

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)
Fund for Healthy Nevada Wellness Committee**

Draft Meeting Minutes February 26, 2019 at 1:00 PM

Meeting Locations

Division of Health and Human Services, 4150 Technology Way, Room 303, Carson City NV 89706
Division of Public and Behavioral Health, 4220 S. Maryland Pkwy, Building D Suite 810, Las Vegas NV 89119

Members Present

Diane Thorkildson
Dan Wold
Shirley Trummel

Members Absent

None

Department Staff Present

Connie Lucido, Chief, Cathy Council, Lori Follett, Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG), DHHS Director's Office.

Others Present

Fernando Serrano, GMAC Member
Jenny Yeager, Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Laura Urban, Office of Food Security
Marie Baxter, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada
Sandy Wallace, Food Bank of Northern Nevada

I. Call to Order

Diane Thorkildson, chair, called the Fund for Healthy Nevada, Wellness Committee meeting to order at 1:00PM. Ms. Thorkildson took roll call and a quorum was confirmed.

II. Public Comment #1

None

III. Discussion of 2020-2021 Grant Award Request for Application(RFA) Reviews

Shirley Trummel opened the discussion asking if the funding cycle for this Request for Application (RFA) was one or two years?

- Ms. Thorkildson responded that it is a two-year funding cycle. Dan Wold referenced the requested grant amounts on the [scoring sheet](#) page that was passed out, stating he sees at the bottom of the spreadsheet the total grant amount for two-years is \$4-million, and the total grant requested amount is over \$8-million. Ms. Thorkildson confirmed that is correct. Ms. Thorkildson suggested they could look at indirect costs to try to start reducing the amounts requested, going line item by line item.
- Mr. Wold stated remembering last meeting they suggested they partially fund some requests to make room for a couple of the smaller requests but the bylaws state we must go fund by the highest ranked and go down the list that way. Mr. Wold added they also need to try to cover the

stated geographically, if the top two ranked grantees are in the north that doesn't benefit the south. Ms. Thorkildson responded she does remember the last meeting and the bylaws issue, asked staff if they have recommendations. Lori Follett responded she understands the ranking system however she should fund Clark County, she must be able to justify they have served as many citizens of the state as possible. Ms. Follett added the RFA (Request for Applications) does state that 50% of the budget must be allotted to food and there are a few that are off, so we can start looking at that to trim the upper tier. Ms. Follett added the staff can look back at grantees that have requested equipment in the last two-years and are asking for equipment again, and that would be a good place to start.

- Mr. Wold responded that those are great points and he agrees, and he looked through the applications two or three times but couldn't find the percentages stating how much was for food. Mr. Wold asked Ms. Follett if she knew which applicants did not request 50% of food?
- Ms. Follett responded they didn't state the percentages, but she looked at what the figure they were requesting for food and compared to their total amount and was able to tell it wasn't at least 50% that way. Ms. Thorkildson agreed and added if we tried to split the difference and hold to the bylaws as well as trying to cover everyone geographically, asked if Catholic Charities covered every county except Clark?
- Mr. Wold responded they go as far as Tonopah but not Southern.
- Ms. Thorkildson stated that Food Bank of Northern Nevada serves just in Reno and they were very specific on their application that they are a separate program from pantries covered by Catholic Community Services application.
- Ms. Follett stated that is correct and the Food Bank of Northern Nevada institutes the prescription food program which is very specific on their duties, Catholic Charities does incorporate some of the food bank within their application and that is to not duplicate services.
- Ms. Thorkildson stated Money Management covers Clark County.
- Mr. Wold asked if Three Square does as well, Ms. Follett responded they do and, they cover some rural areas as well. Mr. Wold added if you look at Three Square they are requesting \$806,165 and Catholic Charities is requesting 2.86 million.
- Ms. Follett wanted to add that Catholic Charities absorbed the grant awarded to Elko last grant cycle which that service is included. Ms. Thorkildson asked if that figure is in addition the FY19 award amount of \$918,620, Ms. Follett responded yes so, their total amount was around 1.2 million.
- Mr. Wold stated there is a large drop in the first four applicants as opposed to the last four. Ms. Thorkildson asked if he meant in terms of score or in terms of funds requested, Mr. Wold responded in terms of score, however if you look at the top four ranked applicants the total being requested is around \$5 million, but they would geographically cover the whole state. Ms. Thorkildson stated they would just have to figure out how to trim \$1 million of those funds requested, in which Mr. Wold agreed.
- Ms. Trummell asked regarding the top four, Catholic Charities covers most counties in exception of a few rural counties and Money Management only covers Clark County if she is correct? Ms. Thorkildson asked if they cover southern Nye county as well?

