

**Department of Health and Human Services
Director's Office, Grants Management Unit**

**Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)
GMAC Subcommittee Meeting – Wellness
April 27, 2015**

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting Locations (Videoconferenced)

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

Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD), Early Intervention Services
1020 Ruby Vista Drive, Suite 102, Elko NV

ADSD Early Intervention Services
3811 W Charleston, Suite 112, Las Vegas NV

Subcommittee Members Present (None Absent)

Deborah Campbell
Jeff Fontaine
Dan Musgrove

Others Present

Laurie Olson, Chief, Grants Management Unit (GMU)
Laura Adair, Pat Petrie, Rique Robb, Connie Ronning, Cindy Smith, and Gloria Sulhoff, DHHS, GMU
Melissa Aguirre, Communities in Schools
Audrey Arnold, United Labor Agency of Nevada (ULAN)
Ann Barron, Senior Center of Boulder City
Marcia Blake, James Seastrand Helping Hands
Scott Cooksley, Anne Schiller and Peter Vogel, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada
Dawn Davis, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
Kellie Gonzales, Family Resource Center of Northeastern Nevada
Michele Johnson, Financial Guidance Center
Cynthia Radley and Dan Williams, Three Square
Dana Serrata, Helping Hands of Vegas Valley

I. Call to Order, Welcome and Announcements

Laurie Olson, Chief of the Grants Management Unit in the Department of Health and Human Services, Director's Office, introduced herself and called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM. Roll call was taken and a quorum was confirmed. During roll call, the subcommittee members disclosed their affiliations to determine potential conflicts of interest with the applicant organizations. Deborah Campbell, a public affairs, government relations and philanthropy strategy consultant, has no relationships with any of the applicants. Jeff Fontaine, in his position at the Nevada Association of Counties, has relationships with a few of the applicants in that he represents the counties, but did not foresee any conflict of interest. Dan Musgrove, a government affairs consultant, advocates for Medicaid dollars but not on behalf of any of

the applicants. The subcommittee members agreed that none of the disclosures represented a conflict of interest.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Election of Wellness Subcommittee Chair

Ms. Olson called for nominations for a Chair to lead the subcommittee. In addition to this responsibility, the Chair will present the subcommittee's recommendations to the full Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) at its meeting on May 14, 2015. Mr. Musgrove stated that his schedule was busy during the legislative session, and supposed that Mr. Fontaine's was, as well. He suggested that Ms. Campbell might be best suited to take on this role.

- Dan Musgrove nominated Deborah Campbell for the office of Subcommittee Chair. The nomination was seconded by Jeff Fontaine. Ms. Campbell accepted the nomination, and there being no further comments or discussion, the nomination carried unanimously.

IV. Review of Wellness Proposals

A. Introduction of Recommendation Process

Ms. Olson reviewed the goals of the Request for Applications (RFA) to seek proposals from strong organizations that are mission-driven and goal oriented, with programs that address the mission and goals of the Department and service delivery models that address the whole individual. She pointed out differences in the RFA procedure from previous cycles, including a preliminary review of the applications by the GMU staff, and the elimination of any interaction between applicants and evaluators during the review process. The subcommittee can ask questions of GMU staff, discuss score variances between members, and submit score adjustments. Any adjustments to scores will be used to recalculate the rankings of the proposals. Questions regarding scope of work may be directed to GMU staff to address during negotiations. She reminded the members that this was first and foremost a competitive process, with scores based on merit, not geography. They cannot skip over higher scoring applications to fund lower scoring applications for any reason, including geography; and any budget reductions must be based on a formula that takes scores into account, with no arbitrary or random budget cuts.

B. Discussion of Proposals

Subcommittee Chair Deborah Campbell thanked the staff for providing input, the completeness of the review packets, and providing the average rankings by geography, which she found to be very helpful. Mr. Fontaine echoed her appreciation, stating that the review process keeps getting better and has made their jobs a lot easier. Ms. Campbell shared her past experience in reviewing proposals and was excited about the work staff did looking at outcomes. She led a review of the grant applications as listed on the spreadsheet which ranked them by average GMAC score. The members discussed each proposal; the following comments and concerns were noted.

- Senior Center of Boulder City: Ms. Campbell stated that earlier, she neglected to disclose that she knows the executive director. She wondered if there would be a gap in services for this population if the program isn't funded. Ms. Olson shared the history of the hunger one-stops, adding that the Senior Center started the program less than two years ago, and that any organization not funded will leave a gap somewhere. The applications were scored on merit, not geography, and funding recommendations should be based on scores. Mr. Fontaine noted that

while the senior center serves seniors, a distinct segment with needs across the state, other applications were more broad-based and comprehensive in their services. There were also concerns with leveraging of funds.

