

Food Bank of Northern Nevada

Collaborative grant with CCNN and FBNN Prescription Pantry program

Jenny Yeager – Director of Programs at the Food Bank of Northern Nevada.

For public comment –

- First off, I'd like to thank the full GMAC, as well as the Wellness subcommittee and the state staff for allowing us the opportunity to apply for these funds, and we recognize the challenges involved when you have two times more requests than you have funds to allocate. We know that this is not easy, and we thank you for the work that goes into making this happen and for your recommendation to fund our applications.
- For several funding cycles now, the challenge between funding applications based on score, vs. funding to assure statewide coverage has posed problems and confusion and we are asking that the Wellness subcommittee review and revise their bi-laws, in an effort to make the funding priorities clear. When 30% cuts are made to a proposal's budget, we hope that there is consideration given to the scope of work on that project. Awarded proposals scored high, because their scope of work is comprehensive, they meet the objectives of the grant, and they show the ability to improve food security while clearly articulating the collaboration that was required in the RFA. When you cut an agency ask by 30%, it's important to understand that the things that you found compelling in that application may have to change, in order to absorb that type of reduction in funding. We ask that the committee to consider funding in line with the bi-laws. Funding the highest scoring proposals well, better serves the food insecure clients throughout our state. In addition, it is clear from the asset map provided that if the top 3 applications were funded vs. the top 4, all counties in Nevada would be supported and only a slight budget reduction would be required, a reduction of 6.3% vs. 30%. In addition, we would ask that the motion that was made to allocate any leftover funds to the 5th scoring application be reconsidered. Again, if there were funds leftover, and if the bi-laws are followed, those funds should be allocated back to the top scoring proposal. We would also ask that if the subcommittee is going to make a standard cut across the board, then that be clearly articulated in the RFA, so that organizations who are applying are aware of how funding decisions will be applied.
- Secondly, we are asking that the methodology that is used to score the applications be reviewed as well. Our application received the second highest score, receiving two 98's and one 63. As an agency, it's difficult to understand how to improve future applications when you see a 35 point swing from one reviewer, without indication why? We are asking that the rubric or ranking system be reviewed by state staff, to assure that all reviewers are following the same methodology when reviewing each proposal.
- We would also like to ask that the committee consider the impact that a proposal has on the counties being served when making funding recommendations and consider the extent to which other resources may or may not be available, especially when looking at the needs of our rural and frontier counties.



FOOD BANK
OF NORTHERN NEVADA