

# Draft Minutes of the Monday, March 29, 2021

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)

Director's Office, Grants Management Unit (DO-GMU)

Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services– Proposal Evaluation

Monday, March 29, 2021, 1:00 p.m.

## Meeting Video/Teleconference Information:

Per Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006, there will be no physical location required for this video/teleconferenced meeting. Public comments by teleconference are welcome.

Materials: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/>

## I. Call to Order

(Welcome, Roll Call, Announcements) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 pm by Connie Lucido. Ms. Lucido took roll call and established the attendance of the NOFO evaluators.

### Evaluators Present:

Laura Urban

Adrienne De Lucci

Shirley Trummell

Amber Bosket (joined at 1:06)

Diane Thorkildson

Lisa Torres

### Also Present:

Connie Lucido

Cyndee Joncas

Kayla Samuels

## II. Public Comment #1

*Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.*

Lily Helzer thanked committee for their work rigorously reviewing the applications and making suggestions for future improvements.

## III. March 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes – Review and Approve

Grants Management Unit

Revision – Laura Urban should be present under "Evaluators" column.

Amber Bosket moved to approve as amended, Diane Thorkildson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **IV. March 24, 2021 Meeting Minutes – Review and Approve**

Grants Management Unit

Revision – item review “March 10, 2020” should be “March 10, 2021”.

Amber Bosket moved to approve as amended, seconded by Shirley Trummell. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **V. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services - Proposal Evaluation and Review Summary**

(Discussion, Information) Office of Food Security

Laura Urban thanked the committee members for their time and patience. Ms. Urban shared the updated score summary on the screen. There were small changes from the first presentation. The rounding was changed to include two places past the decimal point. A map showing State Coverage will be ready for the GMAC meeting. Ms. Urban included information regarding the Nevada Food Insecurity Projections: 2020 assembled by Feeding Nevada. The statistics may play a part in the final recommendations.

Ms. Urban asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

Ms. Urban shared the Applicant Partner Summary 2.29.2021. The recurring partners are in green text. Three Square Food Bank is a recurring partner as well as Helping Hands of Vegas Valley (twice) and Soulful Seeds (twice). An asterisk is included for applicants who included MOUs/Partner Agreements.

A suggestion for the next NOFO cycle is more clear information about the partnerships.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if the requirement was for three partners? The Money Management International proposal did not include any MOUs.

Ms. Urban confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Trummell asked if the requirement was for two or three?

Ms. Urban replied an MOU for each partner with a minimum of three partners. Some of the partnerships were unclear. For the most part all of the applicants qualified, however, not all of the applicants included enough information regarding partnerships.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if the inclusion of the MOUs was a requirement in the NOFO? If it was, the Money Management International would not have met the basic NOFO requirements. Ms. Thorkildson would feel uncomfortable listing Money Management International (MMI) as the top scoring applicant if they did not meet the basic NOFO requirements.

Ms. Trummell, agrees, and said, as an example, Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada is the only applicant supplying services to three of the rural Nevada counties, had included only one partnership agreement. Some sort of clarification regarding the requirements will be needed.

Ms. Bosket reviewed the NOFO and clarified it stipulates two or more collaborative partnerships.

Lisa Torres said the NOFO states “one lead agency within the collaboration will submit the application on behalf of the partnership”. The statement needs to be clarified as it appears to state the lead agency and one other agency.

Ms. Urban said the intent was for the lead organization and two other partner agencies.

Ms. Thorkildson clarified a total of three partners, the lead agency plus two partners and asked if executed MOUs were to be attached to the application?

Ms. Bosket said page four of the NOFO states “signed MOUS are to be included with the submission packet”.

Ms. Urban is not sure if this is a situation where it would need to be specified that lack of inclusion would result in disqualification.

Ms. Thorkildson commented this situation is an example of problems encountered historically where rules are made but not abided by. Feedback received from applicant agencies in the past has been harsh. Ms. Thorkildson asked that the workgroup be cognizant of what was asked and hold applicants to that standard.