- Helping Hands of Vegas Valley: Organizational strength not as high as some; met only minimum requirement of spending 50% of grant award on food. Some outcomes need more work.
- Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada: Concerns over leveraging of funds and outcomes; descriptions of board and staff scored low.
- Family Resource Centers of Northeastern Nevada: Concerns measuring outcomes; met only the minimum requirement for purchasing food; fluid strategic plan.
- East Valley Family Services: Good outcome statement but would like to see more on how they track outcomes. Does not meet minimum requirement of 50% of funds used for food. They propose to spend 39% of the grant award towards food, the remainder to come from other programs. Ms. Olson stated as a current grantee, they are using Temporary Food Assistance Program (TFAP) funds to help meet this requirement. However, for the purposes of the current RFA, it is not appropriate to let them do this and not others. If the subcommittee decides to recommend them for funding, staff will work with them during negotiations to rearrange the budget so that 50% of the funds are used for food. The GMU reviewers had also noted that this would need to be revisited during the budget process; it was not justification for disqualification.
- NyE Communities Coalition: Scored high by all subcommittee members; no concerns.
- Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada: Ms. Olson explained that the FY15 grant amount of \$792,952 shown on the scoring spreadsheet represented their grant award of \$320,000 combined with grant funds from their primary partner, Community Services Agency. Because CSA is no longer participating in the food security project, she assigned all funds from both agencies to CCNN. Scored high by all members; no concerns.
- Consumer Credit Counseling Service: Scored high overall. It was noted that client follow-up is a challenge.

C. Adjustment of Scores

Having completed their reviews, Ms. Olson asked if there were any scoring adjustments. There being none, the meeting continued without interruption to agenda item V.

V. GMAC Discussion of Funding Options

Ms. Olson acknowledged that the subcommittee had tough decisions to make. She reviewed the parameters of the funding recommendation process. While geography is a concern, this is a competitive process and the highest scores should be funded first. There is no shortage of need throughout the State, but there is not enough money to fund everything, which would require \$1.75 million more than what is available. Recommendations cannot skip over higher scores to fund lower scores. Any budget reductions must be based on scores and not arbitrary. Because of the short time frame in which the subcommittee has to develop recommendations, GMU staff ran some numbers in advance using various funding scenarios. Several approaches were considered; the three on the funding options spreadsheet were the best, but none are perfect. The PCAN Subcommittee decided on Option 2, and the Disability Services Subcommittee chose Option 1.

- Option 1 funds the highest scoring applications at the amount requested until the money runs out. What is left can stay on the table or be awarded to the next highest scoring applicant.
- Option 2 attempts to bring in the next tier of proposals. To accomplish this, every program has to reduce its budget, sometimes severely. More programs are funded, but the reductions will

require proportional cuts in the number of people served. A very low grant award may not be reasonable because administrative costs to manage the grant may outweigh the benefit.

- Option 3 attempts to establish standard award amounts based on scores. The amounts are not based on a formula; just what works in each category. The goal of this approach was to try to even up the amount of funds each grantee would receive. A major flaw is that a lower scoring applicant requesting less than the standard amount may get fully funded while higher scoring applications requesting more than the standard amount would take a cut.
- On the second spreadsheet, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada's funding options were broken down into two allotments to show the distribution by geographic area. They were the only applicant proposing to cover a much larger area, Washoe and a vast number of rural counties. Separating the proposal in this manner would only change the funding amount if the subcommittee chose Option 3.
- Another option was considered, based on what the grantees are currently receiving, but there is one applicant who is not a current grantee, and one of the applicants, Helping Hands, is a food pantry only, so funding at the same level would not allow them to expand to a one-stop.

Mr. Musgrove preferred Option 1, which rewards the best proposals, over Option 2, which penalizes higher scoring applicants in order to include lower scoring ones. Mr. Fontaine commented that Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada's high request confounds the allocations and wondered if they could even run the program with so great a reduction. Ms. Olson advised the subcommittee members that they could offer the lower amount, and if declined, offer it to the next highest scoring applicant, but when the budget is cut even 10 or 20%, much less 50%, the scope of work needs to be cut, too.

Mr. Fontaine pointed out that CCSN was asking for the most, but ranked in the bottom third, eight points below the next highest score. He supported Option 1, which has five of eight applicants fully funded, with \$128,569 remaining.

The members were in agreement that Option 3 was not on the table. Because funding recommendations are based on merit, they felt justified in recommending full funding under Option 1. If CCSN had asked for a more modest amount, there might have been another option, but trying to fit them in, with their lower score, was too big a stretch. Ms. Campbell recapped that the reviewers scored the proposals based on merit, all three reviewers were aligned with the scores, and no one adjusted their scores. All three subcommittee members stated their agreement with Option 1.

Before making a motion to fully fund the top five applicants, Mr. Musgrove questioned how to handle the surplus of \$128,569 and \$50,000 in Food Security reserve. Ms. Olson stated that the \$50,000 has been designated by the Department Director to remain in reserve so it is not available for award recommendations by this subcommittee. She offered a few suggestions on how they might treat the \$128,569 balance, such as dividing it equally between the five funded programs, or performing a mid-year review of utilization of funds and allocating it at that time.

- Mr. Musgrove motioned to recommend full funding for the five top-scoring applicants: Consumer Credit Counseling, \$355,971; Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada, \$988,178; NyE Communities Coalition, \$167,472; East Valley Family Services, \$323,381; and Family Resource Centers of NE Nevada, \$286,429. The motion was seconded Mr. Fontaine, and with no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed.

- Mr. Fontaine motioned to recommend that the \$128,569 in unobligated funds remain in reserve, and to direct staff to present recommendations to GMAC in December regarding allocations to grantees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Musgrove, and there being no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed.

VI. Public Comment

- Dana Serrata, Executive Director of Helping Hands of Vegas Valley, shared her concern that an application progressed in the process when it didn't meet the requirements. She said this led to reduced funding for other applicants.

VII. Adjournment

- Mr. Musgrove motioned to adjourn. Mr. Fontaine seconded the motion, and thanked Ms. Campbell for leading the subcommittee. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.