

HMEP Mid-Cycle FSW Funding Committee Worksheet

<u>County</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Amount in Training</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>In compliance with SERC</u>	<u>Rm. Tax</u>	<u>In compliance with this request</u>	<u>If no, what's needed</u>
Carson	7/20/2015	\$ 585.00	3	Yes		No	Need LEPC meeting minutes approval (ETA 9/1/15)
Clark	7/10/2015	\$ 26,620.00	22	Yes	\$528	No	Completed signed application, assurances, compliance certification completed and signed, meeting minutes approving the grant application, and Activity Sheet.
Douglas	7/6/2015	\$ 14,880.00	25	Yes		No	Need corrected Activity sheet and signed Title Page. Note there is no hotel being requested for attendees which is a savings.
Elko	7/15/2015	\$ 14,579.00	10	Yes	\$960	Yes	
Eureka	7/14/2015	\$ 1,490.00	2	Yes	\$65.04	Yes	
Mineral	7/21/2015	\$ 11,541.00	14	Yes	\$336	No	Need meeting minutes approving application. ETA 8/6/15
Nye	7/13/2015	\$ 19,644.00	18	Yes	\$650.43	Yes	
Pershing	7/20/2015	\$ 7,453.00	10	Yes	\$0	No	Need meeting minutes approving application.
Storey	7/17/2015	\$ 3,900.00	20	Yes		Yes	
UNLV	7/8/2015	\$ 5,754.00	6	N/A	\$72	Yes	
Washoe	7/16/2015	\$ 8,580.00	44	Yes		No	Need LEPC minutes approving application. (Mtg. ETA 8/20/15)
White Pine	7/15/2015	\$ 20,914.00	20	Yes	\$540	Yes	

**\$ 135,940.00                      194                      \$3,151.50                      \$139,091.50**

**Total available for FireShowsWest Apps.**

\$ 17,874.00

Training HMEP

\$ 40,000.00

SERC \*\*

\$ 57,874.00

To Fund All in Full  
Need add \$ 81,217.50

Staff Comments/Recommendations:

Nye: Request includes responders from volunteer fire departments.

---

Douglas: Participants all separate vehicles, drive round trip each day of conference and no hotel. That is a savings.

---

Clark: Need completed signed application, assurances, compliance certification and meeting minutes. Next LEPC not until 8/12/15.

---

If funding is not increased by SERC for the FSW applications or partially increased, staff recommends using the historical data from 2014 using factors such as proposed number of participants vs. actual, amount awarded vs. actual amount expended, ability to manage the reporting along with submission criteria for 2015.

2014 FSW Requests vs. Actuals

County	2014 Participants Requested	2014 Funding Requested	2014 Actual Participants	2014 Actual Funding	2015 Proposed Participants	2015 Funding Requested
Carson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	585.00
Clark	30	27,942.00	18	16,218.00	22	<b>27,148.00</b>
Douglas	19	7,900.00	12	4,609.00	25	14,880.00
Elko	10	7,715.00	0	0.00	10	<b>15,539.00</b>
Eureka	2	1,760.00	1	627.00	2	<b>1,555.04</b>
Mineral	14	9,134.00	14	4,037.00	14	<b>11,877.00</b>
Nye	26	23,542.00	24	19,221.00	18	<b>20,294.43</b>
Pershing	10	6,714.00	3	3,166.00	10	7,453.00
Storey	15	2,925.00	10	2,925.00	20	3,900.00
UNLV	4	4,169.00	0	0.00	6	<b>5,826.00</b>
Washoe	30	5,850.00	10	2,925.00	44	8,580.00
White Pine	21	20,399.00	12	8,410.00	20	<b>21,454.00</b>
		\$118,050.00		\$62,138.00		139,091.47

Highlighted bold amounts include anticipated taxes and fees for lodging at highest rate available at the conference locations.

If sub-grants approved for adjusted amount, sub-grantee will be required to submit new budget.