

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) Wellness Subcommittee Meeting**

May 1, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Approved May 25, 2017

Meeting Location: Teleconferenced

Public Access Location: Department of Health and Human Services, Family Program Office Conference Room, 4126 Technology Way, Carson City NV 89706

Subcommittee Members Present

Diane Thorkildson, Subcommittee Chair
Jeff Bargerhuff
Dan Wold

DHHS Staff Present

Cindy Smith, Chief, Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG), DHHS
Gary Gobelman, Crystal Johnson, Julieta Mendoza, Marci Mueller, Pat Petrie, Gloria Sulhoff, OCPG DHHS

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions, and Roll Call

Subcommittee Chair Diane Thorkildson called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM. Cindy Smith, OCPG Chief, took roll call. All subcommittee members were present on the call, confirming a quorum.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Discussion: SFY18-19 RFA Grant Applications

Introduction

Cindy Smith thanked the OCPG staff for their help, and the GMAC for their hard work evaluating the applications. All the applications in the Wellness category were well written and because they all scored within fifteen points of each other, it was difficult to come up with options for funding.

Explanation of Grant Solicitation Process and Review

Pat Petrie, OCPG program manager for FHN Wellness (Hunger), reviewed the program requirements outlined in the RFA. The Department was looking for programs with collaborative components and case management services to identify client barriers to self-sufficiency, in addition to providing nutritious food. The hunger program was developed as an offshoot of the Governor's Council on Food Security, and incorporates the Council's strategic plan and focus. This was the second RFA issued for the hunger programs that included the holistic approach to serving clients by either providing resources or referrals to meet the additional needs of the client.

Discussion and Review of Proposals

Cindy Smith stated the purpose of the meeting was to review the scores and determine funding recommendations for the hunger grant proposals. She described two funding scenarios that were prepared for the subcommittee's consideration. "Option 1" awards the full amount of requested funds

to the top scoring grantees until funds are exhausted. "Option 2" would allow more programs to be funded, but at 23% of their request. The 23% was chosen based on how the numbers worked out. This option results in a remaining balance of \$14,000, which could be dispersed evenly among the awardees. The two options were offered for consideration, but subcommittee members were welcome to suggest alternative funding options. Ms. Smith noted that it was difficult to determine the geographic allocation of funds. Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada is based in Washoe County, but serves all rural counties except Clark. It was difficult to determine what portion of their budget would serve the rural counties.

Ms. Thorkildson commented that Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada's (CCNN) proposal identified the program as statewide, but included no mention of collaboration with the food bank or other programs in the rural north or rural south. She wondered if there are competing programs. Mr. Bargerhuff also questioned whether there was duplication of services. Catholic Charities did not give a specific breakdown of the counties served, outside of Washoe and Carson City. He gave them the benefit of the doubt, but would like to have a listing of their collaborative partners, by county, at the time of award. Ms. Thorkildson said it was clear CCNN has many partners, but the other applicants representing counties served by CCNN did not mention how they work together, and CCNN made no mention of the other applicants as partners. Ms. Smith asked Mr. Petrie to discuss collaborative efforts between the applicants.

Mr. Petrie's responded in terms of collaboration between the current grantees. The CCNN program serves the majority of counties in Nevada. They have collaborated with the FRC of Northeastern Nevada on other projects, but not in this program. When asked whether there were data to demonstrate if the programs are duplicative, Mr. Petrie responded that they are not. These two programs may serve some of the same areas, but not at the same time, or the same clients. Just because CCNN is in a county with someone else doesn't mean they are serving the same folks, though there could be some overlap.

Dan Wold noted that, between the two top scoring applicants, the entire state is being covered to some extent.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

Ms. Thorkildson interrupted the discussion to cover the disclosure of conflicts of interest among the subcommittee members, which was inadvertently passed over earlier in this agenda item.

Jeff Bargerhuff, Dan Wold and Diane Thorkildson all confirmed they had no conflicts with any of the applicants.