Ms. Trummell said the NOFO required 50% of the budget was to go to food purchasing and not all of the proposal budgets met that requirement. Most were close except for one. Clarification is needed whether or not proposals who do not have 50% of their budget designated for food purchases can be looked at or not.

Ms. Bosket asked if the technical review specified whether the lack of two partnership agreement documents was grounds for disqualification? Page seven of the NOFO lists what should be included in the project narrative – community organizations and partnerships – signed MOUs must be included within the submission packet. If the workgroup disqualifies proposals for the lack of two signed MOUs then most, if not all of the proposals would need to be disqualified.

Ms. Lucido commented the workgroup needs to be consistent with the application of the requirements for proposal qualification/disqualification. The missing components will be in place before subgrant funds are awarded. The State Office of Grants performs a technical review.

Ms. Urban asked Ms. Lucido if the committee can make a recommendation to disqualify MMI for not including MOUs?

Ms. Lucido replied, yes, the committee is able to make any sort of recommendation that they wish to the GMAC.

Ms. Urban clarified, as an example, the committee would present the ranking and the disqualification recommendation due to the lack of MOUs despite the high ranking.

Ms. Thorkildson said there must be consistency across the board, what applies to one, applies to all, and the committee holds as closely as possible to the rules outlined in the NOFO.

Ms. Lucido asked if the NOFO technical piece had a requirement for the three MOUs?

Ms. Bosket said the technical review was broken down into the subsections and listed “failure to meet two or more would result in a nonresponsive application and be disqualified”. No proposals received two or more disqualification marks. MMI has one disqualification mark, budgets for both project periods were not included.

Ms. Urban said the inclusion of MOUs was not included in the current NOFO cycle technical review but could be included in the next round. Proposals could still be recommended for disqualification based on the lack of MOUs.

Ms. Torres said the NOFO language clearly specified either “must” or “are encouraged”. The word “must” can be interpreted as the requirement must be met or the proposal faces possible disqualification, whereas “are encouraged” indicates it is good if the items are included but the lack of does not mean possible disqualification. As an example, the target population requirement in the NOFO was for all Nevadans of all ages. This requirement may be a topic for discussion for some proposals.

Ms. Trummell asked if the 50% of the budget going to purchasing food requirement was in the technical review?

Ms. Bosket said the technical review asks if the budget is mathematically correct and are both project periods attached. The technical review does not have language regarding the 50% requirement.

Ms. Trummell said future NOFO technical reviews should include NOFO requirements.

Ms. Bosket clarified the three major requirements the committee will review the proposals against include the inclusion of signed MOUs, the target population to be served, and whether 50% of budget is allocated to procuring food.

Ms. Urban commented she is aware of at least one applicant who did not apply due to lack of time to procure the partnership agreements. Not disqualifying proposals who are lacking partnership agreements could be an issue if the applicant is awarded funds.

Ms. Lucido asked if Ms. Urban to verify MMI did not include MOUs in the original submission.

Ms. Bosket asked if the committee was in agreement to consider proposals that were close to the 50% budget allocated for procuring food requirement?

Ms. Thorkildson commented the only applicant who was completely off the mark of 50% of the budget allocated to food was Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada.

Ms. Urban verified MMI’s application, which was submitted as a PDF as requested, did not include MOUs and the email did not include any additional attachments.

Ms. Bosket said MMI’s proposal states “these MOUs are included within the grant submission packet”, however, they were not.

Ms. Lucido asked how many applicants would be disqualified for lack of MOUs?

Ms. Urban all of the other applicant shared some sort of partner agreement.

Ms. Lucido asked if all of the other proposals included two partner agreements? If the two-partnership agreement minimum requirement is adhered to, how many proposals affected?

Ms. Bosket suggested deciding as a committee to disqualify the one applicant who did not include any partnership documents (Money Management International).

Ms. Trummell commented Jewish Family Services has an unsigned partnership agreement with Sundance Village Apartments and did not include a partnership agreement with Three Square Food Bank and asked if that counts as a disqualification at that point (lack of two signed partnership agreements)?