- Ms. Follet responded she doesn't see anything stating Money Management covers any other counties besides Clark County. Ms. Thorkildson stated she is trying to calculate what percentage each group would need to be funded if they funded all four top ranked applicants, Mr. Wold responded approximately 80% across the board but he isn't sure if we are able to do that. Ms. Thorkildson stated she did the math and at 80% for the top four that would put them at \$2.5 million which is still over.

Ms. Thorkildson asked staff if the bylaws say they must fund the top ranked until funds run out, but the grant rules say we must serve the whole state, how do we handle that? Cathy Council responded depending on how the RFA (Request for Application) was stated, we don't have to fund the top we can fund at whatever percentage for each if that is best, it only depends on what the RFA says.

Ms. Thorkildson stated she recalls having the same conversation previously and the bylaws being in contradiction to the RFA and it sounds like we are in the same place. Ms. Thorkildson asked if they should fund 75% of the top four ranked requested amounts. Ms. Trummell asked if we must use all funds for the top ranked first or can they try to fund only a percentage of what the top ranked is requesting?

Ms. Thorkildson stated that is what was attempted last time, but it was determined to go against the bylaws, and they must fund from top to bottom until funds run out. Ms. Trummell responded if that is true then wouldn't they stop at the top and fund 100% of the top ranked applicants request. Ms. Thorkildson stated that is the question.

- Ms. Follett stated they also must look at what was requested in the budget and do they agree with how the funds are being spent. Ms. Follett added if they felt the funds could be trimmed down if they go line by line to evaluate if those funds would be spent better elsewhere, that is also an option. Ms. Thorkildson stated she didn't bring all the budgets with her, Ms. Follet responded she brought them, but wasn't sure if Ms. Trummell and Mr. Wold had copies at this time.
- Ms. Trummell stated she had them with her. Ms. Thorkildson asked if they would like to go line by line today, Mr. Wold responded he wouldn't mind doing that because the if they did it the other way than 3.4 million would go to northern Nevada which is not efficient.
- Ms. Lucido commented she believes there is some work to be done to the bylaws since this has been an issue in the last two cycles, to make the best decision she thinks this should be addressed in the future.
- Ms. Follett stated she believes Director Whitley would concur to serve as much of the state as possible.

Ms. Thorkildson stated they will start going line item by line item, starting with Catholic Charities they are requesting a total of 1.4 million.

- Ms. Thorkildson continued starting with administrative costs, they are proposing to staff a Program Director, a lead Social Worker, an assistant Case Manager, an Outreach Lead Case Manager, a Rural Assistant Case Manager, a Campus Receptionist, a Homeless Services Coordinator, a Director of Reimbursements, and a new position for a Nutrition Educator which not all these positions are full time and there are several positions that say TBD (To Be

Determined). Ms. Thorkildson stated they could look at direct service employees and not administrative positions, even though she understands the need for administration to run agencies, but they are having to make some tough decisions.

