

MINUTES

Nevada State Emergency Response Commission (SERC)

Funding Committee Meeting

Monday, February 08, 2016 – 1:30pm

Video Conference

Carson City

NDOT Conference Room
1301 Old Hot Springs Road
Room #112
Carson City, NV

Las Vegas

NV Department of Transportation
123 E. Washington Avenue
Building A, Conference Room
Las Vegas, NV

Members Present

Richard Brenner - Chair,
Tom Burns
John Helmreich
Stacey Giomi

Members Not Present

Susan Crowley

Staff

Stephanie Parker
Gwen Barrett
Nathan Hastings
Peter J. Mulvihill

Guests

Irene Sanzare, Nye County Emergency Management
Cathy Ludwig, Washoe County Emergency Management
Patricia Brown, Esmeralda LEPC

1. CALL TO ORDER

Richard Brenner called the meeting to order at 1:35pm

2. INTRODUCTIONS

Members, staff, and guests introduced themselves.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Stephanie Parker: On December 4, 2015 the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or the FAST Act, which dictates what we get through HMEP Funding through FEMSA was signed and they made a few changes. They are going to the three (3) year grant starting with the new application this spring. They will combine the Planning and Training grants into one grant, they are not going to allocate a specific amount for Planning and a specific amount for Training, which gives us more flexibility. We will remove the reference to a "fiscal year", we can move some things to year two (2). They did add some requirements, agreeing to having an auditable accounting system which all of our sub-grantees and SERC already have. The other requirement is that the secretary considers the past record of the State or Indian tribe in effectively managing the Planning and Training grant. I think that is going to be an addition, they didn't go into detail on the webinar. We are collecting in advance for LEPCs for this year's items because in the application you have to give three (3) years' worth of items.

Richard Brenner: That goes into effect next year, right?

Stephanie Parker: Yes, it's the application that we submit this May and will go into effect September through 2019.

There was no additional Public Comment.

4. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2015 MEETING MINUTES.

John Helmreich: I move to approve the September 21, 2015 meeting minutes.

Tom Burns: Second

Richard Brenner: Any discussion?

John Helmreich: There was discussion around how many meetings to recommend to SERC. I think we agreed to just two (2) meeting a year.

Richard Brenner: John it was two (2) face to face meetings. Any other discussion? We will call for the vote. All are in favor. Motion carries unanimously.

5. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (HMEP) MID-CYCLE GRANT APPLICATIONS

Richard Brenner: Looks like Stephanie has applications from Clark County, Washoe County, and Nevada Public Behavioral Health.

Stephanie Parker: Correct

Richard Brenner: How many did Clark County put in for?

Stephanie Parker: they put in for four (4). I split one of them because they were two different activities; one was Training and one was Planning. The Nevada Public Behavioral Health Radiation Control Program; I included that because at the previous meetings, even though they were not eligible to apply, you agreed you wanted to see those applications. They didn't submit anything in 2015 for the previous year to become eligible. They have submitted recently, along with their application. They will not be eligible per policy on this sub -grant, it is something that can be taken into consideration or future funding.

Right now the bottom figure on the bottom left hand is the total awarded in the initial cycle. Go right above that – Total available for mid-cycle applications; Planning we have \$40,545 available and Training we have \$ 80.592 available.

John Helmreich: That's \$121,137 total.

Stephanie Parker: Yes

John Helmreich: The apps are slightly over that at 144, is that correct?

Stephanie Parker: Yes. After going through them, some of the equipment will not be conditionally allowable unless it's used for the Planning. The amount allocated for the training of the equipment should actually be moved over to be considered. Underneath that if we move the Planning and Training apps to the plan to be used in the exercise, than that's more appropriate with what USDOT would actually consider.

John Helmreich: We have actually \$40,000 in Planning funds available and requests for \$100,196 we have \$80,000 in Training with requests for \$24,000. Again, based on the categorization and at this point there is no blurring of those lines we do need to adhere to the \$40,000 and \$80,000 for the Planning and Training funds available.