Ms. Urban asked if there is a lead organization and only one additional partner, is that a disqualification condition?

Ms. Bosket asked if Communities in Schools (CIS) is the only applicant serving Elko? If yes, then they will have to strongly consider a level of funding for this applicant due to the service area. CIS has one signed MOU. If having only one partner agreement is cause for disqualification, then CIS would be disqualified.

Ms. Thorkildson said if that criteria is followed both Northern and Southern Catholic Charities, Communities in Schools, Desert Springs Methodist Church, Jewish Family Services, Money Management International (MMI),

Ms. Trummell said Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada is the only agency serving Humboldt, Lander, and White Pine counties.

Ms. Torres as a reviewer read this completely different. "Only applications from collaborative partnerships involving two or more community organizations" to mean one lead and at least one community partner. The point may be brought up by an applicant that one agency was to submit the application on behalf of the partnership.

Ms. Bosket recommends no other applicants for disqualification other than MMI based on lack of partnership agreements. As an applicant chose not to apply on the basis of that requirement, if the recommendation was made to fund MMI, who did not meet that requirement, there is potential for a legal issue.

Ms. Trummell asked if Jewish Family Services should be disqualified?

Ms. Urban recommended Jewish Family Services be disqualified.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if an official motion was needed?

Ms. Urban said the recommendations would be recorded and motion made at the end of the review meeting.

Ms. Trummell said based on the requirement to include services to all ages it is recommended to disqualify Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada.

Ms. Bosket agrees with the recommendation to disqualify Jewish Family Services as the partnership agreement is not signed.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if there is another applicant not serving all ages?

Ms. Bosket said the University of Nevada Reno, Cooperative Extension for Mineral County, provides veggies for kids' veggies for seniors, so does not serve all ages.

Ms. Thorkildson there may be a coverage problem as UNR is the only agency serving Mineral County.

Ms. Trummell asked even if this workgroup disqualifies applicants for the reasons stated the GMAC can still go ahead and recommend funding?

Ms. Lucido the GMAC can make any recommendations they wish to the DHHS Director.

Ms. Bosket asked for clarification regarding the line between the requirements and servicing all regions?

Ms. Urban said the Statewide coverage is in NRS. The workgroup could recommend applicants be funded under the condition they expand to serve all ages. UNR's application includes the partnerships with the elementary schools in serving students and families with food insecurity issues.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if NRS is to be interpreted that there must be coverage in every county or is it regional coverage?

Ms. Lucido would need to review NRS requirements. The DHHS Director wants to ensure there is regional coverage. There may not be interested parties to partnership with.

Ms. Bosket discussed the proximity of counties and the applicants.

Ms. Thorkildson pointed out the distances between towns.

Ms. Trummell said the difference between UNR and Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada is Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada supports meals on wheels for seniors only. Nye County has the second highest projected numbers for food insecurity.

Ms. Bosket asked if Ms. Trummell recommends Catholic of Southern Nevada be disqualified due to only meeting one age group and UNR not be disqualified due to the coverage area?

Ms. Trummell said it is not evident if Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada can expand to serve all age groups. The UNR proposal talks about serving children and their families.

Ms. Urban UNR's application states "children and their families" in three places.

Ms. Bosket recommends disqualifying Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada due to not meeting the ages served requirement. UNR is recommended to not be disqualified due to serving families and has strong regional coverage.

Ms. Urban asked if any further discussion regarding MOUs or target population was needed? Are there any other areas of concern?

Ms. Trummell said with regards to the 50% budget allocation for food requirement, all applicants except Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada were close.

Ms. Bosket would disqualify one organization application that was way off and not anyone else. The stated cost of food was not easily quantifiable, as an example the cost per meal at over \$7 is an inefficient use of funds (Dignity Health).

Ms. Thorkildson the workgroup can't disqualify based on cost per meal because not it was not a requirement in the NOFO. The workgroup could have graded the applicant lower but can't disqualify out right.

