

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2020, MEETING  
OF THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE'S  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW AND ADVISE ON CORONAVIRUS FEDERAL AID

Chair Jason Frierson called the second meeting of the Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee to Review and Advise on Coronavirus Federal Aid to order at 9:05 a.m. on October 9, 2020, via videoconference. Pursuant to Sections 2 through 9, inclusive, of Chapter 2, *Statutes of Nevada 2020*, 32<sup>nd</sup> Special Session, pages 9 through 11, there was no physical location for the meeting.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chair  
Senator Chris Brooks  
Senator Nicole Cannizzaro  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Ben Kieckhefer  
Senator David Parks for Senator Yvanna Cancela  
Senator Joyce Woodhouse  
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblyman Tom Roberts  
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Senator Yvanna Cancela

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:**

Cindy Jones, Fiscal Analyst, Assembly  
Mark Krmpotic, Fiscal Analyst, Senate  
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Eileen O'Grady, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel  
Carla Ulrych, Fiscal Analysis Division Secretary

**EXHIBITS:**

[Exhibit A](#): Agenda  
[Exhibit B](#): Meeting Packet  
[Exhibit C](#): Clark County Presentation – Pages 45-52

**I. ROLL CALL.**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), called the roll; all members were present except Senator Cancela, who was excused.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Pursuant to Sections 2 through 9, inclusive, of Chapter 2, *Statutes of Nevada 2020*, 32<sup>nd</sup> Special Session, pages 9 through 11, there was no physical location for this meeting. The meeting was broadcast on the Nevada Legislative website at [www.leg.state.nv.us](http://www.leg.state.nv.us). Public comment was accepted live via telephone. Written comments were also accepted by e-mail, facsimile, and mail before, during, and after the meeting.

There was no public comment.

## **III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2020, MEETING.**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2020, MEETING.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

## **IV. REVIEW OF THE USES OF CORONAVIRUS FEDERAL AID ALLOCATED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ENTITIES.**

### **A. Nevada Association of Counties**

Dagny Stapleton, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), said NACO is a statewide association representing all 17 counties. She said NACO followed the CARES Act very closely from inception through passage in spring 2020. Prior to that, NACO members communicated regularly with Nevada's congressional delegation about the importance of federal aid to counties, and the impact that COVID-19 would have on county operations and services. Since the passage of the CARES Act, NACO had been closely following the U.S. Department of the Treasury (Treasury) guidance and working with NACO members on the usage of allocated funds.

Ms. Stapleton noted that the Coronavirus Relief Funds (CRF) allocations for the counties were shown on page 26 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). She stated that Clark County received a direct allocation of \$295.0 million from the Treasury, and the remaining counties received an allocation out of the state's direct allocation. She stated that the allocation for Washoe County was \$20.5 million, and the total allocation for the rural counties was \$46.8 million.

Ms. Stapleton stated that every county in Nevada typically provided regional services to all county residents, which was especially important during the COVID-19 pandemic. She said the counties always played a role in public health. In addition, they provided regional emergency response and support to the most vulnerable residents. Ms. Stapleton noted that the counties chose to support many of those functions with CRF.

Continuing, Ms. Stapleton said every county was helping to supplement public health efforts, either directly or in partnership with the local health district. She said during the pandemic, all public health entities were supported in some capacity with county funding. She said the counties directly sponsored or coordinated local testing efforts, staff and funds for contact tracing and case investigations. Some counties, in partnership with or through their county boards of health, also initiated rigorous communication and outreach efforts to residents about the importance of social distancing, wearing masks, being tested, and complying with and enforcing the Governor's directives.

Ms. Stapleton noted that Clark County, Washoe County, and Carson City each had a public health district. All the rural counties had county boards of health that partnered with the state to provide public health services. Ms. Stapleton noted that Carson City had a highly successful model where its health district was part of the county. She said Carson City had a regional partnership with three neighboring counties to provide public health services. Ms. Stapleton said the Quad County Health Care Coalition was one of the first to begin planning to support mass vaccination when a vaccine became available. She noted that a portion of the mass vaccination effort would be supported with CRF.

Ms. Stapleton said, during the pandemic, emergency response was coordinated at the county level, and many counties established emergency operations centers (EOCs). The counties also provided locally for quarantine and isolation beds for first responders, at-risk residents and the homeless population.

Continuing, Ms. Stapleton said the counties had always been the provider of the local Social Safety Net, which provided critical services, especially during the pandemic. All counties provided meals to seniors through their senior centers, and had coordinated new systems or expanded existing systems for meal distribution and pick up. In addition, the counties were supporting residents by connecting them to or providing for housing and utility assistance. They also established programs to award grant funds to local businesses impacted by the pandemic. Ms. Stapleton noted that the counties had done all of that while also maintaining other critical services, including municipal services in all unincorporated areas; administering elections; providing critical infrastructure such as roads and water systems; providing child protective services; and ensuring that the justice and districts courts continued to safely operate and provide services during the pandemic. She noted that many services were supported through CRF.

Ms. Stapleton provided an overview of the efforts by NACO to assist the counties in spending their CRF allocations responsibly and based upon federal guidelines. She said NACO communicated regularly with the Office of the Governor and the Governor's Finance Office (GFO) to advocate for the shared use of the state allocation with the counties, and since then to ensure that all the counties were communicating with the state about their allocations, including funding plans and reporting. Ms. Stapleton thanked the GFO for its accessibility and assistance over the past several months.

Ms. Stapleton said, in early summer of 2020, NACO developed and distributed materials to NACO members, which included summaries on the CARES Act and allowable uses of the CRF. She said NACO also hosted a training session for members, which reviewed the federal guidelines for spending, accounting requirements, and audit considerations for local governments. Ms. Stapleton said NACO made every effort to encourage and assist members so that the funds would be spent responsibly and in full compliance with federal guidelines, which NACO believed the counties were doing.

Finally, in July 2020, NACO began working with a national nonprofit organization, the National Development Council (NDC), on a program that would allow counties to distribute CRF to local small businesses. Ms. Stapleton said the Small Business Grant (SBG) program was an ongoing program that rolled out in early September. She noted that the program was modeled after the Clark County program, which was the first program to be put in place. The SBG program was made available to the other 16 counties, eight of which were participating in the program. She noted that two counties had their own business assistance programs. Ms. Stapleton said the SBG program awarded grant funds to small businesses in Nevada to cover costs for personal protective equipment (PPE), rent, utilities, retrofits to comply with social distancing directives, and operating expenses.

Ms. Stapleton said the Office of the Governor required eligible local governments to submit a spending plan for the first and second half of their allocation in order to receive a CRF allocation from the state. Of Nevada's 15 rural counties, 14 chose to receive the funds up front. All but one of those counties had already received the first half of their allocation and confirmed that the funds would be or had been spent. About half of the rural counties had also developed a spending plan for the second half of their allocation, and most of those plans had been approved by the Office of the Governor. She noted that some of the counties had already received the second half of their allocation. The remaining counties chose to receive the second half of their allocation through reimbursement to ensure that any unused funds remained with the state. If the funds were not requested for reimbursement, they would be allocated to other jurisdictions or needs.

Continuing, Ms. Stapleton said, in terms CRF expenditures, Nevada counties supported their residents in similar ways, especially during the pandemic. Most rural counties allocated funds to conduct or assist with testing and contact tracing, and all had spent funds on regional emergency response and to sustain county operations during the pandemic, including new and unplanned expenses related

to the virus. Some of those expenses included improvements to ensure the safety of employees and the public; purchases of PPE for staff and emergency personnel and for community distribution; costs for telework and to provide some county services online; and changes to operations to honor the Open Meeting Law and allow the public to participate in the local government process, either remotely or at a social distance. Another common use of the funds was to support additional child care and recreation programs for students who were distance learning and in need of additional support during those times. In over half the rural counties, that support was provided through partnerships with the Boys and Girls Clubs. Ms. Stapleton said rural counties also elected to share dollars with hospitals and school districts, and provided additional supports to residents in need, including nutrition, housing and utility assistance, and assistance for small businesses.

Ms. Stapleton highlighted several of the rural county spending plans in detail, beginning with Carson City (page 30, [Exhibit B](#)). She noted that Carson City was one of the largest rural counties and Nevada's only consolidated city/county. The population of Carson City was approximately 55,000. Carson City received an allocation of approximately \$10.2 million. She noted that Carson City had received its entire allocation from the state, and confirmed it was on track to spend all of the funds by the December 30, 2020, deadline. Ms. Stapleton provided the following breakdown of CRF expenditures for Carson City:

- \$1.6 million was provided to the Carson City School District and charter schools to assist with social distancing, distance learning, and public health needs in the schools, including support for school nurses.
- \$1.8 million was provided to Carson Tahoe Regional Medical Center to support a temporary structure for overflow due to COVID-19, as well as additional nurses to provide screenings.
- \$1.0 million was provided to nonprofit organizations in collaboration with the Boys and Girls Club in Carson City to support students and residents in need. A portion of those funds was provided to community organizations impacted by COVID-19.
- \$1.0 million was used to establish a supply depot where local businesses and other entities could obtain PPE and sanitation supplies.
- \$200,000 was provided to a long-term care facility to retrofit for a social distancing improvement project to allow for isolation of exposed or positive residents.

Ms. Stapleton stated that the balance of Carson City's funds went toward county operations, including retrofits in city buildings and facilities, regional emergency operations, and public health, as well as contact tracing and testing for the quad-county public health response.