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

Stacy Giomi: In the past been able to move money between Planning and Training, is that still a possibility?

Stephanie Parker: That is still a possibility. We are in a good position to do that because we use all our money for the sub-grants. As long as 75% goes to the sub-granting that is an option.

Irene: Question about which part should be mid-cycle funds. Should Nye County plan to apply for this or could we qualify under the SERC grant; the equipment training ops grant?

Stephanie Parker: You can always apply for that. Policy is written that mid-cycles are first come first served. It depends on the Funding Committee recommendations; I don't think they had, during mid-cycle, more applications than there was money.

Richard Brenner: Irene have you put a grant together?

Irene: We are in the process of doing so.

Richard Brenner: The mid-cycle grant is a grant period where we put the grant out and ask people to apply. We only had a handful of counties apply, and then we have extra money left over in the HMEP process. At that point we start telling people to start mid-cycle grants. Until the money runs out, the Funding Committee looks at grants.

Stephanie Parker: We currently have five (5) applications and there are two (2) other LEPCs that are submitting based on the results here.

Irene: I am sitting in for Missy Holt. Should we go ahead and continue on and apply for this if there's not enough funding?

Richard Brenner: it looks like we are not going to have enough money.

Irene: I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Richard Brenner: Which grant came in first?

Stephanie Parker: I started receiving the emails December 17th. All the ones from Clark came in first; three of them I have signatures that are actually completed, still waiting for signatures on one. Washoe was the same day on January 20th with a completed application.

Kathy Ludwig: Washoe County LEPC has submitted an application for \$29,952, with \$24,002 requested for Continuing Challenge for our LEPC discipline, \$5,950 requested for a custom eight (8) hour hazmat IQ training class. The Continuing Challenge we want to send 28 people and the IQ we plan on training about 160 people up here in Reno. I can answer any questions you have.

Richard Brenner: I take it the Fire Marshal office is not providing that Hazmat IQ training?

Kathy Ludwig: No.

Some discussion ensued about the HazMat IQ training and review of documentation sent by Washoe County, quotes and letter of declination not required.

Stacy Giomi: Because of the order that they came in are we taking action on Washoe now, even though it's the last one in?

Richard Brenner: Actually we can't.

Stacy Giomi: May I make a suggestion; I think there was something in some of the applications that we probably aren't going to be able to fund for HMEP. Maybe it would be better for us to globally go through that summary sheet that Stephanie put together and decide there are things in the grant that we can't fund because of the nature of the grant. If it gets us to the point where we know we can fund everything, we can go back and approve at the order they came in.

John Helmreich: That's a good idea. A suggestion is that perhaps we have a general discussion with two (2) levels of approval; one assumes that we can't move funds between Planning and Training and one assumes we will be able to. The total requested is close to what we have available, it's just not allocated correctly.

Stacy Giomi: I do not think that we have ever been denied that movement request. Stephanie, how quickly do you think you could get an answer on moving funds between categories.

Stephanie Parker: From the time I put into the portal, it takes two to three business days.

Stacy Giomi: I think we proceed on the presumption that we are going to be able to move funds. Stephanie won't send out the grant paperwork until we get approval to move the funds. Then she can send them out with whatever contingencies may exist.

John Helmreich: If we can't we would have to re-look. Get together again.

Kathy Ludwig: if grant applications are submitted but incomplete due to lacking signatures, do they still get first preference over the ones submitted that are complete?

Richard Brenner: In the past we have always wanted a complete, but I don't know. We kept placeholders where we put contingent on them. I know you have put a big effort out to there to request a complete package.

Stephanie Parker: That has been unclear for me. We are trying to address in Policy and Procedures because some sending a blank application with just their name on it. When I look at the past two years, we would place contingencies on it. But in the past two years we haven't had the situation where there is not enough money to go around. I only have one (1) that I don't have signatures or approval, which I should get in the next two days, Clark County. It is up to the SERC commission.