Ms. Bosket agreed and revised her statement to not recommending for funding based on the cost per meal. Every organization who applies for food insecurity should have an understanding of meal cost. Meal cost could be considered a side qualification. The Dignity Health application does not show fiscal responsibility.

Ms. Trummell said there are many other sources of food in Clark County. The workgroup may consider reduced funding.

Adrienne De Lucci asked if Dignity Health could be recommended for partial funding due to the high cost of meals.

Ms. Thorkildson said if the disqualified applicants were removed (MMI, Jewish Family Services, and Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada), funding went to the applicants who scored 90 or above at 70-75% funding, and those who scored 80 and above received a somewhat lower level of funding.

Ms. Urban said Kayla Samuels developed a spreadsheet tool to help with allocations.

Ms. Trummell reminded the workgroup Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada is the only agency serving Humboldt, Lander, and White Pine counties. The other areas have multiple service agencies so their funding could be at a reduced level.

Ms. Samuels shared her screen showing a spreadsheet with funding recommendations.

Ms. Thorkildson suggested recommending funding those scoring 90 and above at 70-75% of the application request.

Ms. Bosket asked if the Food Bank of Northern Nevada and Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada is asking for combined million dollars of funding?

Ms. Thorkildson said Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada serves mostly rural, highly underserved communities. Other areas have overlap with the Food Bank of Northern Nevada.

Ms. Bosket asked if population density should be looked at? Should there be a 70/30 split in funding to match the population density? There are quite a few strong applications in Northern Nevada.

Ms. Thorkildson after eliminations in Southern Nevada the next largest applicant in Southern Nevada becomes Three Square.

Ms. Torres suggested looking at what the reviewers recommended regarding no-partial-full funding.

Ms. Bosket asked who reviewed the "Just One Project" application?

Ms. Thorkildson reviewed, agency is based in Las Vegas, working with the Clark County School Districts, some low-income housing apartment complexes, doing farmer's markets on school sites and at low-income housing parking lots. Newer program, not brand new, strong connection with Clark County School District.

Ms. Bosket suggested separating out Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada applicants to determine funding distribution. If eligible programs in Southern Nevada were funded at 100% the amount equals \$1.1 million which is 50% of the funding for 70% of the population.

Ms. Thorkildson has concerns with potentially providing 100% funding to applicants who scored below 80%. Feedback received on previous funding recommendations is that choosing that way is not fair. The questions included why even have a NOFO and an active competitive process if it matters more where an agency is located than their core.

Ms. Bosket regional coverage itself matters heavily. Funding would not just be given due to location.

Ms. Urban asked Ms. Lucido what the term “regional coverage” actually means. If there was one partner in Northern, Southern, or Rural Nevada would the coverage requirement be satisfied?

Ms. Lucido said “regional coverage” is typically defined as Northern, Southern, and Rural Nevada. When looking at the landscape of funds to be distributed the Southern, Northern, and Rural regions are considered. Funds are also distributed to the mental health regions split into four quadrants. The recommendation presented to the GMAC can include the workgroups defined regions.

Ms. Trummell agrees population density must be considered as well as considering the counties who have few services. It’s important to ensure the viable grants who cover the non-served counties are funded.

Ms. Bosket asked how many counties are broken up into inhabited zones? A recommendation may need be made to fund services in the isolated counties.

Ms. Trummell said Nye County is the third largest county in the contiguous United States, the two largest cities are Pahrump and Tonopah and there are many other smaller cities.

Ms. Urban said one of her concerns is recommending applicants who scored lower than an 80. A funding formula could be developed to help move forward. Ms. Urban is not comfortable with not using the scores in this recommendation as well as evaluating the need and the regional coverage.

Ms. Lucido the other review teams also chose that method. The scores were taken into consideration as well as the coverage areas.

Ms. Thorkildson said if the 90 and above scores were recommended to fund at 100% the remainder of the funding is \$500,000 which could be used to fund the applications with scores 80 and above.

Ms. Lucido asked if the Food Bank excluded Elko?

Ms. Urban does not know if the prescription pantry program is expanded to Elko, but the regular program does serve Elko.