Referring to page 31 of the meeting packet, Ms. Stapleton noted that Nye County was one of Nevada's larger rural counties with a population of 46,000 ([Exhibit B](#)). She stated that Nye County received a CRF allocation of \$8.5 million. She said the county had received the first half of its allocation, and expected to receive the

second half this week. Ms. Stapleton said Nye County had confirmed that all of the funding would be expended by December 30, 2020.

Ms. Stapleton provided the following breakdown of CRF expenditures for Nye County:

- \$700,000 would be used for food distribution, and housing and utility assistance. Nye County staff reported that the public assistance program was one of the most successful CARES Act programs to date in terms of quickly meeting the needs of residents. Nye County also intended to use a portion of the funds for a mental health program due to increased need.
- \$1.2 million was allocated to sub-entities such as Nye County School District, Northern Nye County Hospital in Tonopah, and towns and libraries, for PPE, retrofitting and other COVID-19 related expenses.
- \$1.5 million was allocated for small business assistance, including rent, operating expenses, retrofitting, etc. Ms. Stapleton noted that Nye County was a participant in NACO's SBG program.

Ms. Stapleton reported that the balance of Nye County's funds was used for county operations, including public health efforts, which included \$100,000 for community-based testing and contact tracing. Some of the funds would also be used for emergency response, PPE, telework expenses, and other measures taken in response to the virus to safely maintain services to the public.

Referring to page 32 of the meeting packet, Ms. Stapleton provided an overview of CRF expenditures in two of Nevada's frontier counties – Pershing County and White Pine County ([Exhibit B](#)). She stated that both counties had populations under 10,000, and the funds had been very helpful for the counties and residents. Both counties reported that their full allocations would be expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline.

Ms. Stapleton noted that Pershing County received a CRF allocation of \$900,000. The funds were used to pay for increased costs for emergency operations, including equipment to mitigate potential exposure, and a trailer for response efforts in rural parts of the county. In partnership with the local hospital, the county paid for community-based testing events and provided for long-range testing into the winter. The county was also set up to administer vaccinations when a vaccine became available. In addition, Pershing County purchased PPE and cleaning supplies, and made other purchases to ensure compliance with the social distancing directive and to manage any prospective outbreaks at the county jail. Some funds would also be spent on public safety and public health salaries, as well as for remote meetings and other county operations. She stated that the county was also using the funds to support COVID-19 related changes and programs for seniors, as well as small retrofits to the community center to allow for hospital overflow if needed.

Ms. Stapleton said White Pine County received a CRF allocation of \$1.0 million. Approximately half of the allocation was spent on county operations and response, including public health, emergency services, courts, and additional meals to seniors. The remaining 50% was allocated for grants to support small businesses. She noted that White Pine County was a participant in NACO's SBG program. Ms. Stapleton said White Pine County was also utilizing the funds to support programs for students, and assist the White Pine County Fire District in purchasing additional supplies for emergency response.

Chair Frierson recalled that Ms. Stapleton mentioned that the second half of the allocation for some local governments would be distributed by reimbursement so that the funds could be used elsewhere if reimbursement was not requested.

Ms. Stapleton replied that only a few rural counties chose to receive the second half of their allocation by reimbursement. Although some of those counties would most likely utilize all the funds, the reimbursement method would ensure that any unused funds were available to the state for other jurisdictions or needs. She noted that many of the counties that chose to receive the second half of their allocation directly had developed a specific expenditure plan and had already received the funds.

Chair Frierson asked if there were any restraints on reallocating the funds to a different county. Ms. Stapleton thought it was the state's decision whether the funds could be reallocated; however, she believed that was permissible per Treasury guidance.

In response to a question from Chair Frierson, Ms. Stapleton thought the rules were the same for the direct federal allocation and the state allocation, as well as allocations from the state to local municipalities. She said a county could choose to allocate funds to other entities within their jurisdiction; however, any unused funds would revert to the state. It would then be up to the state to determine how to utilize those funds.

Chair Frierson recalled that some local governments had allocated funding for schools, health care, housing assistance, etc., which appeared to overlap with state expenditures. He asked if and how the local governments were coordinating with the state to avoid duplication of efforts.

Ms. Stapleton understood that the school districts received a CRF allocation. She hoped the school districts were not requesting money from the counties for expenditures for which they had already received funding. She assumed that each county was working directly with the school districts to determine specific needs over and above funding that had already been received by the districts. She said costs varied in each county depending on the needs of the school district, and how the county chose to help.

In terms of public health response, Ms. Stapleton said every county coordinated differently on those matters. She said there were local responsibilities through the public health districts. In the rural areas, the counties worked with the state and also provided public health response at the local level. In each of those instances, the state and county coordinated efforts. Ms. Stapleton noted that many counties, even among the smallest, were participating in and spending county dollars and CRF on testing and contact tracing. She did not think there was a duplication of effort in that instance, because there was significant need. However, the state and the counties were working in partnership to ensure needs were addressed.

With regard to housing assistance, Ms. Stapleton said the rural counties were aware that the state was providing housing assistance through the Nevada Rural Housing Authority (NRHA); therefore, most of the rural counties were referring people to the NRHA. She said rural counties providing housing assistance independently were still meeting a significant and important need. Ms. Stapleton did not think there was duplication of effort in the area of housing assistance.

Ms. Stapleton said NACO had been developing the SBG program over the past several months. NACO had been in communication with the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) and the Office of the State Treasurer; therefore, both agencies had knowledge of the NACO program. She said NACO was aware that the state was rolling out a similar program; however, the request made by NACO was for a single program among the rural counties to avoid confusion and to ensure that all the funds were utilized.

Assemblywoman Tolles noted that only Carson City had specifically allocated funding to long-term care facilities, where morbidity rates tended to be highest. She asked if long-term care facilities received a direct allocation from the state. She also asked if there was coordination with the state to ensure that vulnerable populations were receiving critical resources.

Ms. Stapleton replied that long-term care facilities were regulated by the state. She agreed that residents at long-term care facilities were a vulnerable population that required support as part of the public health response. When Carson City received the CRF allocation, the city put out a call for needs in the community. She said Carson City allocated funding to a local long-term care facility that had expressed a need. Ms. Stapleton did not think that other counties shared the funding with long-term care facilities. She said every county individually determined how to expend the funds based on needs and priorities in that county. Ms. Stapleton said she was uncertain whether the state was supporting long-term care facilities with CRF.

Assemblywoman Tolles asked if CRF was used to help first responders. She understood that some specific programs provided temporary housing for first responders and other residents who needed to isolate to reduce community spread. She asked if any of the counties used their CRF allocation for that purpose, or if the funding for those programs was provided by the state.



Ms. Stapleton replied that the counties provided regional emergency response, and many first responders were county employees. She indicated that Clark and Washoe Counties as well as a few rural counties had set aside funds and provided quarantine assistance for first responders.

Senator Goicoechea asked if participation in the SBG program had increased. He recalled that NACO was concerned because the program did not roll out as quickly as anticipated. He was aware that businesses were waiting for the state program to open, because of the simplicity of the application.

Ms. Stapleton replied that NACO worked diligently to roll out the program. NACO used a variety of outreach methods in the rural counties. She noted that in some counties, the county commissioners distributed flyers to businesses. Although participation and interest in the program took a couple of weeks, interest had grown significantly. She said there was a lot of communication at the local level to get the word out in the eight participating counties. She reiterated that two rural counties had their own business assistance programs. Ms. Stapleton remarked that small businesses located in non-participating counties were looking forward to the state's program.

Continuing, Ms. Stapleton said the state reviewed NACO's application during the development of the application for the state program. She noted that NACO's small business grant assistance application was very simple, and included any and all permissible uses by the Treasury. NACO tried to make the application broad and uncomplicated. She indicated that the state was using the same contractor that NACO had used.

Senator Goicoechea said he was glad to hear that interest in the program had grown.

In response to a question from Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, Ms. Stapleton said residents typically contacted their county human services department when in need of a service or program, and the county would then refer them to a state program. However, in the case of housing assistance, the majority of the rural counties were referring residents to the NRHA. Ms. Stapleton said she did not think there was duplication of effort with regard to housing assistance, because of the coordination between the counties and the NRHA. She indicated that the two rural counties that had their own programs were also coordinating with the NRHA.

Ms. Stapleton said existing county human services staff, even prior to the pandemic, were responsible for referring residents to services in the county or to other organizations. In the case of housing assistance, the rural counties were referring people to the NRHA.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson understood that the rural counties were not aiding residents with housing assistance through the CRF allocation; they were providing assistance by referring people to the NRHA.

Ms. Stapleton indicated that two rural counties were offering housing assistance; however, she would confirm that and provide a response to the Subcommittee. She said the remainder of the rural counties were referring residents to the state program to avoid duplication of effort.

Chair Frierson asked if the counties were confident that all the funds would be expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline. He understood that some of the counties had elected to receive the second half of their allocation in the form of reimbursement. He asked if there were systems in place to ensure the funds were expended by the deadline.

Ms. Stapleton replied that NACO had been discussing the matter with its members since the funds were allocated. She said NACO had repeatedly stressed to the counties the importance of developing an expenditure plan, as well as returning any unused portion to the state as soon as possible if the funds would not be utilized. Ms. Stapleton said, in preparing for today's presentation, she had conversations with each of the rural counties, most of which confirmed that they expected to utilize all of the funds. She noted that the counties were grateful to have received a CRF allocation. Ms. Stapleton remarked that the GFO was also working with the counties to ensure the funds would be expended by the deadline.

