

Shambarger, Erick

From: sydney.turner@usda.gov
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 2:41 PM
To: Shambarger, Erick
Cc: Bohdziewicz, Joanna
Subject: Review Package for Proposal 2023-12471 Submitted to USDA\NIFA

December 12, 2023
Program: Compost and Food Waste Reduction
Proposal Number: 2023-12471
Proposal Title: FEED MKE Pilot Project

Erick Shambarger
Department of Administration
CITY OF MILWAUKEE
200 E. Wells St., Rm 606
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3559

Dear Erick Shambarger,

Congratulations on being recommended to receive an award from the 2023 Composting and Food Waste Reduction Program (CFWR).

Your proposal, in response to USDA-NRCS-NHQ-CFWR-23-NOFO0001235 on Grants.gov, has been tentatively approved for funding. In partnership with USDA's Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production (OUAIP), the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) will be managing the FY23 CFWR awards over the course of their periods of performance. This partnership will enhance cross-agency support for awardees and allow for interagency data collection and strategic collaboration of composting and food loss and waste issues at the national level.

As such, NIFA processes and systems will be utilized throughout the project life cycle while OUAIP will provide technical support to recipients. Please read this notice carefully to comply with all NIFA requirements and procedures in order to ensure an efficient pre-award period and the successful implementation of your project.

Award recommendations are an embargoed process; therefore, please keep this information confidential. No social media posts or other public releases of this award, until the USDA Secretary makes the official announcement. Once the Secretary announces, you will receive an email and then you can make your own public statements

The award is not official until a letter is sent from our Awards Management Division. We will contact you if there are any further budget changes.

DUPLICATION OF FUNDING

If this proposal was submitted to another agency and has not yet been funded, we need documentation that the proposal has been withdrawn. If the proposal was declined by another agency, please send a copy of the notification. If you are accepting an award from another agency, please send a letter withdrawing this proposal.

If this proposal is not original work and or is inappropriately duplicative of or overlapping with other work supported by USDA, please email both Sean Potts at Sean.Potts@usda.gov and Lydia Kaume at lydia.kaume@usda.gov declining the

award and withdrawing this proposal.

PROJECT INITIATION: REEport SYSTEM

The REEport database is an inventory of agricultural research maintained by USDA-NIFA. The database is widely used to describe research focus and to evaluate success by the federal, state, local and private sectors. Careful, clear and concise reporting, including well thought-out impact statements, is very important. USDA will use your annual reports to monitor and evaluate progress, in addition to informing Congress, the scientific community, and the public. Your award will be posted on the NIFA Web site, with a direct link to REEport submissions (initial, annual, termination).

In order for us to finalize the Recommended Award Data for your grant proposal, you must submit a Project Initiation form using REEport (Research, Education, & Extension Project Online Reporting Tool). You should have already received an email notification from the REEport System alerting you that a new project initiation form is available for editing. REEport can be accessed through the NIFA Reporting Portal at <http://portal.nifa.usda.gov> (make sure to sign in using the email address you associated with your project proposal in grants.gov).

Reeport project initiation is a 2 -step process:

Step 1: Identify a contact person even if it is yourself

Step 2: initiate the project

TIPS FOR COMPLETING THE PROJECT INITIATION.

Include all FTEs that support the project, regardless of source of funding.

Under classification tab, your project is 100% Extension.

ALL CFWR projects are classified as 100% Extension. Enter 0% for all other categories (Forestry, Animal Health component, Research and Education).

