

**STATE OF NEVADA
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

MEETING ACTION MINUTES

DATE: June 8th, 2016

LOCATION: Hearing Room A, Public Utilities Commission
1150 E. William Street
Carson City, NV 89701;

Hearing Room A, Public Utilities Commission
9075 West Diablo Drive, Suite 250
Las Vegas, NV 89148

CHAIRMAN: John Ritter, FOCUS Property Group

SECRETARY: Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination, and Management (State Grants Office)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Voting Members	Non-Voting Members
<i>John Ritter, Chairman</i> <i>Assemblyman Derek Armstrong, Vice Chair</i> <i>Zanny Marsh, Executive Director, American Red Cross of Northern Nevada</i>	<i>Connie Lucido, Chief, State Grants Office</i>
Absent	
<i>Pete Goicoechea, Senator</i> <i>Tim Burch, Director, Clark County Social Services</i>	

1. CALL TO ORDER -

Chairman Ritter called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS -

Mr. Ritter called roll and Assemblyman Armstrong and Ms. Marsh were present. Ms. Marsh announced she needed to leave at 3, so it was decided any agenda items requiring motions would be discussed first while quorum was present.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT-

None.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION- APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 13th MEETING

A. No comments on the minutes.

- i. **Ms. Marsh made a motion to pass the minutes as they were written.**
Assemblyman Armstrong seconded. Motion was passed unanimously.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION- DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEMS

A. Update on Bill Draft Request (BDR) for Interim Finance Committee (IFC) Change

Ms. Lucido said the BDR changing the language of when an agency could appear before IFC was approved by the Governor's Office, and the Department of Administration is drafting language for it.

Chairman Ritter asked for next steps and Ms. Lucido said she will draft the language and the Director would review. Chairman Ritter asked if it could be circulated through the Council and Ms. Lucido agreed.

Chairman Ritter asked if they could go to IFC before the application was submitted before resources were expended. Conversation centered around the timing of applications. Ideally, there would be enough time to go before the IFC before a grant application was submitted, however, most deadlines are within 4-6 weeks and it would not be feasible to schedule an appearance and the application deadline likely would have passed before the IFC could decide.

B. Update on Request for Information (RFI) and Technology Investment Request (TIR) for grant management system

Ms. Lucido said the RFI deadline for the State Grant Management System was June 1 and the Grants Office received 11 responses, which is a considerable amount for the type of vendor request. Ms. Lucido said the proposals varied from little detail to robust. Ms. Lucido also said permission from the TIR Committee was granted to move forward and she submitted a budget enhancement that was in for review at the Governor's Office. The costs varied, so she did not have an estimate yet, but for next steps, she would like to see some demonstrations and have EITS serve on the review panel to ensure the technical specs were correct.

Ms. Marsh asked if there could be potential resistance and if there is anything that can be done to get out in front of this. Ms. Lucido said yes, she believed there could be some initial resistance with some agencies being resistant with the

upstart at first, but she would like to engage agencies in the process and allow them to be part of the demonstration process. The council discussed how valuable the system will be in identifying, coordinating, and monitoring performance outcomes.

Chairman Ritter said the survey data said we need this system, and wondered if charitable organizations could use it. He said he has seen challenges in philanthropic organizations with the breadth of their capabilities to handle grant management on their own, but thought if they teamed up they could be more successful. Chairman Ritter suggested system should be useful for non-profits to the extent possible.

Ms. Lucido agreed and said collaborations are more powerful and make for stronger applications and this is something the Grants Office encourages. She said there is the capability to open the system up to sub-grantees.

C. Match Funds and Survey Data

Match Funds: Ms. Lucido presented on answering the ranking per-capita from last meeting. She looked at 2013 data from states with similar populations and similar Camelot scores: West Virginia, New Mexico, Arkansas and Mississippi. The data does not include contracts or salaries.

Questions centered around the Camelot ranking. The higher the ranking, the lower social factors were met. Chairman Ritter asked if this was further data to show Nevada is faring poorly. Ms. Lucido said Nevada per capita is ranked 51st in Medicaid grants and ranks last in services rendered state-to-state.