Continuing, Ms. Stapleton said that a few counties did not think they would spend all of their allocation, which is why they chose to receive the second half by reimbursement. That would ensure the funds were available to the state for other needs if reimbursement was not requested by those counties.

Chair Frierson said it was important for the counties to understand that if they did not request reimbursement as the deadline approached, the state was likely to spend the funds elsewhere; therefore, it was critical for the counties to request reimbursement as soon as possible.

Ms. Stapleton said NACO had stressed that message to the rural counties, and the counties were aware of the fact that the state may use the funds elsewhere to avoid having unused funds on December 30, 2020.

#### B. Clark County

Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County, introduced Yolanda King, County Manager, Clark County; Kevin Schiller, Assistant County Manager, Clark County; Jessica Colvin, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Clark County; and Billy Samuels, Deputy Chief, Clark County Fire Department. Ms. Jacob noted that the Clark County presentation would be followed by the county's municipal partners that received a funding allocation from the county.

Ms. Jacob stated that Clark County was the 11<sup>th</sup> largest county in the nation. She said regional and municipal services were provided for 2.3 million residents. She noted that if unincorporated Clark County were a city, it would be the largest populated city in Nevada.

Ms. Jacob referred to the chart on page 36, which displayed Clark County regional services and municipal services ([Exhibit B](#)). She stated that COVID-19 had a significant impact on regional services. She noted that regional services for Clark County included the University Medical Center (UMC).

Ms. Jacob stated that the concentration of cases tracked with the concentration of the population of the state. She noted that the figures presented on page 37 of the meeting packet were from October 5, 2020 ([Exhibit B](#)). Of the 82,437 cases in Nevada, 69,151 were in Clark County. She said that rate had been constant, which had significantly impacted the county.

A heat map by zip code was provided on page 38 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). Ms. Jacob said, as of October 5, 2020, there were still areas of Southern Nevada that were particularly impacted by COVID-19. Many areas still exceeded 2,200 cases. She noted that those areas were marked in red on the map. Areas marked in orange on the map indicated between 1327 and 2261 cases.

Page 39 of the meeting packet included a brief narrative of the timeline ([Exhibit B](#)). On May 19, 2020, the Clark County Board of County Commissioners approved the CRF allocation that was directly distributed to the county, as well as the expenditure plan. Ms. Jacob said the county's priority included regional services and direct emergency assistance for the entire region. Clark County covered a region of 2.3 million residents; therefore, the county wanted to maximize support for the communities. She noted that Clark County allocated housing early in the pandemic for first responders, which was an important need.

Continuing, Ms. Jacob said the State of Nevada provided an allocation of the state's CRF to local governments; however, the Cities of North Las Vegas, Henderson, Mesquite and Boulder City were excluded. Consequently, Clark County worked with those municipalities to assist them with their respective COVID-19 related costs. On July 7, 2020, the Board of County Commissioners allocated a portion of the county's direct allocation to the Cities of North Las Vegas, Henderson, Mesquite and Boulder City.

Jessica Colvin, CFO, Clark County, provided a summary of CRF expenditures. She stated that the Board of County Commissioners determined that the needs of the community required a regional approach, both to the public health crisis through the multi-agency command center and county hospitals, as well as a regional approach to the economic crisis through social services and human services programs. Referring to page 40 of the meeting packet, Ms. Colvin said the Emergency Medical Care and Rehabilitation Care line items were intended for a medical surge facility and rehabilitation care facility in the event that hospitals in Southern Nevada reached or neared capacity ([Exhibit B](#)). Between

the county hospital and the fire departments, a plan was designed to stand up a 900-bed medical surge facility. She noted that the medical surge facility had not yet been required; however, the county was prepared to stand up the facility in the event of a resurgence.

Continuing, Ms. Colvin stated that Clark County allocated approximately \$21.5 million for the medical surge facility and the rehabilitation care facility; however, the total cost was approximately \$34.0 million. Some of those funds were allocated to help support the four cities that did not receive a CRF allocation from the Treasury or the state. Clark County and the four cities had an agreement that in the event that a medical surge was required, those cities would provide a portion of their funds to help support the regional medical surge facility.

Ms. Colvin stated that Clark County used a portion of the CRF for additional information technology infrastructure and equipment to allow for teleworking, and to provide services virtually whenever possible. In addition, the funding was used for building modifications, such as retrofitting and social distancing within the regional facilities. Ms. Colvin stated that \$208.4 million of the \$295.0 million allocation was designated for services to the 2.3 million residents in the Cities of Las Vegas, Henderson, North Las Vegas, Mesquite and Boulder City.

Ms. Colvin said the Board of County Commissioners also allocated CRF for municipal costs. She said Clark County also provided services to the one million residents in unincorporated Clark County. The Business License program noted on page 42 of the meeting packet was a program to enforce closures and adherence to the Governor's directives ([Exhibit B](#)). In addition, funds were used for building modifications in municipal facilities, such as the Parks and Recreation facility. Further, a portion of the CRF allocation was used for economic recovery programs for small businesses located in unincorporated Clark County.

Referring to page 43 of the meeting packet, Ms. Colvin stated that a total of \$57.1 million was allocated to the four cities that did not receive a CRF allocation from the state ([Exhibit B](#)). She explained that the allocations were based on their proportionate populations to one another, to arrive at the county's total allocation of \$295.0 million.

Continuing, Ms. Colvin said a portion of the funding allocations that were provided to the Cities of North Las Vegas, Henderson, Mesquite and Boulder City must be held until November 1, 2020, in the event that there was a need for a medical surge facility. For example, Boulder City was allocated \$1.5 million; however, the city was required to hold \$300,000 of that allocation until November 1, 2020, to ensure there was not a need for a medical surge facility. If there was, the city had agreed to contribute the funds to the facility.

Ms. Colvin stated that the four cities were responsible for adhering to Treasury guidelines. She noted that any unspent funds were to be returned to Clark County by the beginning of December unless the cities could show that obligations were in place through the end of the year.

Page 44 of the meeting packet displayed the county's spending through September 30, 2020 ([Exhibit B](#)). Ms. Colvin noted that approximately 50% of the funds were already obligated. Outside of the subawards to the four cities, response and mitigation efforts was the largest expense to date, which had been the county's focus since the beginning. She said, over the last couple of months, the county had been working toward direct assistance for recovery efforts in the form of housing, utility and food assistance, totaling approximately \$36.2 million. She said business recovery efforts within unincorporated Clark County totaled \$2.4 million to date, but the program was ongoing, and applications continued to be processed.

Ms. Jacob said the counties were responsible for regional emergency response efforts. Thus, Clark County set up the Multi-Agency Command Center (MACC), which supported the entire region. She said the effort was led by the Clark County Fire Department. Ms. Jacob recalled that during the early days of the pandemic, PPE was difficult to obtain. She said the important role of the MACC was to coordinate those types of logistics. Supplies were stored at the MACC, which was staffed five days a week to address the ongoing needs of the community.

Ms. Jacob said if there was a need for a medical surge facility, the county would open the facility in phases, beginning with 150 beds. She noted that the facility could accommodate up to 900 beds. She said Clark County entered into a contract with the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) to house the medical surge facility.

Ms. Jacob said Clark County coordinated daily testing sites in Southern Nevada in partnership with the Nevada National Guard. She said the entire effort was supported by the UMC in conjunction with Clark County staff. She noted that testing sites were available to everyone. As part of the testing effort, the county stood up a high-throughput testing lab at the UMC, which supported the entire community. Ms. Jacob said the testing lab was a game changer for Southern Nevada. She recalled that early in the pandemic there were some challenges related to testing, because there were not enough resources available to process tests in state. Therefore, a portion of Clark County's CRF allocation helped the UMC with the capital investment for the testing lab. She noted that the UMC was now capable of processing 10,000 tests per day. As of October 3, 2020, 224,547 tests had been collected throughout the Las Vegas Valley through fixed and mobile units, which were deployed to make testing accessible within the community.

Kevin Schiller, Assistant County Manager, Clark County, said in March 2020, it became evident that there was an immediate need for shelter among the vulnerable homeless population after shelters were closed due to a positive test result. Clark County worked with the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) in terms of how to shift from a congregate care setting to a non-congregate care setting.

Mr. Schiller said Clark County funded more than 300 housing units for community isolation in a non-congregate setting. The housing units were individual rooms with full-service programming. In addition, the county began a master leasing program with multiple hotels to assist first responders as well as the homeless population. He noted that the needs of the homeless population from a medical acuity were much higher, not just related to COVID-19, but in general; therefore, Clark County began contracting for an assisted living facility for direct transition. Additionally, the county partnered with Hilton to provide 134 dedicated rooms for visitors in need of isolation and quarantine. Clark County also contracted with Rita Suites to provide direct placement for first responders, including hospital staff and those on the frontlines. Finally, the county partnered with the City of Las Vegas for the Cashman Center Isolation/Quarantine (ISO-Q) Facility.

Continuing, Mr. Schiller said with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March, Catholic Charities, a major homeless shelter, was required to close due to a positive test result. He said the master leasing program referenced earlier was a direct result of that closure. Also, the ISO-Q facility at the Cashman Center and the construction costs of approximately \$5.4 million served as a diversion for hospital needs in terms of medical assistance. The ISO-Q facility served as a navigation center to transition more than 300 clients into a housing program. Mr. Schiller said Clark County would continue to maintain the program after December 30, 2020, as it moved forward beyond the CRF.