- Mr. Wold commented he agrees and their personnel is costing around \$400,000. Ms. Thorkildson stated the Director of Reimbursements, the Receptionist, the Social Services Program Director positions may be indirect. Mr. Wold commented the salary states \$20,000 but they are only requesting \$6,500 so he isn't sure if the rest is being picked up in another way. Mr. Wold continued when looking at the Director position, the salary is \$64,000 plus the additional 26% benefits but they are only requesting \$24,000.
- Ms. Thorkildson responded it is not an Full Time Employee (FTE), so the rest must be covered by another source. Ms. Thorkildson stated there is five positions that are completely out of the grant and a few that are partially out, asked do we want to recommend reducing personnel cost by cutting the positions that appear more administrative?
 - Mr. Wold stated it would be a start.
 - Ms. Trummell asked if they did go through with that wouldn't we have to do that to all grantees to be fair and would that even be able to be done. Ms. Thorkildson stated yes at this time if they are consistent and are trying to work within the bylaws and the RFA. Ms. Thorkildson stated if they are going forward with not funding the indirect personnel costs for the positions of Social Service Director, Receptionists, and the Director of Reimbursements that would cut \$38,722 which is not much of the total need to cut but it's a start.
 - Mr. Wold stated there is almost \$50,000 being requested for travel and training. Ms. Follett stated to keep in mind that travel on this request does service outlying areas.
 - Ms. Thorkildson responded she was looking at travel to conferences, not mileage reimbursement or travel for direct service.
 - Ms. Follett responded the travel for conference total is about \$2,000
 - Ms. Thorkildson asked if they can agree to eliminate the travel to conferences, Mr. Wold and Ms. Trummell agreed. Ms. Thorkildson continued they have requested \$30,000 for a van to travel to the rural and frontier communities, which she agrees makes sense but is that something the State can purchase.
 - Ms. Lucido responded that is also a current question in another grant as well. Ms. Thorkildson asked if they would have an answer during this meeting, Ms. Lucido replied no they will not.
 - Ms. Follett mentioned there is operating costs right above the van request as well.
 - Ms. Thorkildson stated going back to the operating costs, \$60,000 is being requested for Feeding the Families annual holiday event, \$1,200 for office supplies, and \$4,100 for rent etc.
 - Ms. Trummell asked if that \$60,000 goes for food and wouldn't we have to keep that since 50% of the grant must cover food.
 - Ms. Thorkildson responded there will be more food listed in their budget but yes, she agrees. Ms. Thorkildson asked if they should leave that \$60,000

for the holiday event and staff will verify that it is to cover food costs. No Objections. Ms. Thorkildson stated moving on to the office supplies and rent funds request, she noted that Catholic Charities did put in an 8% indirect rate which she believes these items are indirect. Ms. Thorkildson asked if they should leave these expenses or take them out.

- Mr. Wold responded he knows they will need to print and answer phones, Ms. Thorkildson responded she would recommend asking such expenditures be made from the 8% indirect cost allowance. Ms. Thorkildson asked if they would agree, Mr. Wold and Ms. Trummell agreed.

Mr. Wold discussed that with as far as they have gotten into the budget so far, we have only eliminated \$46,000 out of \$2,863,000. Mr. Wold added with the total grants being requested is almost \$6 million and their total to award is only \$4 million, about a third will have to be cut from the applicant's budgets and will we have enough funds to cut out of these budgets.

Ms. Thorkildson stated if they did go line by line item it would take many hours, but another option is to set some universal reductions and direct staff where to take those reductions. Ms. Thorkildson elaborated that each top applicant would be reduced by 30% in the indirect areas.

- Ms. Trummell agreed and referenced Ms. Follett's idea about looking back at previous grantees to see if anyone is requesting equipment that has already received equipment and those can possibly be eliminated. Ms. Trummell asked since we don't know if we can purchase a van for Catholic Charities she would assume it has never been done in the past. Ms. Follett responded not to her knowledge it has not.
- Ms. Thorkildson asked for agreement on if they do the math and look at funding the top four ranked applicants which would cover the entire state at 70-75% of their requests, would that work and not put them over budget still. After a moment of silence and calculating, Ms. Thorkildson stated at 70% for each of the top four, this would put them at \$26,000 over the \$2 million limit.

IV. Approve Grant Award Recommendations

- Ms. Thorkildson asked for agreement on the recommendation to fund the top four applicants (Catholic Charities, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, Three Square, and Money Management) at 70% because they were the top four scoring applicants and cover the entire state geographically. Mr. Wold made the motion. Ms. Trummell seconded the motion. The motion carried through unopposed.
- Ms. Thorkildson asked where we should direct staff to start making budget reductions first. Ms. Trummell asked if we make the cuts and the amount cuts total more than the \$26,000 target, will the extra funds go to fund the 5th top scoring applicant. Ms. Thorkildson stated she wasn't sure if there would be left over funds since the 30% brings the amount down to the total pot. Ms. Follett stated she thinks Ms. Trummell is stating the cuts they want the staff to make in addition to the 30% may bring the total down below 2 million. Ms. Trummell confirmed since when they were going line by line previously and they had already found \$46,000 to eliminate, if there is money left over will it go to the next top scored. Ms. Thorkildson stated if there are funds left over then yes it would go to the next top ranked. Mr. Wold agreed. Ms. Thorkildson

asked for a motion. Ms. Trummell motioned if there is money left over will it go to the next top scored. Mr. Wold seconded the motion. The motion carried through unopposed.

