark for a legislative bill. The RFP for the study will be issued in the coming months.

Ms. Smith commented it is in the ADSD proposed legislative budget, the \$750,000 to go out to bid after the final budget has been approved.

Ms. Tyson commented Director Whitley said this would be under SNAP discretionary funds because part of the strategy is to increase senior SNAP participation. Director Whitley is not thinking this is part of the competitive funds from the Tobacco Settlement Fund.

Ms. Handler commented both herself and Ms. Smith were asked to be at the meeting to clarify the RFP will be forthcoming in the next month. This could also be an opportunity for the pilot.

Ms. Cody Phinney commented part of the perceived benefit of the legislation was to move forward with the food security piece the Department was trying to knit together and to solidify the demand for the information.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the \$750,000 Ms. Berntson spoke about earlier was the same \$750,000 being discussed now.

Ms. Berntson replied the \$750,000 she spoke about was for home-delivered meals.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if this was a bill draft.

Ms. Berntson replied no, it is in the budget enhancement.

Ms. Smith and Ms. Handler clarified the \$750,000 RFP is potentially for the MOW Program and whatever else is applied for.

Mrs. Sandoval asks for clarification that there is a study completely separate from the \$750,000.

Ms. Smith answered funds for the study will come from SNAP according to Ms. Tyson.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if this is more in conjunction with the Senior Nutrition Bill.

Cynthia Routh Smith answered she does not know and referred her to Jill Berntson.

Ms. Berntson clarified the Senior Nutrition Bill brought forth by Nevadans for the Common Good is a request to make an appropriation to ADSD to increase funding for home-delivered meals.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if that included the \$750,000.

Ms. Berntson replied no.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if it was a different appropriation.

Ms. Berntson replied yes.

Ms. Berntson confirmed the \$750,000 she mentioned earlier is an enhancement in the ADSD budget. She clarified it is not for the Senior Nutrition Bill.

Mrs. Sandoval summarized the last few minutes of conversation: there will be a bill asking to have the study done and the funds have already been set aside for the study to occur.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the Office of Food Security is the appointed body that will conduct the study.

Ms. Phinney said it was her understanding the OFS would oversee the study.

Ms. Liveratti asked if Ms. Tyson knew how much the study would cost.

Ms. Tyson said Director Whitley did not have a specific amount in mind, he just assured them he can do it and will do it. Ms. Tyson asked Ms. Phinney if she also got the same impression.

Ms. Phinney said it was her understanding that the \$750,000 figure came from something different, and was not associated with this study. She does not have a specific number to present toward the cost of the proposed study. She will be glad to obtain the appropriate estimate. The \$750,000 number was not mentioned in relation to the discussion she was part of.

Senior Nutrition Bill

Barbara Paulsen presented on the Senior Nutrition Bill. She mentioned the bill centered on the home-delivered meal program. The bill is requesting two things: 1) a mechanism or formula for states to establish their funding which will ensure a certain amount of money per meal can be set aside to stay within range to provide reasonable support to match federal funding for the program; and 2) to provide funding for the home delivered meal program. Currently, there is a waiting list for this program. There was a large convention in Las Vegas last spring to discuss all the issues and to invite legislators to respond. Approximately 1,500 members attended, as well as 25 public officials. During the summer, communication with interim committees led to the Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans, and Adults with Special Needs designating a BDR. BDR-152 recommends the state appropriate money to cover costs for programs which are not covered by the federal government. Specific wording has not yet been established, but the Council will be notified with updates. The BDR has gained support in Southern Nevada, specifically through a program provider in Henderson who has formed a team to submit a resolution to the Henderson city council supporting this BDR. Three member institutions from Boulder City will present a resolution on January 24.

The goal for this year is to meet with every legislator from Southern Nevada before the Legislative session begins. Various issues are being considered, though establishing more funding for the home-delivered meals program is the top concern. Although the \$750,000 going to ADSD is a start, it is nowhere near enough to reduce the waiting list for the home-delivered meals program. The bill is requesting a mechanism for sustainable funding through the appropriation of \$5 million. Ms. Paulsen would appreciate the Council's support.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the money would be distributed statewide.