Discussion took place on examining the rankings of other states and agencies within Nevada. Assemblyman Armstrong noticed Higher Education (in other states) ranked high in funding and asked if they have research. Ms. Lucido said yes, they do. Assemblyman Armstrong saw the City of Las Vegas was awarded \$11 million and was lower on the list. Ms. Lucido said she wanted to show how funding runs the gamut and how working together could bring in more funding. Nevada per capita grant funding ranks 51st in Education, 33rd in Transportation. Chairman Ritter said the document, and the document sent from Pew, supports the claim that Nevada is not doing well and wondered if having match funds would help move the state forward.

Chairman Ritter wanted to pin down specifics and asked how much should be requested for a pilot match fund. He wanted it to be reasonable and achievable

and be able to keep going back each legislative session to ask for more based upon previous success of bringing more revenue into the state. Based on previous grant council discussions, he suggested \$15-20 million for the 2017 biennium.

Assemblyman Armstrong said that amount sounded good, but he was more concerned with structuring the BDR on how to award the money. For example, would it be a contingency fund to IFC? Would there be a committee? He also suggested having a smaller number in the first year, like \$5 million, and a larger amount the second year (\$10 million). The rest agreed.

Ms. Lucido said while it sounded like a wonderful idea, she had a couple of concerns: she did not know where the funds would come from, and if it came from general fund, we would need Jim Wells to tell us how the process would work. The second concern was if a project is more than 1 or 2 years, the match wouldn't be available. If it were 3 and 4 year programs, they would not be eligible. Ms. Lucido wondered if there was a way to allocate all funding the first year the length of the program. Ms. Marsh said it shouldn't matter and that if it was encumbered, it was encumbered. Chairman Ritter wondered if the pilot could be structured in a way that the project could exceed the biennium, but not the amount. Assemblyman Armstrong said language should be added if funds weren't expended, it wouldn't revert back to the general fund and agencies that applied for a multi-year grant lasting past the biennium but didn't expend all funds, the remainder would roll over.

Chairman Ritter asked how someone would apply for the funds and who would oversee and manage the account. He asked Assemblyman Armstrong if he would be able to have a conversation with Jim Wells about all of these questions and Assemblyman Armstrong agreed.

Ms. Marsh asked if it could be folded into visiting IFC to request a provisional approval. Chairman Ritter said he thought the simpler, the better. In one state, the Governor's Office oversaw the account. Assemblyman Armstrong said an appropriate place could be the contingency account and it could become another line item. Chairman Ritter said he would like to see a more concrete idea for next meeting since this will require legislation. He wondered if there should be a prioritization of grants (i.e. education, would that take precedence for approval if it is prioritized?). Assemblyman Armstrong said he would like to see a prioritization set on how much is brought in compared to smaller grants and believed it would make a stronger case for showing greater return.

Ms. Marsh said that was an interesting idea, but asked about recurring grants that already struggle to receive funding. Discussion centered around agreement on not wanting to see the prioritization of areas becoming politicized and who the feedback for that decision should come from. Chairman Ritter said he would like to continue the conversation next meeting.

(Ms. Marsh needed to leave the meeting, so agenda items were taken out of order to accommodate quorum. Conversation came back to the item 5C, after item 6 and item 5E were discussed. Ms. Marsh left at 2:55 p.m.)

Survey Data: Ms. Lucido explained the survey data the Grants Office collected. She said each agency has been directed to update their state plan and this data will inform the new mission of the State Grants Office. Ms. Lucido said what the survey told them was that many agencies were not aware of the State Grants Office and so she would like to get out and visit agencies. Surveys were sent out to state agencies, as well as more than 300 outside stakeholders.

Chairman Ritter said he was struck by the biggest barrier overall was not what the Council has been talking about, but was time and staffing burdens. He said if the Council was able to get the items they had been discussing implemented, downstream, would it be successful? If staff was short, would they be able to execute it well? He wondered how to address it: was it at agency level, the level of the State Grants Office, at municipal levels?

Ms. Lucido said currently the State Grants Office serves as an advocate for agencies. She said the office is limited where it stands now, but she would like to go on a “roadshow” and meet with agency leadership and explain how it can help them. She continued there are some agencies that are already self-sustaining now.