I have everything from Washoe County. The is one of the four from Clark that just went in front their commission last week.

Stacy Giomi: My comment, unless I missed something, because I read through this, there are clearly things that we can't fund through this grant. Maybe there's a way to finagle them in. Clark County and the grant application, they are asking for gas monitors. This isn't an equipment grant. If we keep a couple of these off, there's enough money to fund everything regardless of the order they came in.

Stephanie Parker: In the past they never funded equipment, however the last cycle they funded equipment as long as it was tied to planning and that's what this application was and it was used in an exercise. In the best practices, Richard worked on that document, only in the planning phase can you get equipment to use during an exercise but it's not for PPE, just for equipment. Am I right Richard?

Richard Brenner: You're right. Henderson did it. I would bet you \$100 that USDOT would never approve atmospheric monitors, and they did. The same thing with Nye County, it was a monitor. It's USDOT that makes the final call.

Stephanie Parker: Each one of those things must be included in exercise or plan for USDOT to even consider it.

Irene: I want to make clear on my question earlier, what we would be actually applying for would be the same as Clark County under the rad watches. What they would they be applying for is the same that what we would be applying for.

Stacy Giomi: I don't think that we can act on a grant that we don't have before us.

Stephanie Parker: No.

Richard Brenner: Let me explain to you from the standpoint that it may be the same items being requested but it's a different pot of dollars. The HMEP dollars that Stephanie was talking about deals with transportation dollars that can be used for planning and training purposes. The SERC money, the grant that just went out about a month ago, that money can be used for planning, training, equipment, pretty much anything. It's a \$25,000 grant. as long as you relate it to Hazmat you're good. With this

grant we have to relate it back to planning or training, if you're going to do any kind of equipment tie you are going to have to connect it to the transportation issue.

Stephanie Parker: I got a call from Public and Behavioral Health, that's where a lot of RAD calls are coming from. Because you see it several times, the I-80 corridor is going to be opening back up and they are trying to get equipped to handle that and do some exercises along that corridor. That's where we have multiple applications with that; Clark, Washoe, and Nye.

Kathy Ludwig: To clarify I am not asking for any equipment, or RAD watches, or anything like that. I am asking for the training at this point. We already have the RAD watches in place here in Reno.

Richard Brenner: You are just asking for the Continuing Challenge and the Hazmat IQ training. And you sent in a complete package.

Kathy Ludwig: Correct.

John Helmreich: We do have the training dollars available. In response to Kathy's earlier question, I would suggest that the date stamping of the complete or incomplete application be discussed by our policy group. I have some opinions, up to this point we haven't really been pressed for dollars and our precedent has been if there is an item that was incomplete on the application we would consider it anyway with contingencies. It is worthy consideration going forward for the policy committee to if we have to make decision based on when the application was submitted, are we considering only completed applications first and then go from there or what is our policy?

Tom Burns: I am assuming that Washoe is the five grants. We either determine in order to fund all of Washoe because that's where we're gonna run short on money we need to decide that one of the other submission is deficient and go to the back of the line. If we do that, we need to apply it consistently throughout. There's a clerical error, is that insufficient? I want to be on the same page. We have to have some sort of determination to decide if it is deficient or not.

John Helmreich: Agree.

Richard Brenner: Let's go through these- is that okay with the committee? All agree.

Stacy Giomi: Can we go through the order on the spreadsheet? I am on the goals, they are not talking about using the gas monitors in an exercise, and they're talking about putting them on monitors.

Richard Brenner: It looks like the comments include "in an exercise" on the spreadsheet, you've already notified them.

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

Richard Brenner: Stacy I believe it was Henderson who actually applied and was awarded.