Referring to page 47 of the meeting packet, Mr. Schiller said grants were awarded to more than 30 providers to increase capacity to meet the demand for services such as food assistance and domestic violence shelters ([Exhibit B](#)). Due to unemployment and other impacts throughout the region, food assistance was a critical piece. The county had also seen an increased need for sheltering due to a rise in domestic violence incidents. In addition, case management/response was critical for the homeless population as well as those experiencing financial crisis. Mr. Schiller said people that were typically employed had found themselves in a significant crisis and in need of a variety of services.

Continuing, Mr. Schiller said grants were also awarded to providers to assist with distancing learning support for students. Clark County had seen an immediate need for child care and support for students in the Clark County School District due to distance learning. The county implemented distance learning programs through Clark County Parks and Recreation, which expanded afterschool programs to full-day virtual learning programs.

Mr. Schiller said there were two other areas of need related to the pandemic (page 47, [Exhibit B](#)). First, there was a need for support related to distance learning and impacts associated with COVID-19 for foster parents with kinship placements. In addition, there was a need for outreach specific to cases of child abuse and neglect in terms of reporting and outreach.

Mr. Schiller said when Clark County reached code red status about six weeks into the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a significant rise in positive cases among the Hispanic population, as well as an inability to test and resistance to basic needs services due to fear of residency and other issues. Consequently, Clark County initiated an ongoing mass campaign called *Esta En Tus Manos*, which focused on education related to COVID-19, prevention services, basic needs and assistance, and testing locations, to remove barriers within a highly vulnerable population. Mr. Schiller noted that Clark County directly funded testing locations within those high-risk communities to ensure access to testing.

Mr. Schiller said food delivery was a significant need among all populations. The county initially worked with the state on delivering food to vulnerable members of the community, but then moved into mass food delivery. He said the county expanded those services, because many people remained isolated.

Mr. Schiller said, at the onset of the pandemic, Clark County determined there would be a significant need for housing assistance due to the eviction moratorium and the significant unemployment rate. In response, Clark County allocated \$30.0 million, and the state provided an additional \$20.0 million toward the housing assistance program (page 48, [Exhibit B](#)). The county initially partnered with 14 nonprofit organizations to ensure the capacity and need would be met. Unfortunately, the need was about fivefold above what was initially anticipated with those 14 nonprofit organizations. For context, the county received between 40,000 and 45,000 inquiries about the housing assistance program within a matter of days. Consequently, the county halted the program from a processing perspective, at least with regard to outward communication. However, the nonprofit organizations continued to process housing assistance applications. Clark County, in collaboration with the Office of the State Treasurer and other statewide partners, began reevaluating the application process. Mr. Schiller said the program transitioned to an attestation process to ensure Treasury guidelines were met. He noted that the new application process would be rolled next week.

Continuing, Mr. Schiller said Clark County would hire between 45 and 60 contracted staff for a full-time call center. The contracted staff would also be responsible for adjudication of housing applications. Mr. Schiller said the county anticipated that approximately 14,000 households would be served through the implementation of the attestation process. To date, 2,700 households had been served for a total of about \$7.0 million.



Mr. Schiller said Clark County residents in need of housing assistance would be referred to the county's program. The nonprofit organizations would finish processing the existing inquiries and then transition to the attestation process to expedite the process. Clark County was confident that 14,000 cases would be adjudicated, which would utilize all of the funding allocated to the program.

Mr. Schiller said many people experienced a reduction in work hours and/or were experiencing a financial crisis. Consequently, Clark County wanted to ensure that assistance was available for housing and utility costs as well as other expenses. He said the nonprofit organizations would remain engaged, providing holistic case management, emergency services and direct assistance. Mr. Schiller noted that Clark County issued a payment of \$5.3 million to NV Energy for approximately 14,000 residents who were impacted by COVID-19.

Ms. Jacob said Clark County's economic recovery grant program was led by Shani Coleman, Director of Economic Development. She said Ms. Coleman had been working on the program since the beginning of the pandemic, which served as a resource. She noted that the county collaborated with city partners and the state on three programs, which had provided a total of \$2.0 million in assistance to date. Ms. Jacob noted that a second round of grant assistance through the Small Business Stabilization Grant program would be opening soon. She said the program helped fund payroll and working capital for small businesses. The county also had a commercial rental assistance grant program that helped commercial tenants remain in their properties. She said the program was beneficial for commercial landlords as payments were disbursed directly to the landlord.

Continuing, Ms. Jacob said the Protective Retrofit Grant program was an ongoing program that could be layered with the Small Business Stabilization Grant program. The intent of the program was to help businesses create the necessary infrastructure to safely re-open, including retrofitting, Plexiglas, PPE, disinfection programs, and any other modifications necessary to comply with the social distancing directive. Ms. Jacob said a grocery store in Laughlin had been forced to close due to the impact of the business closure directive and various other stressors related to the pandemic. The closure of that grocery store significantly impacted the community of Laughlin. However, Clark County provided financial assistance, which allowed the grocery store to re-open.

Ms. Jacob said the county had partnered with Legal Aid of Southern Nevada on a small business legal assistance program (page 49, [Exhibit B](#)). It was a relatively new program that offered legal assistance to small businesses impacted by COVID-19. In addition, Clark County had partnered with the Urban, Latin and Asian Chambers of Commerce to provide grants to members of those chambers of commerce. Lastly, Clark County collaborated with the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance to help businesses navigate local and federal assistance programs.



Ryan Turner, Division Head of Emergency Management, City of Henderson, provided the following statistics regarding the City of Henderson:

- Population: 325,214
- COVID-19 Cases: 6,514, including 659 hospitalizations and 192 deaths
- Current Unemployment Rate: 14%
- K-12 Student Count: 41,630

Mr. Turner said, in working with the Clark County School District, it was estimated that approximately 931 students did not have access to a computer or the Internet, which equated to 361 elementary school students, 74 middle school students, and 496 high school students. He said the City of Henderson was working with the school district to identify the locations of those students.

A timeline of the coronavirus was provided on page 52 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). On January 27, 2020, the pandemic began in the United States, and on March 15, 2020, the City of Henderson declared a state of emergency and activated the emergency operations center (EOC). He said the EOC was open for approximately two months. During that time, the city focused on life safety and incident stabilization. On May 15, 2020, the recovery phase began. Mr. Turner noted that the city had a Federal Emergency Management Agency-approved disaster recovery plan through which the recovery organization was formed. With that, the city did not look at regional assistance, because Clark County was providing for that. He said city leadership wanted to focus on the unique needs of the City of Henderson; therefore, approximately 112 community-impact surveys were sent to nonprofit organizations, businesses and residents to determine specific needs. A recovery plan was devised based on the survey results, and then divided into seven main categories. At the request of the city's senior leadership, the seven categories were prioritized using the Reach, Impact, Confidence and Effort method, and the overall recovery plan was developed. On July 30, 2020, Clark County awarded the City of Henderson a CRF allocation. Subsequently, the city implemented the prioritized plan with the recovery plan on August 4, 2020.

Mr. Turner thanked Clark County for awarding funds to the City of Henderson. The CRF allocation funded the city's recovery plan, and greatly assisted the community. He also thanked the Interim Finance Committee for providing resources and programs to Henderson and Nevada residents, which assisted in the overall recovery.

Jim McIntosh, CFO, City of Henderson, said the chart on page 53 in the meeting packet reflected the city's total CRF allocation of \$29.6 million ([Exhibit B](#)). As stated earlier, the funds were prioritized into seven distinct categories that were important and unique to the City of Henderson, and as such, were the best use of funds. The blue section in each bar on the table represented how much had been obligated to date, and the orange section represented how much remained in each category (page 53, [Exhibit B](#)). He said a common challenge expressed by other

entities was the timeframe in which the dollars must be expended. Mr. McIntosh noted that the City of Henderson had expended approximately 30% of the funds to date.

Mr. McIntosh said the first of the seven categories was Childcare and Education (page 54, [Exhibit B](#)). He stated that child care and education had been very important to the Henderson community for a long time. The City of Henderson was aware that emergency child care would be necessary due to the closure of non-essential businesses and gaming establishments, as well as the impact on first responders and health care workers. At the beginning of the pandemic, the city implemented Battle Born Kids Emergency Childcare, which began as a 24/7 child care service to assist first responders and health care workers. The program had since transitioned into a larger scale child care program with capacity for more than 400 children. The Battle Born Kids Emergency Childcare program was available to families on an as-needed basis, and more than 10,600 unique applicants had been served to date. Mr. McIntosh said the City of Henderson considered the program to be very successful. He noted that the program was available at recreation centers, and technology was available for students to do their schoolwork. He said the City of Henderson worked closely with the Clark County School District to address the needs of the district as well as students and families within the district. Mr. McIntosh said the city was grateful to have relationships with other jurisdictions. He said the City of Henderson was trying to assist the community as much as possible.

Mr. McIntosh said the second category was Infrastructure. He said city hall and the Parks and Recreation Centers were all retrofitted to adhere to the public safety measures that were in place, including social distancing, PPE, etc. He said the city worked diligently to provide modifications to parks and public areas. In addition, money was spent on telework modifications for city employees as well as technology upgrades to allow the public to access services remotely when possible, which also included electronic permitting and web access for open meetings. Mr. McIntosh said the City of Henderson worked hard to maintain a high level of service to the public.

