

Draft Minutes of the Wednesday, March 24, 2021

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)

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

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

Wednesday, March 24, 2021, 1:00 p.m.

Meeting Video/Teleconference Information:

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

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

I. Call to Order

(Welcome, Roll Call, Announcements) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was called to order at 1:09 pm by Connie Lucido. Ms. Lucido took roll call and established the attendance of the NOFO evaluators.

Evaluators Present:

Laura Urban
Adrienne De Lucci
Shirley Trummell
Amber Bosket
Diane Thorkildson
Lisa Torres

Also Present:

Connie Lucido
Cyndee Joncas

II. Public Comment #1

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

There was no public comment.

III. February 26, 2020 Meeting Minutes – Review and Approve

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Revision - Laura Urban should be included as present as an evaluator.

Ms. Urban expanded on her comment regarding the Food Bank partnership. It is likely that Catholic Charities is partnering with more agencies through their partnership with the Northern Nevada Food Bank.

Diane Thorkildson moved to approve as amended, seconded by Lisa Torres. The motion passed unanimously.

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

(Discussion, Information) Office of Food Security

The workgroup resumed proposal evaluation.

Proposal 12:	Northern Nevada Dream Center
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or ‘pros’ that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Adrienne – partnerships with local growers, quarterly nutrition education workshops and enrollment in other nutrition programs, using own data base to collect data,</p> <p>Laura – good collaboration with Food Bank of Northern Nevada, have access to food truck, including food from local greenhouse project</p> <p>Amber – comprehensive program, achievable plan, large reach, high hopes of strengthening the program, variety of types of food being distributed strong attribute, included 3 clear MOUs.</p>
Now, let’s chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Amber – came in on low side considering amount of money asked for and number of meals produced</p> <p>Laura – needed more details on food sources, how much food can be obtained from the greenhouse project? Needed more detail for the program referrals.</p> <p>Diane – is this a different applicant than Food Bank?</p> <p>Adrienne – how are connections with partners made?</p>
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<p>Amber – overall cost of food seems low, good that info re: pending items was included.</p> <p>Adrienne – no concerns</p>
Changing gears, let’s move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is	<p>Adrienne – gave a general overview of the project, some details were missing</p> <p>Laura – would have liked to see more quantifiable outcomes and indicators</p> <p>Amber – seemed more comprehensive than other proposals</p>

comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	What is meant by 'informal and supportive partnerships'? How much food can be obtained from the greenhouse project? How to augment the food budget to remain sustainable?

Proposal 13:	Nye Communities Coalition
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	Diane – serving some of the most remote counties in the State, have a complete list of MOUs and community partners, good that they are leveraging the use of Vista and AmeriCorps volunteers Lisa – agrees
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	Shirley – budget is not 50% allocated to food Diane – also noted that
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	Diane – food expenditure does not meet 50% threshold Lisa – budget good overall other than percentage issue Shirley – agrees Laura – provided both year one and year two budgets
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	Diane – scope detailed and one of the better ones, included outputs and outcomes Lisa – comprehensive goals and outcomes Shirley - agrees
Last one! Are there any questions that you would	No questions

like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	
---	--

Proposal 14:	Reno Food Systems
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Diane – creative activities with gleaning and connecting with grass-roots community level food acquisitions</p> <p>Shirley – good to have creative, thinking outside the box, ways to get food to people</p> <p>Laura – good that the applicant is purchasing the food which helps to create a strong, resilient food system and support local farmers and the local food economy</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Lisa - how many served, accomplishments and success not addressed well</p> <p>Diane – not sure of relationships with partners, infrastructure, how many people served, food budget not 50%</p> <p>Laura – talked about leveraging partners, not clear how</p>
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<p>Laura - seems applicable and sufficient</p> <p>Lisa – no concerns with the budget</p>
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	<p>? - Scope – scope missing details</p> <p>Laura – could have been more quantifiable</p> <p>Lisa – agrees – evaluation is quarterly reports, more detail and information re: how data would be collected would be good</p> <p>Shirley – agrees – no specific info on how many people would be served</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>How many people will be served?</p> <p>Describe data system.</p>

Proposal 15:	Three Square Food Bank
Abstract:	

Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Shirley – developing additional partners in first and second years, going into places that need the help.</p> <p>Diane – helping small rural food pantries build physical infrastructure, serving rural frontier, inclusion of tribal communities</p> <p>Lisa – equipment valuable to smaller entities to store food</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Lisa – may be duplication</p> <p>Shirley – many other agencies getting food from Three Square</p> <p>Diane – during final discussion the overlapping areas will be considered</p>
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<p>Lisa – no issues</p> <p>Diane – none</p> <p>Shirley - none</p>
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	<p>Diane – does not include much detail, includes required elements but evaluation tools not specific enough</p> <p>Lisa – scope gives the essential information but not much detail re: quarterly reports, need better tools to evaluate success</p> <p>Shirley – goal says going to 8 areas but everywhere else says 6, distributing to 12 unclear if that means after adding partners</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>Are there duplication of services?</p> <p>Areas of service?</p>

Proposal 16:	University of Nevada Reno
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are	<p>Laura – good that have staff, expanding on existing program, collaboration with local food sources, had data system in place</p> <p>Amber – reaches rural areas</p> <p>Adrienne – agrees, good project for providing services to the rural areas, well qualified, good description of the program</p>

associated with the project.	
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Laura – backpack program may not be the best process to address food insecurity, referral piece not detailed enough, ages served unclear, integrated food system not expanded not enough information</p> <p>Amber – does not serve all ages, MOUs and collaborative partnerships not included, not easy to assess reach and factors such as cost per meal, total number of meals</p>
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<p>Amber – other funding sources purposes not listed on budget summary, items B and C are blank, cost per meal data not provided,</p>
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	<p>Laura – data points are missing, evaluation measures are included</p> <p>Amber – details that were included were adequate, age groups not specified</p> <p>Adrienne – evaluation tools were helpful but scope was too general</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>What ages are served? How will all age groups be served?</p> <p>How many meals will be served?</p> <p>What areas will be reached?</p>

Proposal 17:	Washoe County Human Services
Abstract:	
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Amber – clear objectives, scope seemed achievable with , serves all ages and vulnerable populations, strong collaborations in place, almost 100% of funding goes to food purchases, has support elsewhere to keep proposal going, outcomes clear, education includes how to grow food, education through partnerships, information was comprehensive enough</p> <p>Laura – collaboration, infrastructure in place for referral system, provide nutrition education opportunities by a registered nurse, data collection system in place, application was organized</p> <p>Adrienne – strong community partnerships and who was responsible for what, partnership with local grower, questions were answered with clear information</p>

<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p>Laura – length of time to put together a local garden</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	<p>Amber – fantastic budget in terms of how money will be spent on food purchases, cost per meal in line, spot on in terms of achievability, detailed in budget summary (other funding sources) Adrienne – budget fell in line with narrative</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.</p>	<p>Adrienne – provided enough indicator information Amber – program is clear enough the proposal could be handed to another person and they could achieve it</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>How long does it take to construct a community garden? Donated land and program implementation timeline? Are non-profit partners involved in land donation? Cross-over with Reno Food Systems application? Same land being used?</p>

V. Public Comment #2

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

There were no public comments.

VI. Additional Announcements and Adjournment

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was adjourned at 2:22 p.m.

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