Stacy Giomi: Okay so it's Henderson. They are getting a nominal amount of equipment that was being used specifically in an exercise that ties that together? This seems like a regular SERC grant application to me where they are specifically requesting equipment. I do see the tie in the dissertation but I don't see a tie to exercise or to training.

Stephanie Parker: On the second page of the Objectives the hazmat technicians will train personnel on how to use the new monitors before they are placed into service and will be completed within the grant period.

Stacy Giomi: for me, that's not enough. That's my opinion.

John Helmreich: To clarify; I thought the equipment had to be associated with a planning operation, not a training item.

Richard Brenner: I don't know. This money is going to be moving back and forth.

Stephanie Parker: They submitted it as a planning activity all in a lump sum. You're right it's very vague and not tied back to their plan to enhance or exercise it.

Stacy Giomi: Is this application otherwise intact?

Stephanie Parker: Yes it is.

Stacy Giomi: It seems like we are talking in circles. We should take them in the order received. I would consider making a motion approving this pending g USDOT approval of the request. Is that a bad way to go?

Richard Brenner: It would be under the training area, correct?

Stacy Giomi: I don't think it matters to us what category it goes under, as long as they submitted a worthwhile application and Stephanie can get the applications money to the right category, staff can do that so we're square with USDOT. It seems more administrative to me.

Stephanie Parker: USDOT will consider as submitted. If we try to change to training with equipment, they will not. That's the Best Practices that you guys developed.

Richard Brenner: I will second Stacy's motion. Further discussion?

John Helmreich: I don't mind doing this at this point in the process. We may not have yet fully the dollars available, I am just not clear. The planning and training are independent. Right now we are underfunded, even if we are allowed to move back and forth by \$3,000 or so. If we approve this one without seeing the other ones we might have to go back and adjust

Stacy Giomi: We are taking a leap in order, which we have always done. If we come across one that is lacking something that may be the one that gets set aside until they

become compliant. If USDOT does not fund monitors then we have the \$21,000 available again. And we can reconsider whatever else might have been in the hopper.

Richard Brenner: That's the only thing we can do. When I jumped over the Kathy I should have stayed on the path on the spreadsheet.

Stacy Giomi: If we don't try to deal with them as they come in this order, we could be talking in circles all afternoon.

Richard Brenner: My fault I apologize.

Tom Burns: I think at this point we are tied with what we have done historically in the absence of a change in policy.

Stacy Giomi: We are certainly tied to policy. We are also tied to the opinion of the courts; we are commissioned and committee members and make a decision based on policy and what we see here. On my motion I want to be sure that it is clear.

Stephanie Parker: We have to approve the first one for North Las Vegas for gas monitors based on USDOT approval and the quote.

Stacy Giomi: I didn't see the quote, but I amend my motion to include a quote.

Richard Brenner: I will second that.

Tom Burns: Stephanie, did they include a quote?

Stephanie Parker: No in my notes I put that we need approval from USDOT and a quote.

Discussion about the quote and notes.

Stephanie Parker: I have a question for the Committee as far as PPE. That PPE is not included and that is why it is taken out of the equipment and out of the training and only for the planning.

Stacy Giomi: A gas monitor is not a PPE.

Richard Brenner: What we have right now; it's contingent on USDOT and a quote.

John Helmreich: Is only one quote required?

Stephanie Parker: That policy has not been changed yet. That policy is still under review. It is currently one quote for equipment.

Richard Brenner: Any further discussion. All in favor say Aye. Opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

The next grant is for \$29,980.75. Once again with the radiation watches. Do they have a quote in?

Stephanie Parker: This is a federal sole source. Even though it was submitted planning and training it would have to be the planning to be considered by the USDOT.

Tom Burns: Again, in light of what we just approved on the prior one where you said we must include exercise or plan to use an exercise, is that the same contingent here?

Stephanie Parker: Yes, and they actually included that in their statement.

Tom Burns: Yes I was looking at that. It does reference using exercises and real life incidents.

Richard Brenner: The only thing we're looking at is contingent on USDOT?