Mr. McIntosh noted that one of the largest categories was COVID-19 Response Staff Time, which included substantially dedicated staff time for responding to COVID-19 (page 55, [Exhibit B](#)). He noted that some public safety officers assisted with cooling stations and food delivery in addition to their regular duties. Mr. McIntosh said the COVID-19 Response Staff Time category also included funds for mandated leave and quarantine.

Continuing, Mr. McIntosh said the next category was Public Health Activities. As the Governor implemented directives, the City of Henderson, in coordination with Clark County, was responsible for enforcing those directives and providing guidance to businesses and residents concerning changes made to the directives. The funding set aside for Public Health Activities was used to provide materials to residents and businesses to help them understand the latest public health orders from the state.

Mr. McIntosh said the Business and Community Support category was a very important category (page 55, [Exhibit B](#)). He said the City of Henderson recognized the hardships experienced by many local businesses; therefore, the city developed a Business Recovery Grant program. He stated that the program was initially intended for businesses with 20 employees or less; however, due to the success of the program, it was made available to businesses with 50 employees or less. The program had since been expanded to include businesses with 100 employees or less. He said local businesses were very grateful for the city's help during this time. Mr. McIntosh said the Business and Community Support category also included funds for state-mandated business compliance as well as the city's recovery plan.

The final two categories included Testing and Medical Support and Supports to Individuals and Vulnerable Populations (page 56, [Exhibit B](#)). Mr. McIntosh said \$1.7 million was allocated for testing and medical support, which included PPE for first responders and businesses that provided health services or support for vulnerable populations. Coronavirus testing programs were available for residents and staff. He added that there was a testing location in the City of Henderson. Mr. McIntosh said funds were also allocated for contact tracing for city employees, and to prepare for a vaccination roll out when a vaccine was deployed.

Mr. McIntosh stated that the City of Henderson was very grateful for the large regional programs that were stood up by Clark County and the state. He said the state and the county were in a much better financial position to provide support such as housing and homeless assistance for individuals and vulnerable populations. Funding in the Supports to Individuals and Vulnerable Populations category was intended to be used to communicate available assistance to vulnerable populations. He said the City of Henderson directed funding to support other programs and services, such as food distribution, a transportation program for residents, homeless sheltering, and housing assistance.

Referring to page 57 in the meeting packet, Mr. McIntosh presented some of the opportunities and challenges related to COVID-19 ([Exhibit B](#)). He stated that the City of Henderson supported the regional request for assistance from the state. He said city leadership understood its role in terms of the assistance that was needed within the Henderson community. He stated that the guiding principal had been to expend the CRF quickly and within the confines of the Treasury rules and guidelines while meeting the unique needs of the citizens. Mr. McIntosh said the City of Henderson was grateful for the CRF allocation from Clark County, and the city was willing to assist in any way possible.

Mr. McIntosh said the City of Henderson was looking forward to the prospect of additional stimulus dollars. The city was also hopeful that the deadline for the CRF would be extended beyond December 30, 2020, because the timeframe was very challenging in terms of developing infrastructure for larger programs.

Continuing, Mr. McIntosh said the City of Henderson was optimistic that a vaccine would be deployed in the future; therefore, the city had already begun to develop a deployment plan. He stated that COVID-19 was a public health crisis that had created a fiscal and economic crisis for residents and businesses, and that crisis would not end until a vaccine or therapeutic drug became available.

Mr. McIntosh understood there were concerns throughout the state about expending the CRF before the December deadline. He noted that the City of Henderson had expended approximately 30% of its CRF allocation to date, and the city was confident that 100% of the funds would be expended by the deadline. He stated that any remaining funds would be returned to Clark County. Mr. McIntosh said he would like the majority of the funds to be expended locally, or at least at the county or state level.

Mr. McIntosh said the City of Henderson was concerned about a fiscal cliff for community programs. The city had stood up a number of programs, including child care, food distribution, and additional assistance for vulnerable populations. When the CRF expired, those services would have to be eliminated or provided for through the city's general fund.

Continuing, Mr. McIntosh said there was concern about the long-term economic and social damage that would only worsen the longer the crisis continued. Even when a solution to the public health crisis became available, it would take time for the state to recover. Mr. McIntosh noted that the City of Henderson was closely monitoring several metrics, including economic and social metrics, the unemployment rate, and residential defaults.

Mr. McIntosh recalled recent news articles that expressed concern about looming issues in the state, such as the increased demand for child care, utility shutoffs, and Internet access for students while distance learning was in effect (page 57, [Exhibit B](#)). He said the City of Henderson had focused on those specific areas when determining how to allocate the funding.

Jared Luke, Government Affairs Manager, City of North Las Vegas, introduced Will Hardy, Director of Finance, City of North Las Vegas.

Mr. Luke stated that the City of North Las Vegas was a unique city with a population of 252,000 residents. He noted that North Las Vegas was the largest minority-majority city in Nevada. He stated that the city had experienced many highs and lows during the pandemic, including a valleywide unemployment rate of 15.5% (page 59, [Exhibit B](#)).

Mr. Luke said the COVID-19 pandemic had a disproportionate effect on Southern Nevada, especially in the City of North Las Vegas (page 60, [Exhibit B](#)). During the pandemic, North Las Vegas experienced unemployment, business failures, and record numbers of risk of foreclosure or eviction.

Referring to page 61 of the meeting packet, Mr. Luke said the CRF allocations were announced and disbursed in mid-April ([Exhibit B](#)). At that time, most states received their funds and began implementing programs. On June 29, 2020, Governor Sisolak announced a funding plan for the state's direct allocation, which excluded some cities in Southern Nevada. Mr. Luke noted that Southern Nevada was the epicenter of the pandemic in Nevada with over 80% of coronavirus cases statewide.

Continuing, Mr. Luke said the CRF would have been a relief for Southern Nevada. It was assumed that Southern Nevada would receive a larger funding allocation than Northern Nevada, because the funds were intended to help areas hardest hit by the virus. On August 3, 2020, the City of North Las Vegas received a subgrant from Clark County in the amount of \$23.8 million. He noted that the City of North Las Vegas should have received \$47.6 million based on Treasury guidelines. He said the allocation of \$23.8 million equated to \$93.15 per person compared to cities in Northern Nevada that received \$184.00 per person. Although all cities statewide benefitted from county services, the lower per-person allocation put the City of North Las Vegas at a disadvantage.

Will Hardy, Director of Finance, City of North Las Vegas, said North Las Vegas was grateful for the allocation provided by Clark County. The city government determined the best way to spend the funds would be to support the residents of North Las Vegas; thus, 83% of the allocation was earmarked for programs that would directly assist the community.

Page 63 of the meeting packet provided a breakdown of the \$23.8 million allocation ([Exhibit B](#)). Mr. Hardy said, like other jurisdictions, the City of North Las Vegas had direct emergency response costs, such as medical expenses, PPE, testing, etc. However, the city determined that the best use of the funds would be economic support for the community through programs such as small business assistance, housing assistance, and other programs that would directly support struggling businesses and residents in Southern Nevada.

Mr. Hardy noted that the Small Business Assistance program had been very successful. He said 48% of grants were awarded to minority-owned businesses, 38% were awarded to women-owned businesses, and 25% were awarded to minority-owned and women-owned businesses. In a short amount of time, the city had established a program that disbursed grants on a daily basis to distressed applicants in North Las Vegas. Mr. Hardy said the city had received a lot of positive feedback about the program similar to the comment provided on page 64 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)).

Continuing, Mr. Hardy said the city decided to expand the Small Business Assistance program. He said an additional \$4.0 million would be awarded in round two of the program. In addition, the city focused on the CARES Housing Assistance Program (CHAP), which recently opened. Finally, the city established the Southern Nevada Urban Micro Academy (SNUMA) and other programs to assist with education and other needs in the community.

Mr. Hardy stated that North Las Vegas and Southern Nevada had been drastically impacted by the pandemic. He said the City of North Las Vegas believed it was using the CRF allocation in the best way possible.

Mr. Luke said, in approximately eight weeks, the City of North Las Vegas had established programs that helped more than 170 businesses. In addition, the SNUMA program helped students connect to their education. He noted that the CHAP, which just recently opened, was receiving an application every nine minutes on average. That statistic alone highlighted the need in North Las Vegas, as well as the city's ability to expend all the funds. Mr. Luke urged the state to consider allocating unused funds to Southern Nevada, which had been disproportionately affected by the pandemic. He said the need for funds would only increase. He stated that the state could help residents with housing assistance now to avoid evictions later. He understood that time was of the essence.

Continuing, Mr. Luke said the counties and cities in Northern Nevada attested that they would be able to spend the entirety of their allocations, which was two times more than the amount received in North Las Vegas. He said there was no doubt that the City of North Las Vegas would expend the funds by the deadline. He remarked that the need was greater than what the city received.

Mr. Luke read the following feedback from a recent CHAP recipient, which he thought summed up the city's outcome.

I don't think you will ever understand how grateful I am for you and the program for the assistance. I am a single mom of three and on the verge of being evicted due to this pandemic. I was offered a position with a large employer in Southern Nevada, and due to COVID, the offer was rescinded. I then applied for PUA and was denied. Currently, I'm in the process of appealing, which means I've been with no income to pay my rent. This morning, October 8, 2020, I was awarded with the rental assistance, and I couldn't do nothing but cry and call you to tell how grateful and thankful I was for your assistance. You guys have saved my children and I from eviction, and now in the process of assisting me with my bills. I am truly thankful. Man, I can say this a million times, most definitely, a lot of weight lifted off my shoulders.