Ms. Paulsen confirmed the funding would be distributed statewide, including all rural and urban providers.

Ms. Liveratti asked how Ms. Paulsen arrived at the five million dollar figure.

Ms. Paulsen responded the funding would be across a biennium, and is an increase in reimbursement per meal. Additional funding would fill the gap for home delivered meals and would eliminate the waiting list. Depending on level, cost per meal would stay the same as long as extra staff and equipment were not required. After a certain level, any new meals would be full price.

Ms. Liveratti commented she supports the home-delivered meal programs but does not believe \$5 million is a realistic number. She feels more information from a study can point to what the appropriate funding request should be.

Ms. Paulsen commented when looking at the whole state budget, \$5 million is not that much to help vulnerable seniors in danger of being institutionalized, which would cost the state more money.

Ms. Tyson stated the reimbursement amounts that go to senior programs is \$2.20 for congregate meals and \$2.65 for home-delivered meals. For a comparison, children's meals are \$3.30. There is an issue in terms of parity since meals for children are only being delivered to one location whereas home-delivered meals would be delivered to various homes resulting in a higher cost per meal; therefore, a need exists for immediate relief. Some providers fear they might have to shut down their organizations due to low funding, especially if the county will not help them with the extra operational costs. Ms. Tyson asked if the waiting list was primarily in Clark County or if it exists in Northern Nevada as well.

Ms. Paulsen responded the waiting list consists of seniors living in Henderson, Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas.

Ms. Tyson commented the reason Washoe County does not have a waiting list is because the county looks at the funds for indigenous and homeless individuals and includes vulnerable seniors. This is not the process in Clark County. This is an opportunity for further discussion on county comparisons to find long term strategies for combating senior food insecurity.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the request is a one-time request.

Ms. Paulsen responded it is for immediate use. However, a mechanism needs to exist to review the reimbursement amounts, possibly every few years in order to ensure costs keep up with levels of inflation.

Mrs. Sandoval asked how the \$5 million will be sustainable after the biennium.

Ms. Paulsen explained the second part of the request is to put a mechanism in place to look at future funding.

Ms. Jamason asked Ms. Berntson if the \$750,000 would offset this proposal.

Ms. Berntson replied it is separate.

Ms. Jamason asked what will be done with the \$750,000. Will it be used to purchase meals or used toward reimbursement rate increases?

Ms. Berntson said they will need to look at how the funding formula is constructed, and it will go out through the competitive bidding process every two years.

Ms. Jamason asked if Ms. Berntson is considering increasing the reimbursement rate across the state.

Ms. Berntson replied yes.

Ms. Jamason supposed the funds are not necessary for new clients but are intended to ensure existing programs are not in jeopardy.

Jill Berntson replied they will attempt both goals since the intent is to address the waiting list as well.

Ms. Jamason asked Ms. Paulsen what is she asking of the Council.

Ms. Paulsen replied for the Council to demonstrate support for the concept that the state needs to increase its level of funding on a perennial basis for this important program.

Mrs. Sandoval supposed Ms. Paulsen wants support, not necessarily for the legislation, but the concept.

Ms. Paulsen replied yes, if the Council can support the concept it would help them in their proposal of addressing the need for program funding and sustainability.

Mrs. Sandoval supposed the perennial fund amount is not determined because a formula needs to be created.

Ms. Paulsen confirmed Mrs. Sandoval's supposition.

CHERIE JAMASON ENTERTAINED AND MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE AND SUPPORT LOOKING AT THE REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR THE MEAL PROGRAMS FOR SENIORS. CHUCK DUARTE SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

- 7. Make recommendation for Chuck Duarte to fill position of “member representing community-based services (Northern Nevada).”**

This item came after agenda item 12

Mrs. Sandoval commented the Council needs to move the area Chuck Duarte is representing to a member representing community-based services to Northern Nevada.