Under Knowledge areas, this program falls under Human Nutrition Science Emphasis Area. Knowledge Area Classification appropriate for CFWR projects include:

KA 703 - Nutrition Education and Behavior

KA 704 - Nutrition and Hunger in the Population

If initiation is completed but there is a need to make edits or changes to this project, please use the Project Changes Module in REEport. See the Project Change instructions starting on page 124 of 132 in the REEport Guide for Project Directors. If you need additional guidance, the REEport Customer Service team can be reached at electronic@nifa.usda.gov.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS FOR AWARD PROCESSING

In addition to the above-mentioned information necessary for the pre-award, if you receive requests for information from: Sydney Nowlin, sydney.turner@usda.gov the CFWR Program Specialist. or the Awards Management Division, please respond with all requested documents by date indicated in the request.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS FEEDBACK

Appended below are the individual reviews and panel summary for your proposed project. Please briefly address all panel concerns in a narrative format and submit to Sydney Nowlin at sydney.turner@usda.gov by Decemember 31, 2023. Your response should be limited to 1-2 pages.

AWARD START DATE

The recommended award start date is June 01, 2024.

PROPER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THIS FUNDING

Proper acknowledgement of this funding in social media, published articles, manuscripts, dissertations, posters, presentations, inventions, patents, and press releases, a condition of this award is a condition of this award. More information is also found on page 97 of the Policy Guide. Proper acknowledgment statements can be found at: <https://www.nifa.usda.gov/grants/regulations-and-guidelines/acknowledgmentusda-support-nifa>

PRE-AWARD COSTS

As outlined in 2 CFR 200.458, pre-award costs prior to the effective date of the award are allowable only with the written approval of the USDA awarding agency. See Pre-award Costs section under IX. Allowable Costs. As outlined in 2 CFR 200.308 (e)(1), all costs incurred before the USDA awarding agency makes the award are at the risk of the recipient. The USDA awarding agency is not required to reimburse costs if for any reason the: (1) award is not made; (2) award is less than anticipated; or (3) award is inadequate to cover such costs. If charged to the award, these costs must be charged to the initial budget period of the award, unless otherwise specified by NIFA.

Again, congratulations on your recommended award and I am looking forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Sean J. Potts
Management and Program Analyst
Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Email: sean.potts@usda.gov
Call & Text: 202-957-8998

Lydia Kaume, PhD. RDN (she/her/hers)
National Program Leader
Division of Nutrition
USDA, National Institute of Food and Agriculture
Kansas City, Missouri
lydia.kaume@usda.gov
cc: Joanna Bohdziewicz-Borowiec

=====
==

Compost and Food Waste Reduction - PANEL SUMMARY

The panel decision regarding your proposal is based on the input provided by the reviews and the collected expertise

and judgment of the individual panel members. This panel summary reflects the consensus opinion of the panel regarding your proposal.

Proposal Number: 2023-12471 Project Director: Shambarger

Proposal Title: FEED MKE Pilot Project

Positive Aspects of the Proposal

The proposal was well-rounded and addresses many sources of food waste and opportunities for waste reduction. There was a focus on food recovery, which was identified as a high priority on the hierarchy of food waste reduction. The panelists appreciated the use of data to strengthen and validate claims of program impact. Specific examples of environmental justice, service to historically underserved communities, and mitigation of climate change were included in the proposal. Collaborators were varied and each contribution was made clear in the narrative. The proposed program is underway, and panelists agreed that an infusion of additional funding would strengthen existing efforts. Community groups were included to engage stakeholders in the project, and the panel was impressed with the inclusion of mini grants to compensate the groups for their time and expertise.

Negative Aspects of the Proposal

The panel discussed that training for community groups may be necessary to ensure accurate data collection, and this was not addressed in the application. The service area is very large, and panel noted that this could pose a challenge for project implementation and monitoring. The project manager and scope of work is not identified and it would be helpful to have more detail on the criteria used for hiring.

Synthesis Comments

With many positive aspects to the proposal, the panel felt favorably toward the project and noted it would only be improved with additional information included in the budget narrative.

=====
==

The following reviews were submitted for your proposal, the names of the reviewers have been removed to maintain confidentiality.