Mr. Luke reiterated that if additional CRF became available, it was evident that the funds could easily be expended in North Las Vegas. He said North Las Vegas needed the support of its partners in Southern Nevada, the Subcommittee, and the Governor's Office to help as many people as possible. Mr. Luke thanked its partners in Southern Nevada, the Subcommittee, and especially Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Chairwoman of the Clark County Board of County Commissioners, for her leadership during this time.

In response to a question from Chair Frierson, Mr. Luke reiterated that cities in Southern Nevada with populations less than 500,000 received a funding allocation that amounted to \$93.15 per person, while cities in Northern Nevada received a funding allocation that amounted to \$184.00 per person. All cities throughout the state benefitted from county services. He remarked that the funding chasm was massive. Mr. Luke reiterated that Southern Nevada experienced more than 80% of the COVID-19 cases in the state. He stated that the congressional intent of the CRF was to assist residents directly affected by the pandemic.

Mr. Luke said, in the last six to eight weeks, the City of North Las Vegas had stood up programs while remaining flexible and working hard under the leadership of Chairwoman Kirkpatrick and the county. He understood that some of the state's funding was for unemployment, which was beneficial, but he hoped that additional funds could be allocated to Southern Nevada. Based on the amount of work that had been accomplished in North Las Vegas in the past two months, he said he could only imagine how much more could have been done if funding had been allocated earlier.

Lisa LaPlante, Communications Director, Boulder City, said the population of Boulder City was approximately 16,000 residents, with an average age of 52. According to the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD), there had been 190 cases of COVID-19 in Boulder City to date, which was approximately 1.12% of the city's population. Ms. LaPlante stated that approximately 140 tests were performed each week.

Ms. LaPlante said the City Council of Boulder City had been extremely concerned about funding, and ensuring that residents, especially seniors, were cared for during this critical time. On September 8, 2020, the city council reviewed and approved Resolution 7154, which addressed the recommended uses of the grant award from Clark County. Ms. LaPlante expressed her gratitude to Clark County for awarding \$1.5 million in CRF to Boulder City.

Continuing, Ms. LaPlante stated that approximately \$1.2 million of the allocation was used for public safety payroll. She said public safety personnel had been used quite frequently during the pandemic, especially at testing pods throughout the community, and also to ensure that senior homes and first responders had proper PPE. Ms. LaPlante noted that public safety payroll was an eligible CRF expense and in line with other cities nationwide.

Ms. LaPlante said \$200,000 was set aside for small business recovery grants and administrative costs. Within the next few days, Boulder City businesses would be able to apply for loans of \$5,000 or \$10,000 depending on the number of full-time employees. The grants would help pay for working capital, such as rent and utilities, as well as COVID-19 related expenses, such as cleaning supplies and retrofitting for employee and customer protection, which was critical for everyone.



Ms. LaPlante stated that \$150,000 was earmarked for an all-day Parks and Recreation child care program. In addition, \$20,000 was set aside for communications compliance. She said equipment upgrades would take place next week to enhance the city's ability to live stream meetings to the general public. She noted that Boulder City residents were politically active, and many had expressed concern about attending meetings during the pandemic. Even though 15 seats were available, the city was concerned about proximity and the amount of time that people would be in contact with one another.

Referring to page 72 of the meeting packet, Ms. LaPlante stated that \$20,000 was set aside for food purchases for the Senior Center of Boulder City ([Exhibit B](#)). She said the senior center provided lunches for residents, housed a food pantry, and was the service site for the Meals on Wheels program. In addition, \$50,000 was set aside for housing and utility assistance, which would be administered through Emergency Aid of Boulder City. She said Boulder City leadership remained in contact with both agencies to ensure that the most vulnerable residents received the assistance they needed. Ms. LaPlante said, over the next few days and weeks, Boulder City leadership would continue communications with senior organizations, homes and residents to ensure their needs were being fulfilled.

Ms. LaPlante said Boulder City was striving to maintain free weekly testing, which was currently offered every Tuesday from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. She said the city continuously received phone calls during the week from people concerned about potential exposure to the virus. Ms. LaPlante noted that the city tried to provide testing in certain situations to ensure that people such as first responders were tested on a regular basis.

Finally, Boulder City was working with agencies that provided housing, food and utility assistance to ensure those agencies had the necessary resources. She said utilities were provided through the city. In addition, Boulder City contracted with a trash removal company. She said the city was willing to work with people who could not pay their bills to ensure that their utilities were not shut off. To date, 150 utility shut offs had been avoided. Ms. LaPlante remarked that some Boulder City residents had contributed money to ensure their neighbors' utilities were not shut off. She said Boulder City was a tight-knit community that cared for one another; however, at times like this, it was incumbent upon elected officials to help where they could. She stated that Clark County's assistance programs had been extremely helpful, but Boulder City needed ongoing assistance. In light of recent data indicating that many people may become homeless in the coming months, Boulder City wanted to ensure it was staying on top of things and cooperating with local agencies to ensure residents were protected.

Aaron Baker, City Manager, City of Mesquite, said he appreciated the opportunity to address the Subcommittee concerning the city's use of CRF. He noted that the City of Mesquite had an expenditure plan, and was highly confident that the entirety of the funds would be expended by the deadline.



An overview of the City of Mesquite was provided on page 76 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). Mr. Baker said the increase in coronavirus cases was slower for Mesquite due to the geographic separation from the Las Vegas Valley. He stated that Mesquite was the regional hub for northeast Clark County for medical services.

Mr. Baker said the City of Mesquite was grateful for the regional efforts by Clark County and others, as well as for the expertise and support that would otherwise be unavailable to Mesquite as a smaller entity. He stated that the City of Mesquite had a coordinating council comprised of nonprofit organizations and faith-based groups in the community. The council worked to support everyone in need and maximize available resources.

Mr. Baker stated that the table on page 77 of the meeting packet highlighted the areas that were supported through the CRF allocation ([Exhibit B](#)). He noted that the amounts listed for FY 2019 through the fourth quarter of FY 2020, and FY 2020 through the first quarter of FY 2021, were actual expenses (page 45, [Exhibit C](#)). Those figures did not include encumbrances; consequently, some of the data was skewed. He noted that some items had not yet been finalized.

Mr. Baker said medical expenses incurred by the city included COVID-19 testing. He said the City of Mesquite managed all the testing for the community, and the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) provided and processed the tests. He noted that the SNHD had been an excellent partner.

Continuing, Mr. Baker stated that the estimated total appeared low, because staffing costs were included in payroll expenses, which would be discussed later in the presentation. He said the estimated total for medical expenses included incidentals and testing costs.

Referring to page 47 of the presentation, Mr. Baker said the City of Mesquite had taken several steps to ensure the safety of the community, such as electronic plan review, and improved technology for public meetings, which allowed for greater public participation ([Exhibit C](#)). He stated that many of the costs for FY 2020 through the second quarter of FY 2021 had been encumbered, but not actually booked, either because an item had not been received, or because the project was not yet complete.

With regard to payroll expenses, Mr. Baker said the City of Mesquite tracked COVID-19 related tasks by the hour on timesheets [inaudible], including EOC staff, public safety, community testing efforts, compliance with state directives, and staff duties directly related to COVID-19.

Mr. Baker said the City of Mesquite was working with local nonprofit organizations and other organizations to assist residents with housing and utility costs, as well as to assist small businesses with costs such as rent, utilities, PPE and retrofitting. He said the city was excited about the programs and their ability to help local businesses and residents.

Referring to page 49 of the presentation, Mr. Baker said the City of Mesquite employed the services of an auditor to verify compliance with CARES Act guidelines, which was an unanticipated expense ([Exhibit C](#)).

Ms. Jacob explained that Clark County and its municipal partners had provided a combined presentation, because they all worked together to maximize support for the community using CRF. She said Clark County and its municipal partners were concerned about the impending fiscal cliff with the expiration of the CRF and the ongoing needs of constituents. She understood that the Subcommittee had similar concerns.

Ms. Jacob said slides 51 and 52 of the presentation indicated the current regional need and how prospective additional CRF would be deployed in Southern Nevada ([Exhibit C](#)). She said Clark County was deploying extra resources and striving to meet the needs of the community; however, at current funding levels, the county could only provide assistance to 14,000 households. She said Clark County and the local governments were unified in their support. They believed the most significant need was housing stability for residents. At the September 11, 2020, meeting of the Subcommittee, Ms. Jacobs testified that Clark County could require as much as \$159.0 million just to meet half the need that had been forecast, which was a staggering number. She understood it would not be easy to acquire that amount of funding; however, she asked the Subcommittee to consider deploying additional direct assistance to Southern Nevada if funds were available.

Assemblywoman Jauregui recalled that 45,000 housing assistance applications had been received in Clark County. Of that amount, 2,700 households had been served of the estimated 14,000 households that could be served through the program. She asked how applications were being prioritized. She also asked if applicants would be referred to the cities in which they resided when the Clark County housing assistance funding was depleted.

Mr. Schiller confirmed that approximately 45,000 inquiries for housing assistance had been received, and applications were processed on a first come/first served basis. However, the professional staffing agency employed by the county would continue to adjudicate applications currently in the queue. He noted that the staffing agency used by Clark County was the same staffing agency used by Los Angeles County for its adjudication process.