MS. JAMASON MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION FOR CHUCK DUARTE TO FILL THE POSITION OF MEMBER REPRESENTING COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES IN NORTHERN NEVADA. MS. ADLER SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

- 8. Make recommendation for Robert Herdzik to fill position of “member representing non-food manufacturing or business.”**

Mrs. Sandoval commented the Council needs to vote whether to fill the position of “member representing non-food manufacturing or business” with the recommendation of Robert Herdzik. Robert Herdzik was considered because he implements the Homeless Management Information System, a statewide database used to track homelessness, but is also used widely among nonprofits to collect data.

MRS. SANDOVAL ENTERTAINED A MOTION TO APPROVE ROBERT HERDZIK TO FILL THE POSITION OF MEMBER REPRESENTING NON-FOOD MANUFACTURING OR BUSINESS. A MOTION TO APPROVE WAS MADE BY MS. LIVERATTI. MS. MCGILL SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

- 9. Make recommendation for Aurora Buffington to fill position of member representing University of Nevada Cooperative Extension.”**

Mrs. Sandoval commented the Council needs to vote whether to fill the position of member representing University of Nevada Cooperative Extension with the recommendation of Aurora Buffington.

A MOTION TO APPROVE WAS MADE BY CHERIE JAMASON. MS. PHINNEY SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

NO TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ALLOWED FOR THIS AGENDA ITEM.

10. Report on and make recommendations regarding consideration of new appointees for the vacant positions of:

-One member representing community-based services (Southern Nevada)

-One member representing the executive administration in the gaming and hospitality industries

Mrs. Sandoval asked the Council if they had any recommendations for the two vacant positions. She mentioned a community-based organization no longer represented was Boys and Girls Club and asked if the Council would like to view it as one of the recommendations. Mrs. Sandoval also asked if the Council would like to consider an executive in the gaming and hospitality industries located in rural Nevada.

Ms. Jamason asked if research can be done.

Mrs. Sandoval commented research can be conducted, and any results should be sent to Ms. Urban to be ready for the next meeting.

11. Follow-up discussion and make recommendations for commemoration of Senator Debbie Smith's work regarding nutrition programs and anti-poverty policies.

Ms. Urban referred the Council to look into the packet for a one page document outlining the recommendations the Council came up with last meeting.

Mrs. Sandoval commented the Council would do a remembrance acknowledgement bill during the legislative session.

Ms. Jamason recommended Sparks Marina due to its high population. She asked if Rotary Centennial Park was the one at Idlewild.

Mrs. Sandoval responded yes.

Ms. Jamason said both are populated by the most people in the list.

Mrs. Sandoval asked if the Council wanted to vote on a fruit tree and a bench or get one item only rather than both, and which did they want to choose.

Ms. Jamason commented the Council can do two fruit trees and two benches if the Council wishes. She commented Debbie Smith did amazing work and deserves at least a bench and a tree.

MRS. SANDOVAL ENTERTAINED A MOTION TO PLACE A BENCH AND A FRUIT TREE, POSSIBLY TWO, AND LOOK AT SPARKS MARINA OR ROTARY CENTENNIEL PARK AS POSSIBLE LOCATIONS. A MOTION TO APPROVE WAS MADE BY MS. ADLER. CHERIE JAMASON SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

MRS. SANDOVAL ENTERTAINED A MOTION TO DRAFT A REMEMBRANCE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT BILL DURING THE 2017 LEGISLATIVE SESSION. A MOTION TO APPROVE WAS MADE BY JODI TYSON. CODY PHINNEY SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITHOUT PUBLIC COMMENT.

12. Identify new areas of focus and create any subcommittees

This item came after agenda item 6

Ms. Jamason commented that a great deal was spoken about seniors' needs and asked if this was a significant interest of the Council.

Mrs. Sandoval said she called for the overview of senior programs because it seemed the Council needed to be educated on what was being offered. She said the request for Ms. Urban to collect more data will help determine where the next focus areas will be for the Council. She said they need more information before they decide, which is why she did not feel they had to address item 12 today.

13. Public Comment

No public comment was given.

14. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

No closing remarks were given.

Mrs. Sandoval adjourned the meeting at 4:49pm.