=====
==

Overview/Summary – The FEED MKE project wants to address food waste and increase composting by conducting outreach to inform the public about the impact of food waste on climate change; build capacity for community action through mini-grants; build relationships between community action groups that carry out operations like food gleaning, food pantries, food kitchens, food banks, etc; and incentivize private sector food waste reduction.

Merit/Technical Criteria: Strengths – This proposal intends to reduce municipal food/waste and to divert food waste from landfills. Proposal specifically addresses environmental justice, racial equity, climate change, and investment in historically underserved communities. Project demonstrates economic benefits for the greater Milwaukee community. The proposal includes provisions for collaborating with a wide range of collaborators and partners.

The main effort of this proposal is to reduce food waste (source reduction), in keeping with the top of the EPA pyramid. The proposal also addressed feeding hungry people and creating compost.

Weaknesses – Tangentially addresses composting.

Project Relevance: Rationale: Strengths – The proposal is very effective at presenting quantifiable measures for how it will be effective in reducing food waste. Proposal aligns with USDA priorities as outlined above. There is a robust

amount of anticipated participation (ongoing) by historical underserved groups and groups serving historically underserved groups.

History and Capacity: Strengths – Applicants have already demonstrated an ongoing program in Milwaukee, further funding would bolster their efforts and allow for expansion.

Evaluation Plan: Strengths – Proposal goes to good lengths to offer statistics to back up their claims for food waste reduction and gleaning. Identified indicators dovetail effectively with project activities.

Monitoring and Evaluation Experience: Strengths – Monitoring is already being carried out, so this would be a continuation of effort.

Sustainability: Strengths – As this project is already underway, applicants have demonstrated sustainability. Further funding would only bolster these efforts.

Key Personnel Experience and Skills: Strengths – Application includes a lengthy list of key personnel, partners, and collaborators.

Cost: The bulk of funding goes to pay salaries/benefits for involved compensated individuals, the outreach component, and micro-grants for sub organizations to carry out their operations.

Budget Narrative: Weaknesses – This section could have been fleshed out more.

Funding: Strengths – Ongoing funding will be through continued grant applications and fundraising.

Diverse Collaborator List: Strengths – Very diverse collaborator list, lots of involvement with local community action groups.

Alignment and Intent: A strong and well written proposal. The presented strong statistics of the demographics of the area. Applicant has experience, but concerned about who will be hired to be the project manager as that could make or break the success of their objectives.

Impact and Projected Measurable Outcomes: How they will measure progress is doable and appropriate. Again, how successful they are will be determined by who is hired as project manager for the project. Their strategies are sound for the current proposal, but for future sustainability their points are very general and contingent on so many other factors.

Fiscal Plan and Resources: Their budget seems reasonable, and the Federal Funds requested is within the allowable range and appropriate for the scope of work. There is a description for most of the line items.

Collaboration and Partners: They have 21 partners that will be involved in various stages of this project. They provided 11 letters of support. Key partners had a synopsis of their involvements and role, but not for some of the others.

STRENGTHS

The proposal addresses a few key priorities identified in the RFA. Source reduction and feeding hungry people are both addressed in this application, which is unique. The rationale is clearly identified and the proposal addresses key areas for making impactful change. The application proposes to expand upon existing, successful programming. There are several key goals and objectives identified, with quantifiable results. Mini-grants are included to compensate community organizations in assisting with data collection. Programs are already established and the proposal seeks to further expand on past success. The project is well supported by municipal and research personnel. The budget is well defined and addresses the key requirements of the project. The budget narrative is well organized and clear. The applicant has well established programs and is committed to funding the project beyond grant terms. The project includes a diverse collaborator list and addresses the inclusion of underrepresented communities in partnership with community-based organizations. The proposal includes underserved communities as stakeholders and partners. Letters of support are provided.

WEAKNESSES

The service area is very large and programming could be difficult to sustain. Recording accurate emissions related to food waste reduction could be challenging. Data collection relies on community organizations who may not have expertise.