Chairman Ritter said perhaps a fifth issue needed to be added to the Council’s Vision and Ms. Lucido agreed time management was a large issue that prohibited many agencies from applying for grants.

D. Update on Council Vision and Business Plan

Erin Hasty from the State Grants Office presented on the draft of the Council Vision. Ms. Hasty said they incorporated the data survey and the Governor’s Strategic Vision to create a document that would hopefully expand the importance and revenue in the state. They looked at data, program development and implementation, time constraints/staffing and training, budget/match requirements, legislative process and sustainability of programs.

Chairman Ritter asked if she could get a hard number of how much money was brought in currently, and how much we would increase it to. There was also confusion with some of the language of staffing and training. Ms. Lucido said the office could come up with that number, as well as fine-tune the misunderstandings and add clarity to the document, especially by combining staffing and training with program development. The item will be brought back to the Council in October.

E. *Review how grants are handled statewide and explore the need of grant support in Southern Nevada*

Assemblyman Armstrong said in an effort to increase funding coming to Nevada, he wanted to determine how to make sure Southern Nevada is identifying and bringing in proportional funding. Ms. Lucido asked if he had a group of folks she could work with so she could reach out to them. Assemblyman Armstrong affirmed he did.

F. *Budget Disincentives*

Ms. Lucido said she asked some people from agencies to come and share on what they had experienced. Kirsten Columbe, Deputy Director of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), said she supports the BDR and believes it will be a big help. She said she has challenges in not having administrative support to do much of the work and that existing staff workload is prohibitive to applying for grants. The Council asked if she has seen any of her budget adjusted downward after receiving a grant. Christina Hadwick of DPBH said yes, as far as general fund, if it gets a grant and it receives program income, the program income has been used to show as general fund. Ms. Hadwick said once the program runs out, they get it cut because the program income has been taken away. Chairman Ritter asked if when they apply for a grant is it expanding your work instead of replacing the budget, Ms. Hadwick replied yes, she thought so.

Charise Whitt of the Office of Criminal Justice spoke next and said funds from the Department of Justice funnel through them to the community. She wanted to reiterate the importance of match funding. She knows many agencies do not apply for grants due to the lack of match. She stated that the Justice Assistance Grant eliminated the 25 percent required match. The general fund used as match also decreased exponentially. This along with reduced federal funding and an increase in the cost allocations resulted in the Office literally running out of money and may not have an office next year. Match requirements went down 43% and so did

funding. Her office is mostly grant funded and she does not know if they will remain in operation the next year. Ms. Whitt also asked the Council to consider re-thinking awarding funding for pilot programs based on revenue being brought in. She said her department could not compete with the level of funding health or education brings in, but many rural agencies rely heavily on them for funding for important services.

Kelli Anderson from the Division of Emergency Management (DEM) spoke and said DEM is 95% federally funded and 5% state funded. The state does not provide a hard match. DEM is forced to seek support from locals with volunteer time to meet the match requirements. She said her agency has a hard time coming up with many of the grant requirements for many federal programs. For example, FEMA can require a 50% match, but with only 5% of allowable available funding, they miss out on opportunities. She was asked if other states fund their emergency management at such a low level. Ms. Anderson said Nevada ranks last in funding and falls behind Guam. Ms. Anderson also asked the Council to consider the bureaucracy of state agencies having to apply to two bodies for match funds.

Miles Dickson, Nevada Community Foundation spoke of the changes he was excited to see. He said he believed the staffing challenges and long-term questions of what is necessary to bring Nevada up to where it needs to be are crucial. He said he doesn't know the size staff needs to be, but he knows it is not at it now.

6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION- FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- A. Continue discussion on match funds;
- B. Budget disincentives;
- C. Update on Grants Management System;
- D. Governor's Finance Office, match fund possibilities; and
- E. **Assemblyman Armstrong made a motion to approve future agenda items discussed for future meetings. Ms. Marsh seconded.** (Ms. Marsh left at 2:55 p.m., but the motion was made out of order). Motion passed unanimously. A future meeting date of August 10th, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. was scheduled.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT-

None.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION- ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.