Stephanie Parker: Correct

Stacy Giomi: Stephanie that \$580 incorporated in that total amount is truly training dollars to have that person come in and do the training?

Stephanie Parker: Yes. It's to cover those expenses but we would need to submit it to USDOT and planning.

Stacy Giomi: Maybe this question is for Richard or Nathan - can we have Stephanie, once we approve these grant applications, go through and allocate them in the right category and make that request administratively through USDOT? Do we need a motion to do that?

Nathan Hastings: I hope that I am understanding correctly the context in which it was discussed with the last application and how you are discussing it now. The first thing that I am think of, if I understand your question correctly, if that part has always been done administratively as a component of carrying out the action taken by the Committee, the best course of action would be to continue to do that. Am I understanding the question correctly? Are you asking something beyond that?

Stacy Giomi: Nathan I think you are correct. In the past, now that I have thought about it, basically Richard or Karen that we as a subcommittee would approve and administratively she would work on categories and getting them to USDOT. I think we did that without motions. Richard and John I will defer to you. Then we don't get bogged down in the category issue.

Richard Brenner: I agree Stacy.

Nathan Hastings: I am ignorant as to what happened in the background, how the actual action of the motion would be carried out administratively. Based on my recollection of the past meetings and how the approvals would come up and be reviewed and what the motions were like and what was approved and my understanding of what the action was that would be taken, to me my understanding is

consistent with what you are describing. Based on the way this agenda is set up that you would take the action under the motion of the approval or partial but would not attempt to or need to attempt to detail all the background or administrative stuff.

Stacy Giomi: Ok, perfect. Then I guess as committee members we can take that category off the table and Stephanie needs to make a note of it to put it on the minutes for reference purposes but we don't need to do that in a motion every time.

Nathan Hastings: When we're talking about categories you're talking about a subset of the primary group of a particular agenda item.

Stacy Giomi: I am not talking about pulling into another category that isn't on the agenda.

Nathan Hastings: Unless you have another question about it I don't have anything else to say.

Tom Burns: I move to approve the Clark County LEPC request for \$29,980.75.

Richard Brenner: Do I have a second?

Stacy Giomi: I will second, contingent on USDOT approval.

Richard Brenner: Any discussion? All in favor say Aye. [Ayes all around.] Any opposed? Motion carries.

Next item is \$17,706. It looks like they put the two together.

Tom Burns: You did have quotes Stephanie?

Stephanie Parker: Yes. This is the City of Henderson.

Tom Burns: It appears they referenced in their use in exercises. Do we need that must include exercises or plans use in exercises?

Stephanie Parker: I only used that I know to move the \$2,000 over to the Planning.

Stacy Giomi: Stephanie why does it say here that "bylaws are due 11/20/15 on the \$2,000 and not the \$15,000?"

Stephanie Parker: Because I forgot to remove it, because they submitted it. The only thing they need on this one is an approval from DOT. I have the signatures as well.

Stacy Giomi: So DOT approval is the contingency?

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

John Helmreich: I move to approve Clark County's request for \$17,706 contingent upon approval from USDOT.

Richard Brenner: I will second it. .Discussion? All in favor say Aye. [Ayes all around.] Any opposed? Motion carries.

The next one is Clark County again.

Stephanie Parker: Disregard the bylaws, we have received the bylaws. We still need all the signatures and the quote and the minutes.

John Helmreich: What is the training dome?

Richard Brenner: Basically a dome that is on the ground, think of a rail car. They have taken off of the rail car and put it on wheels so you don't have to be ontop of a rail car to practice.

John Helmreich: I am still having difficulty visualizing, but that's ok.

Richard Brenner: Gave further description of the dome and how it works.

Stacy Giomi: This is the one that in addition to DOT approval – signatures, quote, and meeting minutes, correct?

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

Richard Brenner: When did this one come in Stephanie?