Continuing, Mr. Schiller said the state allocated \$20.0 million to the Clark County housing assistance program in addition to \$30.0 million allocated by Clark County. When the funds were depleted, the county would reassess other allocations. Mr. Schiller stated that when the CRF expired, Clark County would assess the county's social services funding to determine how to continue a certain level of housing assistance and prioritization with existing funds. However, he noted there were significant deficits due to the economic impact faced by the county and the region. He said it was more costly to assist someone after they were evicted; therefore, the county was trying to determine how to prioritize that diversion after

the CRF expired. Mr. Schiller stated that Clark County intended to expend the funds by the December 30, 2020, deadline, as well as consider mitigation plans for the future.

In response to Assemblywoman Jauregui's question regarding city programs, Ms. Jacob said Clark County's housing assistance program was deployed through nonprofit partners. For example, the City of Henderson deployed a portion of its funding to help the nonprofit organization that was assisting Henderson residents. She said the Clark County Social Services Department, in collaboration with the nonprofit partners, was working to deploy resources quickly. Ms. Jacob said the county was trying to find efficiencies where possible to maximize assistance.

Chair Frierson asked if Clark County was confident the entirety of the funds would be expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline. In the event that a portion of the funds still remained as the deadline approached, he asked how the funds would be utilized. Chair Frierson asked what portion of the funds had already been expended.

Yolanda King, County Manager, Clark County, said the county was very confident that the funds would be expended by the deadline. She said the county anticipated that the majority of the remaining funds would be spent during round two of the housing assistance program, which was scheduled to begin next week. In addition, Clark County recently closed round two of the small business recovery program. She said approximately 1,400 applications were received; therefore, the remaining funds for business recovery would definitely be expended by early November. Ms. King said, due to the significant need for housing assistance, funds allocated for that purpose would be expended quickly.

Ms. Colvin said she was uncertain exactly how much of the CRF allocation had been obligated to date; however, she would provide that information to the Subcommittee. She noted that the obligations were contractual obligations for specific services to be provided to the county through December 30, 2020, and for the county to pay for those services; therefore, those obligations represented funds that would be expended by the deadline.

Ms. King said the county would provide the Subcommittee with the exact percentage, but she could attest that most of the money had been spent or obligated. As indicated by Ms. Colvin, contracts were in place which obligated the county to spend those funds. She reiterated that Clark County would expend the entire CRF allocation by the deadline.

Chair Frierson commended the efforts of the county and local governments to support the community. He asked if there was an alternate plan in the event that the funds were not fully expended as the deadline approached.

Ms. King replied that the alternate use for the funds would be for housing assistance. She said the next phase of the housing assistance program would be rolled out next week. She indicated it was still early enough to know if the funds

would be expended by the beginning of November. If not, applications would continue to be processed on an as-needed basis. Ms. King said the county was confident that the number of requests would exceed available funding.

Mr. Schiller added that Clark County had been an active participant in discussions concerning eviction mediation. Prior to the Supreme Court program, the county expedited a contract with Legal Aid of Southern Nevada for the housing assistance program. In addition, Clark County was working on corporate mediation with major landlords in the new attestation process. He said the housing assistance program was not limited to individual applications, the program also focused on major apartment complexes with 200 to 300 tenants, which was why the county was confident the funds would be fully expended by the deadline.

Chair Frierson thought Clark County's response indicated a clear vision for the remainder of the year as it related to the CRF allocation.

Chair Frierson thanked Clark County and the local governments for their presentation. He said a large purpose of the Subcommittee was to provide information so that the public was aware of the efforts that were underway to meet the needs of communities.

### C. Washoe County

Eric Brown, County Manager, Washoe County, provided an overview of the county's CRF expenditures. He said Washoe County was working closely with the Cities of Sparks and Reno to address ongoing mitigation and recovery efforts related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The county and the cities were confident that the entirety of the funds would be expended in a timely fashion.

Mr. Brown stated that each of the municipalities received a CRF allocation from the state. Washoe County received \$20.2 million, the City of Reno received \$46.6 million, and the City of Sparks received \$19.1 million (page 79, [Exhibit B](#)). He noted that the remainder of the presentation would focus on the expenditure of funds by Washoe County. He also noted that the three municipality managers as well as the Washoe County Health District had been meeting multiple times each week since the pandemic began in mid-March to coordinate efforts. He said the agencies spent a lot of time ensuring efforts were complementary, and not across purposes or duplicative.

Mr. Brown discussed regional expenditures between March and June 2020 as shown on page 80 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). He said approximately \$7.8 million was expended during that time period. Mr. Brown stated that Washoe County entered into an interlocal cost share agreement with the Cities of Reno and Sparks, in which the county was responsible for 50% of the shared costs, the City of Reno was responsible for 35%, and the City of Sparks was responsible for 15%.

Continuing, Mr. Brown noted that \$9.0 million in shared expenses had been submitted for FEMA reimbursement. Washoe County had been working closely with FEMA and the state to ensure the costs were qualifying expenditures based on FEMA guidelines. If the costs were not reimbursed by FEMA, the county would have to find another way to fund the expenses. He noted that one of those options would be through CARES Act funds.

Major expenditure categories to date were shown on page 81 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). Mr. Brown stated that a large portion of the expenses between March and June 2020 was for the Edison Compound. He explained that the Edison Compound was established for surge capacity for people who needed to quarantine. He said, thankfully, the county was not tasked with utilizing the facility; however, it was the largest initial expense.

Referring to the chart on page 81 of the meeting packet, Mr. Brown noted that immediately after the pandemic began an Incident Management Team was formed to help manage response efforts ([Exhibit B](#)). The next category on the chart on page 81 was the POST (Testing) category, which was a testing facility near the county complex on the 9<sup>th</sup> Street campus. He noted that the facility was still in operation. The last category included in the chart was the Alternative Care Site, which was a surge facility that would have provided up to 700 additional beds at the convention center. He said the surge facility was not needed, and the amount reflected on the chart was for expenses incurred to prepare the site ([Exhibit B](#)).

Mr. Brown said Washoe County's initial allocation of CARES Act funding was about \$10.1 million, of which approximately \$4.1 million was used for internal expenses and \$5.9 million for regional expenses (page 82, [Exhibit B](#)). He said in looking at the broad categories, public health was the largest expenditure category. Costs in the Public Health category included expenditures for quarantine facilities; PPE for first responders, medical personnel, human services staff, and others, as well as the broader community as appropriate; the Incident Management Team (IMT); homelessness expenses; and public outreach. Mr. Brown noted that homelessness was a major category that would need to be addressed. Lastly, public health costs also included participation by the three jurisdictions in a University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) wastewater study, which was underway.

Under the Health Compliance category, approximately \$2.0 million was expended for costs related to food access and delivery for seniors; telework capabilities for county employees; and sanitization and social distancing at the county jail (page 83, [Exhibit B](#)). Mr. Brown stated that the Medical category included costs related to testing, contact tracing, and the Alternative Care Site.

Continuing, Mr. Brown said the Payroll category included expenses for public safety and human services personnel. Finally, the Economic Support category related to small business assistance. At the request of the Board of County Commissioners, Washoe County was participating in NACO's SBG program. Mr. Brown noted that Washoe County allocated \$500,000 to support the program.

Mr. Brown said the planned expenditures for the second half of the allocation were pending approval by the Board of County Commissioners. He noted that the plan would be reviewed within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Brown said the county was in need of additional homeless services and supports. Prior to COVID-19, Washoe County had been working diligently to establish the Our Place campus on the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services campus. He said the Our Place campus opened in the fall of 2019; however, it had to be redesigned to adhere to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and health district social distancing guidelines.

Mr. Brown said Washoe County had seen an increased need for homeless shelters. Thus, the county was working with the other jurisdictions to determine how much in CRF would be required to meet that need through the end of the year. Similarly, the City of Reno was working to accommodate the male homeless population originally housed at the Record Street campus. He noted that the Record Street campus was no longer able to provide shelter due to social distancing requirements. Consequently, the city established a temporary site on 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and continued to seek a permanent site for those individuals. He said a portion of the county's expenditures would be directed at shelter and temporary expenses.

Mr. Brown said the second half of the allocation would also be used for human services payroll costs associated with the expanding impacts of the pandemic. Approximately \$2.5 million would be used for public health and safety, including personnel costs, contact tracing and quarantine facilities. He stated that Washoe County Commission Chairman Bob Lucey had shown leadership in terms of offering to assist the Washoe County School District with its re-opening plans. Mr. Brown said Washoe County provided funding to the school district for contact tracing and nurses to help support the district's mitigation efforts as it prepared to re-open schools.

Mr. Brown said multiple quarantine facilities were available in the county for first responders, visitors, etc. In addition, the county executed a community safety campaign, which focused on two main drivers of COVID infection in the region – the Latino and young adult populations. He noted that about half of new cases in the region were consistently among the Latino population. The other driver was the young adult population (18 and 24 years). Mr. Brown applauded UNR President Brian Sandoval for his recent mitigation efforts at the university. He recalled there were additional announcements recently related to the surge in cases among the young adult population.

Mr. Brown said approximately \$1.7 million of the second half of the allocation was directed at technology and telework support (page 84, [Exhibit B](#)). He said Washoe County was in the process of enabling many of its 2,700 employees to work remotely; however, existing technology was incapable of managing that level of need. Therefore, the county was expending funds where possible to allow some

employees to work remotely while still meeting the needs of constituents and businesses. He noted that this option had been well received by employees.