Ms. Bosket said the cut-off score should be moved to 75 and she does not see any reason to exclude any of the remaining applicants from full funding. She feels there could be a strong reason for funding a poorly scoring applicant. If Statewide coverage matters, then funding the population areas matters. If the lowest scoring applicants are not funded, then services may not be provided to the areas who are historically not served just due to a poor application.

Ms. Thorkildson said the total requests exceeds the funding available by about \$900,000 so cuts must be made. The lower scoring applicants were scored low due to concerns with the applicants’ ability to provide the services they were proposing. Ms. Thorkildson recommended partial funding for the City of Mesquite applicant.



Ms. Torres said some applicants with small budgets in small rural organizations may not be able to provide services without full funding and are hampered by not having professional grant writers.

Ms. Urban shared a testimony from the GMAC meeting from the last NOFO cycle where concerns were voiced regarding applicants having funding cut just because their application was approved based on what they proposed, even minor cuts may impact what the applicant is able to do.

Ms. Trummell agrees and would like to see everyone funded, the GMAC takes into consideration the lack of professional grant writers, however, if everyone is funded at the same percentage then why go through the review process? In one example an application includes a manager position, if the applicant is not fully funded could the program function?

Ms. Bosket asked if the next step is to make formal recommendations?

Ms. Thorkildson pointed out the time (hour and half spent).

Ms. Bosket suggested using regional coverage as the leading point for choosing funding.

Ms. Thorkildson reminded the workgroup that the other committees did not lead with regional coverage, they lead with applicant strength and then looked at regional coverage. Ms. Thorkildson recommended following that pattern.

Ms. Bosket was concerned the workgroup could miss out on opportunities to fund applicants with poorly written applications.

Ms. Thorkildson current applicants appeared to have improved their applications based on feedback received during the previous NOFO cycle.

Ms. Lucido said a lot of work was done on the NOFO developing questions for the applicants to answer. The NOFO is not a federal application and does not have the difficulties of figuring out what is being asked for. In the future perhaps the GMAC could change the way funding is distributed.

Ms. Urban said if the definition of regional coverage is as general as Northern, Rural, and Southern, then the regional coverage is met.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if Kayla could enter 90% funding for the applicants who scored 90 and above on the spreadsheet.

Ms. Bosket said Keystone Enrichment Foundation serving Sandy Valley, who scored under 80, is asking for a smaller amount and requested they be funded at 100% as they serve a low-income, low-access food desert. The workgroup should consider all elements when making funding recommendations.

Ms. Thorkildson said the committee is doing their job and considering all elements by holding the applicants accountable for the quality of their applications.

Ms. Bosket feels the needs should be taken into consideration. Every applicant would be disqualified if held to the 50% food budget allocation or MOU requirement. The committee has the flexibility to choose the best agencies to fund.

Ms. Lucido commented the scores were not weighted for locations, partners, or any of that. The choice to look at the score cut off and funding distribution is a good conversation for a future GMAC meeting.

Ms. Bosket recommends funding Keystone Enrichment Foundation at the full amount.

Ms. Urban said Three Square Food Bank is serving Sandy Valley.

Ms. Bosket said it is through the Keystone Enrichment Foundation food pantry.

Ms. Trummell said Three Square Food Bank said they are going to add Sandy Valley as one of their three first year partners.

Ms. Lucido said if the committee is looking at cutting the funding down to the 90% level the applicants have the opportunity to update their scopes.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if applicants scoring 90 and above were funded at 90% then \$625,280 remains?

Kayla said yes and asked if Keystone would be funded at 100% funding?

Ms. Thorkildson said she would need to see some additional calculations before backing funding Keystone at 100%.

Ms. Urban would be more comfortable moving forward if a funding formula was put in place or food deserts were prioritized, possibly including language such as “priority will be given to organizations that demonstrate they are serving those areas. Because that is not in place, Ms. Urban agrees with Ms. Thorkildson.