Stephanie Parker: January 8th. I called Carolyn today and she has not gotten the minutes back. It went in front of your BCC February 2.

Richard Brenner: On the spreadsheet above the 8th, did the \$2,000 come in on the 23rd?

Stephanie Parker: Those two are broken in part, for the City of Henderson - \$15,706 and \$2,000 at \$17,706. That is 12/23 sorry. The total amount is broken into two so \$15,706 and the \$2,000, part 1 of 2 and part 2 of 2 came in December 23, 2015.

John Helmreich: To jump ahead, if we're at the point of saying we're \$ 3,061 short of meeting all requests at this point in time, it appears we have a choice, we could either reduce this one by that amount because it wasn't complete or we could reduce Washoe's request by that amount because it was last. Is that correct? I am asking for a process check.

Stacy Giomi: We could do either of those things or none of those things. The other question is that Public Behavioral Health, another almost \$30,000 in requests and they are also not in compliance.

John Helmreich: They were not eligible.

Stacy Giomi: We do not need to consider that?

Stephanie Parker: No.

Stacy Giomi: in the past we have allocated SERC funds to make up the difference. I would be included to, because the Clark County while it came in first is missing quotes, meetings minutes, I would be inclined to skip it and go to the next in line that we know is compliant.

Richard Brenner: I would rather reward people that do a complete application.

Tom Burns: This is more than a clerical error or missing one signature because someone was traveling. This is deficient because of the lack of material that didn't come accompany it.

John Helmreich: I am glad to hear that, because I agree with the early comments from Stacy and Richard. Clarifying it in policy would be helpful but if we have to make a decision now, I think we have a direction.

Stacy Giomi: Based on that I will make a motion to approve Washoe County's grant application I the amount of \$29,952 contingent on USDOT approval.

Richard Brenner: I will second that.

Stacy Giomi: You have RAD watch must be used in exercise.

Kathy Ludwig: There is no equipment. I didn't think HMEP was an equipment grant. it seems that every request has equipment on it, ours is training only.

John Helmreich: So that statement on the worksheet should be ignored?

Stephanie Parker: Correct

Richard Brenner: The RAD watch is not of their...it has been confusing me since it first started out.

Stephanie Parker: I made an error on the spreadsheet.

Stacy Giomi: Kathy I agree with you in terms of the equipment. If DOT look at this, my personal opinion is that DOT won't approve a lot of this because there is a lot of equipment.

Kathy Ludwig: Thank you

John Helmreich: Stacy could you repeat your motion?

Stacy Giomi: I move to approve Washoe County's grant application for \$29,952, contingent upon approval from the USDOT.

Richard Brenner: Second. My only question is funding, do we have enough funds, do we fund partially?

Stacy Giomi: we have enough funds for this one; we are deficient on the next one.

Richard Brenner: Any further discussion

Stephanie Parker: The Hazmat IQ training is a custom course. I think that is why I put it in there. It includes four (4) hours of new equipment training to include RAD watch device reader and use procedures. That is why it is on the spreadsheet.

Richard Brenner: Any other discussion? All in favor say Aye. [Ayes all around.] Any opposed? Motion carries.

Stacy Giomi: I think that we go back to Clark County's incomplete application.

Richard Brenner: We have one application from Clark County, the \$24,689. At present time they have not submitted anything correct?

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

Richard Brenner: We are still waiting for the items to come in?

Stephanie Parker: Karen said we should get it within two days.

Stacy Giomi: How short are we exactly?

Stephanie Parker: \$ 3,061.19. Right now we have \$ 21,627.81 available, if the others are approved.

Stacy Giomi: I motion to recommend approval of Clark County's grant application in the amount of \$ 24,689, contingent upon USDOT approval, receiving all of the quotes and signatures, and only assuming that the full amount becomes available due to a USDOT declination on an item of one of the other grant applications previously approved. Then if all other items are approved, I approve this grant application in the amount of \$ 21,627.81 thereby reducing their request to the amount remaining available

John Helmreich: Second.