Resumption of Discussion

Ms. Thorkildson asked for suggestions on how to allocate funding.

Mr. Bargerhuff felt all the proposals were good, but the budgets and available funding make allocations difficult. He was ok with either option one or two, and did not have another option to put on the table.

Mr. Wold did not have another option, either, but asked if the little bit the other three get in Option 2 would be worth taking away from the others. He tended toward the first option.

Mr. Bargerhuff noted that Option 1 only allows the rural counties 3% of available funds and that for some of these applicants, this is lifeboat funding. Option 2 would at least give them some funding; for

that reason, he was leaning toward Option 2. Mr. Wold thanked him for that viewpoint, adding that they all met the minimum score and should get something. Ms. Thorkildson agreed, adding that they all spent time prior to the meeting trying to make the money work. She was comfortable with the 23% reduction.
Adjustment of Scores – none

IV. Action Item: Grant Award Recommendations

Having come to a consensus, Ms. Thorkildson called for a vote on the grant award recommendations.

- Jeff Bargerhuff moved to recommend Funding Option 2 for the programs as presented in the “FY18-19 Hunger One-Stop Shop Proposals, Ranked by Score within Geographic Areas” document (Attachment A), with the remaining funds dispersed evenly among the six applicants. The motion was seconded by Dan Wold. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Announcements

Ms. Smith reviewed the next steps in the recommendation process. The subcommittee’s recommendations will be distributed to the GMAC, applicants and stakeholders by May 17. The full GMAC is scheduled to meet on May 25, at which time this subcommittee will present its recommendations for approval by the GMAC.

VI. Public Comment

- Peter Vogel, CEO of Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada, stated that his program service area does not fit the geographical categories perfectly, but it would be appropriate to identify it in two categories: 58% of their current grant is rural, and 42% is Washoe County. Regarding the 3% going to the rurals in Option 1, that percentage would increase because 58% of his grant would be serving the rurals.
- Michele Johnson, CEO of Community Counseling Center of Southern Nevada dba Financial Guidance Center, offered a comment regarding funding Option 2. If she understands correctly, this option provides equal percentages of funding to all awardees regardless of the scores, making the scores irrelevant and even unnecessary. She also commented on the overall geographical distribution of funds; under Option 2, Clark County, with 80% of the state’s population, would receive only 37% of the funding. Even considering the higher cost of rural services, it doesn’t seem as equitable as it could be.
- Stacy Smith, NyE Communities Coalition, referring to comments made by Catholic Charities and Community Counseling Center regarding the percentage of funding going to the rurals, stated that her organization has the relationships and systems in place so that if funded, they would be serving some of the rural areas covered by those two organizations. This might allow the rurals to absorb some of that funding back.

Mr. Bargerhuff, responding to public comment, stated that he considers many small urban communities, such as Mesquite and Laughlin in Clark County, to be geographically more “rural” than “urban” and this would add to the percentage of funds going to the rurals.

He added that, in terms of scoring, there is the aggregate score, but there’s also the score in terms of meeting the minimum. The reviewers evaluated effectiveness and reach, the number of clients served, and cost effectiveness. They looked at the holistic services that Mr. Petrie talked about. The scoring

criteria were utilized, and scoring was important in determining the applicants being recommended for an award. They are all great organizations with great people, but unfortunately we can't fund everyone at 100%. He understands that Clark County has the greatest population, but the subcommittee had to look at this holistically at the state level. He lives in Clark and understands the comment.

- Peter Vogel, CCSN, readdressed the subcommittee to state that in his opinion, Option 1 is a more honest reflection. He did the math on how his program serves the state: 769,000 goes to the rurals; 682,000 to Clark County, and 647,000 to Washoe County. He also expressed disappointment that everyone would be getting funded the same percentage; historically, that is not how it's been.

VII. Adjournment

Having concluded all business, Ms. Thorkildson adjourned the meeting at 9:32 AM.