

FY14-15 Request for Applications (RFA)

Children's Trust Fund (CTF), Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN), Social Services Block Grant (Title XX)

Department of Health and Human Services - Grants Management Unit - Recommendations

- 1 Up to \$500,000 in Title XX funds should be withdrawn from the competitive process in order to address specific, high-priority needs. These include the following.
 - Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) adaptive resources project, which generates a federal match of \$4 for every \$1 spent.
 - Aging and Disability Services strategic plan updates, as directed by the Legislature.
 - Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) outreach activities.
- 2 All remaining Title XX funds should be used to support programs for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect. In addition to the \$724,679 in CTF funds listed in the RFA, DHHS should bring in \$102,155 from the CTF reserve to ensure adequate funding.
- 3 Funding should be awarded according to scores/ranking. Average scores in each category were:
 - Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect - 82
 - Respite Care - 83
 - Independent Living - 75
 - Positive Behavior Support - 68 (one proposal)
 - Health Access - 55
 - Hunger - Increase Access Points - 54
 - Hunger - One-Stop Shops - 59
 - In the first three program areas where applicants tended to score higher, awards should be made to those with scores of 75 and higher.
 - In Positive Behavior Support, the one proposal should receive the available FHN amount.
 - In the last three program areas where applicants tended to score lower, awards should be made to those with scores of 54 and higher.
- 4 To the extent possible, a consistent formula should be used to award funds. To stay within available funding levels, some variations would have to occur. Any impact in these situations would be to the lowest scoring applicants. Existing grantees proposing to continue existing programs but scoring less than 90 points should receive a somewhat more generous percentage of available funds than new applicants with similar scores. This establishes a more level playing field since existing grantees absorbed multiple funding cuts during recent grant cycles.

Existing grantees --

 - Scores 90+ receive 100% of FY14 request or 110% of FY13 award, whichever is less.
 - Scores 80 to 89 receive 100% of FY14 request or 100% of FY13 award, whichever is less.
 - Scores 75 to 79 receive 100% of FY14 request or 90% of FY13 award, whichever is less.
 - Scores 65 to 74 receive 100% of FY14 request or 80% of FY13 award, whichever is less.
 - Scores 54 to 64 receive 100% of FY14 request or 70% of FY13 award, whichever is less

New grantees --

 - Scores 90 + receive 100% of FY14 request
 - Scores 80 to 89 receive 90% of FY14 request
 - Scores 75 to 79 receive 80% of FY14 request
 - Scores 65 to 74 receive 70% of FY14 request
 - Scores 54 to 64 receive 60% of FY14 request

DHHS GMU - Recommendations - Continued

Following are summaries of how this formula would alter GMAC Subcommittee recommendations.

- In the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect category, additional programs would be funded but only six of 20 awards would be for the requested amount. In comparison, the subcommittee recommended fully funding 16 programs.
- In Respite Care, six existing grantees would be funded, mostly at FY13 levels. A seventh new applicant would receive about 77% funding instead of the 80% listed in the funding formula. In comparison, the subcommittee recommended higher awards for the first six and a slightly lower award for the seventh.
- In Independent Living, two lower-scoring applicants would be eliminated, three would receive less than the subcommittee recommended, and two would remain the same.
- In Health Access, two higher-scoring applicants passed over by the subcommittee would receive awards and three lower-scoring applicants would be eliminated. In general, award amounts would be lower than the subcommittee recommended.

5 Two options are possible for Hunger One-Stop Shops, which may require variation from ranking.

- Option 1 -- Award funds to every applicant scoring 54 or higher, regardless of geographic area. Insufficient funds are currently available to apply the funding formula described here. DHHS would have to submit a work program to the Interim Finance Committee to bring in an additional \$291,641 from the FHN reserve. This option would place 44% of the funds in Urban Washoe County, 27% in Urban Clark County, and 29% in rural counties.
- Option 2 -- Award funds based on both score and geography. According to the RFA, "The expectation is to fund between two and five collaborative projects in Washoe and Clark Counties and approximately three rural projects." Applying the funding formula described here would leave a balance of \$34,338, which could be used to partially address a shortfall in the Hunger Increase Access Points category. This option would place 39% of the funds in Urban Washoe County, 35% in Urban Clark, and 26% in rural counties.
- Note the following three factors also affect recommendations for this category.
 - Food Bank of Northern Nevada has said that 39% of the requested funds would support services in Carson, Lyon and Mineral counties and 61% would support services in Washoe County. However, the proposal cannot be dissected because the components are inter-dependent.
 - The Family Resource Center of Northeast Nevada (FRCNEN) carries a per-person cost of \$1,057 which is higher than any other funding request by an extremely wide margin. DHHS recommends an award that comes closer to the average per-person funding request by rural programs rather than a percentage based on score.
 - The subcommittee passed over Nye Community Coalition (NCC) because it appeared that this area would be served by the Consumer Credit Counseling project in Urban Clark County. Staff further analyzed this applicant's proposal and budget, and it does not appear that there are provisions for active outreach in Nye County. DHHS recommendations would add NCC to the award list.