Stacy Giomi: Stephanie, this allows you to do anything you need to do administratively; if you find that some USDOT requests are not going to fly, then you can fully fund it, if not, fund it as much as we can which is the \$21,681.

Stephanie Parker: Okay.

Richard Brenner: Thank you Stacy. Any other discussion? All in favor say Aye. [Ayes all around.] Any opposed? Motion carries.

Stephanie, the folks from Nevada Public Behavioral Health – are they working on putting a plan together?

Stephanie Parker: Yes they submitted their plan, all the requirements for the stat agency so they can submit for future funding opportunities.

6. REVIEW THE MAXIMUM DOLLAR AMOUNT AND WHETHER OR NOT TO AWARD UNITED WE STAND (UWS) GRANT FOR FY2017.

Richard Brenner: Last year Stephanie did not put this grant out there because we were trying to make our reserves higher. Do you have the dollars amount that we have right now?

Stephanie Parker: I do. Year to date we have \$183,797.99, which includes carry-over from the previous year. The goal when the budget was set was to incur or to collect \$375,000. The spreadsheet that Tami sent out gave the FY 2015, as far as what you gave out, was \$457,000. I wanted you to take a look at United We Stand had been based on NDEM Strategic Plan. They have changed that to the FIRA and that is something the Policy Committee is in the process of changing as well; that the applications or the items being requested have to be in line with the state FIRAs, and in line with the original intent of the license plate funds.

Richard Brenner: The license plate funds were combating terrorism, if I remember right.

Stephanie Parker: Right.

Richard Brenner: They have rolled over to the FIRA.

Stacy Giomi: they still do identify priority. I agree the document should be the FIRA that is produced by DEM it terms of complying with that.

Stephanie Parker: I gave you an incorrect amount, I am sorry. We collect \$ 283,159 to date.

Stacy Giomi: What did we anticipate collecting?

Stephanie Parker: \$375,000 was the goal.

Stacy Giomi: do we feel we will collect that mark?

Stephanie Parker: It fluctuates; it's based on renewals and it has not been consistent. We average about \$90,000 per quarter and it only comes in on a quarterly basis. WE have two quarter in.

Stacy Giomi: Based on that we should get another \$180,000. We would put us above our goal.

Stephanie Parker: It would put you above your goal. You want to have it padded so you have \$25,000 to carry over to the next year. To keep a line item in the budget, that's how it was done previously.

John Helmreich: The two quarters would come in by June?

Stephanie Parker: They would be collected by the end of June. We would see the last distribution in July.

Stacy Giomi: If we do \$25,000, assume every county applies, which we know they won't. That puts us at \$445,000 which leaves us \$50,000 for whatever state agencies might put it. That puts us closer to \$475,000. I don't think we should go more than \$25,000.

Richard Brenner: I think we should keep it at \$25,000 just like we did at SERC Planning, Training, and Operation Grant this year.

Stacy Giomi: Is this the SERC recommendation to the full commission or is this for us to set?

Richard Brenner: It is a recommendation.

Nathan Hastings: I read it that it is just to make a recommendation.

Stacy Giomi: I move to recommend to the full commission that we open up the United We Stand Grant applications again for FY2017 to start after July 1, 2016 with a cap of \$25,000 per request.

Richard Brenner: I will second. Discussion? All in favor say Aye. [Ayes all around.] Any opposed? Motion carries.

7. REVIEW THE AVAILABLE FUNDS FOR THE PARTICIPATION PORTION OF FIRESHOWEST (FSW) CONFERENCE

Stephanie Parker: I asked to put this on here because the little that I have participated in the past, the FireShows West management has funded out of SERC at about \$40,000. We did not have to increase that amount. The HEMP had enough funds in it for participation by the LEPCs. This year we are probably not going to have that, I put another column on the spreadsheet for you to look at and determine if the Funding Committee wanted to make a recommendation to the commission to use SERC funding for participations for LEPCs for FireShows West. I thought this was something that needed to be discussed.