- Mr. Wold motioned that the committee propose funding the top four at approximately 70% with the department staff going back to decide where to make the cuts. Ms. Trummell seconded the motion. The motion carried through unopposed.
- Ms. Trummell motioned that if there are any funds left over after the staff makes those cuts they will go to the next top ranked applicant. Mr. Wold seconded the motion. The motion was carried through unopposed.
- Ms. Thorkildson asked which categories would we like to direct staff to make budget reductions in first. Ms. Trummell stated if there are personnel that are not FTE. Mr. Wold stated the indirect costs that are outside of their 8% allowance. Ms. Thorkildson wanted to add travel that is not direct service travel, and the equipment Ms. Follett stated they could look back on. Ms. Trummell agreed. Ms. Follett stated she would consider that. Ms. Thorkildson wanted to recommend the sub-contractors have also listed indirect costs and those could be looked at. Mr. Wold and Ms. Trummell agreed. Ms. Trummell asked when cutting any positions that are not FTE, what will the policy be for the subcontractors. Ms. Thorkildson responded she believes they will follow the same ruled. Ms. Trummell responded the reason for her question is if you go to FISH's budget it talks about personnel and their case manager is only 25%. Ms. Follett stated she believes that is the pantry manager. Ms. Trummell stated she understood and asked if they are looking to eliminate the subcontractor's personnel that are not FTE. Ms. Follett responded that they may need more information on that to find out if these employees are providing a direct service to the client, adding in the rural areas they may have multiple positions. Ms. Trummell stated she agrees. Ms. Thorkildson asked if Mr. Wold found this reasonable. Mr. Wold responded that he does find that reasonable.

Ms. Thorkildson asked for a motion to direct staff to look at funding direct services such as personnel that relates to direct service as opposed to administrative services, travel not related to direct services, equipment purchases that have been funded previously, and looking at subcontractors to be sure they are only being funded for direct services as well. Mr. Wold made the motion. Ms. Trummell seconded the motion. The motion carried through unopposed. Ms. Trummell commented if there is money left over she would like to see the same rules apply to any other grants that are looked at. Ms. Thorkildson asked for a motion in that effect. Ms. Trummell motioned if there is money left over that any other grants that are considered to receive funds must follow the same rules as the others that are funded. Mr. Wold seconded the motion. The motion was carried through unopposed. Ms. Follett stated she wanted to make sure they are saying that the other applications will be looked at the same and mentioned a subcontractor listed on a different application and should staff question that. Ms. Thorkildson responded she would agree with that and asked for comment from the committee. Mr. Wold agreed. Ms. Trummell asked when the recommendation is made is it still up to the GMAC to implement that. Ms. Thorkildson stated that is correct and then after that it will go to the Director for finalization. Ms. Trummell asked if there is a spot at the GMAC meeting for the applicants to negotiate their cases. Ms. Thorkildson responded that there will be time for public comment but there is a grievance process they should go through if they are unhappy with what was finalized. Ms. Thorkildson stated the GMAC meeting is set for March 14th at 9:00 am and asked if there were any further comments from the committee, there was no response.

V. Public Comment #2

Las Vegas – None.

Carson City –

- Marie Baxter, CEO of Catholic Charities, wanted to make a comment that she hopes they will consider not cutting the same percentage across the board because it will cut funds for food, and they provide food to most of rural Nevada. Ms. Baxter added they are roughly serving 15,000 people a month currently which comes to about \$2.76 per person per month.
- Sandy Wallace, Grants Manager for the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, stated she also helped write the grant proposal for Catholic Charities since they are collaboration. Ms. Wallace stated she has been a grant writer for twenty years in Nevada and she wants to recommend they consider funding the top three ranked grants instead of cutting that percentage across the board. Ms. Wallace added the math was wrong and would like to have seen examination of impact per grantee. Ms. Wallace added that she understands there has been much turnover in the State positions but this was one of the worst RFAs she has read with grammar errors, spelling areas, and was very unclear. Ms. Wallace stated she appreciates the want to modify the bylaws but believes it is very important to be as clear as possible with the expectations they have for applicants since they will be analyzed in these meetings.

VI. Additional Announcements and Adjournment

Ms. Thorkildson moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wold seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned without opposition at 2:22 P.M.