Ms. Trummell agrees with Ms. Bosket’s reasoning, but if funds were awarded to Keystone, a lower scoring applicant, then funding should be considered for all applicants who scored lower. Ms. Trummell asked if all applicants could be funded at some level?

Ms. Bosket said she is recommending funding Keystone at 100% due to the special circumstance of the food desert location and lack of other services, which could be explained in the recommendation.

Ms. Torres said if the workgroup is looking at documents regarding MOUs, Keystone did not include any signed MOUs.

Ms. Thorkildson said Keystone included the TFAP agreement.

Ms. Urban said the partnership with TFAP is through the Nevada Department of Agriculture and was not mentioned in their application.

Ms. Bosket Keystone included a signed partnership agreement with Three Square.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if Keystone is not funded will Three Square still serve Sandy Valley?

Ms. Bosket said she is not sure. Thinks the way services are provided to Sandy Valley is through Keystone.

Ms. Thorkildson commented the bigger organizations have the capacity to flex with budget reductions. The smaller organizations may struggle with funding cuts.

Ms. Thorkildson said the GMAC holds the purse strings and can recommend services where needed. Ms. Thorkildson does not think Keystone is the only services for Sandy Valley.

Ms. Urban shared her screen showing Three Square’s application saying they will focus on Sandy Valley Food Share.

Ms. Trummell said Three Square would work with the rural agencies to assess their needs in order to build their capacity, reduce food insecurity in the rural communities by purchasing and distributing a variety of healthy food, the majority of budget will go toward food purchases and build capacity. Sandy Valley Food Share was named as their first-year partnership.

Ms. Urban said as it is 3 o’clock and out of consideration of everyone’s time another meeting will be scheduled to finish assembling the recommendations.

Ms. Thorkildson requested funding scenarios in a spreadsheet format.

Ms. Trummell asked if it was acceptable to send Mr. Urban an email with her opinions?

Ms. Urban replied it would violate open meeting law, but Ms. Trummell could share her opinions at the next meeting.

Ms. Trummell said Communities in Schools is the only agency serving Elko County, UNR is the only agency serving Mineral County, and Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada is serving Humboldt, Lander, and White Pine counties. Ms. Trummell recommends funding those agencies.

Ms. Urban asked if there were any other comments?

Ms. Torres said we unanimously decided not to fund MMI because they did not include any MOUs. The workgroup needs to be consistent with not funding the other applicants, such as Keystone, who are lacking MOUs.

Ms. Bosket said if that is done then the other applicants will need to be reviewed and potentially disqualified. MMI and Jewish Family Services did not submit signed partnership documents. The other applicants submitted some sort of signed partnership document. If applicants are disqualified based on the MOU technical requirement then other applicants would need to be disqualified.

Ms. Urban said information regarding MOUs was included in the FAQ. Clarifying information stated “any agreement that is specific to the initiative“. The workgroup needs to align with that information which may or may not disqualify Keystone. Ms. Urban will revisit the language if it is decided to have that conversation.

Ms. Thorkildson asked if this is an area where the DAG could help by rendering an opinion.

Ms. Urban said no because it doesn’t have anything to do with law.

Ms. Lucido said she doesn’t think the DAG could help but wouldn’t hurt to ask.

Ms. Bosket said if the issue is as you described “any agreement” it sounds like a conversation is not necessary.

Further conversation was tabled until the next meeting.

**VI. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Wellness/Hunger Services – Funding Recommendation**  
(Discussion and action) Office of Food Security

Tabled until next meeting.

## **VII. Public Comment #2**

*Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.*

Stacy Smith appreciates the voices advocating for rural services.

There were no further public comments.

## **VIII. Additional Announcements and Adjournment**

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m.

*This notice was mailed to groups and individuals as requested and posted on the DHHS website at: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/> and on the State of Nevada Public Meeting Notice website at <https://notice.nv.gov/>. Meeting materials will be available to the public online prior to the meeting or contact the Grants Management Unit via phone at 775-684-3470 or by email: [gmu@dhhs.nv.gov](mailto:gmu@dhhs.nv.gov).*