Stacy Giomi: I think that FireShowsWest and its predecessor were valuable training tools especially for smaller volunteer departments to get some quality hazmat training. I know that not every agency takes advantage of it, but I know the few do find it very valuable. I would hate to try to not figure out a way to try and fund that. It might an agenda item for the full commission to talk about with some recommendations from staff.

Richard Brenner: I agree with Stacy. This is something we have worked on for many many years. And in trying to get our first responders hazmat training and the last few years since we have started working with Nevada Fire Chiefs our numbers are getting better and better. We are providing a lot of good training to folks that want the hazmat training. The best way to deal with this is to actually have a discussion at the SERC to see how we fund it.

Stacy Giomi: If you look, you can see the agencies that take advantage of it; Clark obviously spends a lot of money, but you also have Douglas, Elko, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, Storey, White Pine. I think it's important to continue.

John Helmreich: I should know this, but from a historical perspective at what level have we funded it in the past?

Stephanie Parker: FY16 actual for FireShowsWest are on this spreadsheet. It was closer to \$70,000. Some people de-obligated, this was historically the worst fire season, so you had a lot of people who needed to cancel. Prior to that, I didn't capture that information. Like Richard said it has gone up with the attractiveness, quality of training, and surveys post event.

John Helmreich: But in the past, while it was at \$ 70,000, we funded it at \$40,000?

Stacy Giomi: Two different things. The \$40,000 is for the planning and that is built into. So this is funding to send participants to the conference.

John Helmreich: And we have not historically done that?

Stacy Giomi: We have done that

Stephanie Parker: We have done out of HMEP. We've always had the HMEP dollars to send the participants. This year it looks like we were blown out.

Richard Brenner: But we didn't take money and put it aside for FireShowsWest this year?

Stephanie Parker: Correct

Stacy Giomi: That's probably something we need to make a note to do in the future; when that HMEP funds, that we carve a chunk of that out. It will be easier with a three-year process now.

John Helmreich: To summarize the sentiment we should have this at a full SERC quarterly meeting discussion. We would highly support participation dependent upon how much we get from HMEP.

Richard Brenner: We will put this on the agenda for the April meeting.

Stephanie Parker: That's what I would suggest.

Richard Brenner: and then look at possibly funding it with SERC dollars.

Stephanie Parker: Exactly.

Richard Brenner: That's what I would recommend John. Because they don't have HMEP dollars to fund it, we could use SERC dollars to pay for this year. But for next year well carve out a specific amount. In the past we used the pass through.

Stephanie Parker: Yes, we have used a pass through which would potentially get us in trouble because the contract has been with SERC, but paid for by another entity. This year we are trying to get it so that the paperwork lines up so nobody's paper trail looks bad.

Richard Brenner: That money is SERC money, correct?

Stephanie Parker: That \$40,000 is SERC money.

Richard Brenner: In the past we used to go through Storey County. That helped pay for the organization, and the classes. This year are talking about doing something different. Correct?

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

Richard Brenner: Any further discussion with this item? We will include this on the SERC agenda.

8. REPORT OF GRANT CHAGNE REQUESTS ALREADY APPROVED

Stephanie Parker: I thought I was going to have one, but Humboldt County will be able to go ahead and keep their original reward for its original purpose. I will keep you apprised of that.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

John Helmreich: I want to reinforce earlier discussion engaging the Policy Committee regarding what is a substantive deficiency or any kind deficiency on an application and what that does to their status in the que.

Stephanie Parker: Absolutely.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Richard Brenner: Motion to adjourn?

John Helmreich: Motion to adjourn

Stacy Giomi: Seconded the motion.

Richard Brenner: All in favor say Aye. [Ayes all around.] Any opposed? Motion carries. 2:59 pm.