Continuing, Mr. Brown said funding was also allocated toward building a strategic regional stockpile of PPE. Finally, he stated that although the justice and the courts were beginning to return to jury trial, hearings and other activities were still being conducted remotely; therefore, a portion of the funding was allocated for infrastructure and technology.

With regard to duplication of efforts, Mr. Brown said during the period between March and June 2020, Washoe County and the Cities of Reno and Sparks expended funds for mitigation efforts, because the state had not yet set up some of the services that were now available. As the state began providing things such as PPE and contact tracing assistance, the municipalities began utilizing the state resources to avoid duplication of efforts. Mr. Brown thought duplication of efforts between the health district, the state, and the three municipalities had improved with time.

Chair Frierson recalled that Mr. Brown stated that CRF may be needed to cover some expenses if FEMA denied reimbursement. He asked if the county would pay for those expenses out of the initial CRF allocation, or if a reimbursement request would be submitted to the state.

Mr. Brown replied that Washoe County would have to reallocate its planned expenditures between now and the end of the year to accommodate those expenses.

Chair Frierson asked if the county was confident that the funds would be fully expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline. He also asked what the alternate plan would be if there were any remaining funds.

Mr. Brown said he discussed the status of the funds on a weekly basis with the county's financial staff. A contingency plan was in place to reallocate the funds for other uses if the funds were not fully expended before the deadline. He noted that the demand was greater than what the \$20.2 million allocation could accommodate; therefore, it would be a failure on the part of the county if the appropriate adjustments were not made to utilize the funds. Mr. Brown said he was confident that the county's entire allocation would be expended by the deadline.

Chair Frierson called a recess at 12:06 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 12:38 p.m.

#### D. City of Las Vegas

Scott Adams, City Manager, City of Las Vegas, introduced Gary Ameling, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), City of Las Vegas. Mr. Adams thanked the Subcommittee for the opportunity to present the city's CRF expenditures.



Mr. Adams said, when the Las Vegas City Council declared a state of emergency, the city focused on three priorities – health and safety of city employees; health and safety of residents, businesses and stakeholders; and maintaining essential operations. He said all three priorities were intertwined and mutually reinforcing, and could be found in every aspect of the city's response efforts.

Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas had undertaken a number of major actions over the last seven months, but especially during the first couple months of the pandemic. He said a state of emergency under the city charter provided the city manager a lot of authority, so he often found himself in front of the city council and reacting to situations quickly to ensure the city was responding appropriately.

Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas quickly formed an internal COVID-19 response team, and opened an emergency operations center (EOC) for logistical support. He said the local EOC was working to acquire PPE, coordinating with the MACC (the regional EOC), and other emergency functions. Mr. Adams said the city had to quickly identify which employees were essential and non-essential, which led to the furloughing of some non-essential staff. He stated that approximately 300 employees were furloughed for the initial period of the pandemic until businesses began to re-open. He noted that the City of Las Vegas provided infectious disease leave and child care services for employees. Mr. Adams said the Clark County School District closed the schools the weekend after the Governor declared a state of emergency in Nevada, which left the city and other employers in a predicament about how to deal with employees of school-aged children.

Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas worked with Clark County to open the ISO-Q facility at the Cashman Center to address the needs of the homeless population during the pandemic.

Mr. Adams said a number of the items listed on page 89 of the meeting packet underscored the severe financial impact of the pandemic on the City of Las Vegas ([Exhibit B](#)). He said the city implemented a hiring freeze prior to the pandemic, because it had been in a structural deficit for the last couple of years. He said the wage and benefit growth rate crept ahead of the revenue growth rate; therefore, the city froze every vacant position. In addition, the City of Las Vegas had begun concession bargaining prior to the pandemic, but the city increased its efforts during the pandemic. The city also deferred payments and waived penalties for residents and businesses on a wide range of fees and services that became due during the pandemic. In addition, the city established a new customer service and payment center, which was now permanently located in the City Hall parking garage. Mr. Adams said that was one of the positive outgrowths of the pandemic where creativity and innovation of city staff created a function that better served customers. He said all customer responses were funneled through the service center to better serve customers in every aspect of the city's operation.



Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas created a multi-departmental grant team to consider all federal and state grant programs that may be available to the city. He noted that in addition to the CRF, the city identified approximately \$17.0 million in additional federal funds, most of which were disbursed into the community.

Mr. Adams said the city had to abide by and enforce state directives related to the pandemic, which was daunting for a city as large as Las Vegas. In early June, the City of Las Vegas began developing plans to ensure buildings, facilities, programs and services could safely re-open.

Mr. Adams said, overall, the City of Las Vegas was compelled to do many things during the COVID-19 pandemic that were not part of normal business operations. Mr. Adams said he provided the Subcommittee with that information to help establish the basis for the city's decisions related to the pandemic.

Gary Ameling, CFO, City of Las Vegas, discussed the financial impacts on the City of Las Vegas as it related to the COVID-19 pandemic (page 90, [Exhibit B](#)). Prior to the pandemic, the City of Las Vegas had been experiencing a healthy fiscal year in FY 2020. Mr. Ameling said the first seven months of the fiscal year the city was ahead of budget. At that time, the city estimated the general fund would be approximately \$23.0 million over budget in terms of revenue collections. However, after the pandemic hit, the city quickly realized those projections would no longer hold true. Mr. Ameling said the City of Las Vegas worked with its regional partners to develop new sets of revenue estimates, which tempered the future outlook. In May 2020, as the time approached for the city to adopt the FY 2021 budget, the estimates for FY 2020 had changed from \$23.0 million over budget to \$55.0 million under budget. The outlook for FY 2021 included the removal of approximately \$124.0 million from previous projections for a total of almost \$200.0 million over the course of approximately 15 months (the last 3 months of FY 2020 and all of FY 2021). In addition, the city revised the 5-year forecast to reflect continued degradation of revenue sources. Mr. Ameling said it would take until the later part of FY 2022, perhaps even into FY 2023, before revenue estimates returned to pre-pandemic levels.

Mr. Ameling said the city's main fund was the general fund, and the major revenue source was the Consolidated Tax, which was a state-shared revenue. He said more than half of the city's general fund revenue was comprised of the Consolidated Tax. Also impacted were license and franchise fees, fines and charges for services, and other revenues. Page 90 of the meeting packet discussed some of the city's concerns related to other funds and revenue sources, including parking and citation revenue; Rental Car Tax, which supported the Smith Center for the Performing Arts; Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax, which supported transportation construction projects; Parking Garage Tourism Improvement District (TID) sales tax; building permit revenues, which declined at the beginning of the pandemic; and room tax revenues ([Exhibit B](#)).

Mr. Ameling said the CARES Act was enacted on March 27, 2020. The act appropriated \$150.0 billion to state and local governments. Nevada was allocated the minimum amount of \$1.25 billion. In accordance with the federal government formula, 45% of the per capita amount was made available as a direct allocation to cities and local governments with populations of 500,000 or more. For Nevada, that included the City of Las Vegas and Clark County. Mr. Ameling explained that Clark County's CRF allocation was based on the population of Clark County excluding the population of Las Vegas. Ultimately, Clark County received the same per capita amount as the City of Las Vegas. He said the City of Las Vegas filed for a direct allocation on April 13, 2020, and an allocation in the amount of \$118.9 million was received on April 22, 2020.

Mr. Ameling said the City of Las Vegas had submitted two sets of reports to the Treasury. Page 92 of the meeting packet showed expenditures through September 30, 2020 ([Exhibit B](#)). He noted that the format of the expenditures was based on the Treasury's requirements, so some of the categorization was vague. He noted that further explanation was provided on the following pages. Mr. Ameling said the remaining balance as of September 30, 2020, was \$2.8 million, indicating that 97.6% of the city's allocation had already been expended.

Continuing, Mr. Ameling said the primary area of expenditures was for public safety services at a cost of \$104.9 million, followed by \$4.3 million to support staff that were diverted from regular duties to a substantially different use. In addition, \$400,000 was allocated toward medical expenses and \$6.4 million was allocated toward economic support. Of the remaining \$2.8 million, \$2.1 million was committed to Catholic Charities to construct an outdoor dining pavilion to safely serve meals to the homeless population, and \$700,000 would be allocated to the housing assistance program. Mr. Ameling noted that the All Items Not Listed Above category was a catch all category in the Treasury categorization (page 92, [Exhibit B](#)).

Mr. Ameling said the City of Las Vegas spent significant time reviewing the Treasury guidelines and frequently asked questions (FAQs) that had been provided over the past seven months (page 93, [Exhibit B](#)). He said the city believed that all expenditures were in accordance with those guidelines and FAQs.

Mr. Ameling reiterated that the top expenditure was for public health and safety payroll costs. He noted that the City of Las Vegas had its own public safety department as well as its own fire and rescue department. The city was able to use the CRF allocation to support those operations as well as the city's contribution to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) during the critical months of the pandemic (the third quarter of FY 2020). The funds also allowed the city to limit FY 2021 reductions in those public safety departments. Mr. Ameling explained that the City of Las Vegas had to make reductions in virtually every city department due to the budget deficit. Those reductions were 20% across the board; however, in an effort to limit reductions within public safety, reductions were restricted to 10% in public safety departments. He said the CRF also enabled the

city to avoid reductions in police force. Mr. Ameling noted that more than 200 positions were originally earmarked for elimination; however, the CRF allowed the city to retain those positions.

Mr. Ameling said the next category was Budgeted Personnel and Services Diverted to a Substantially Different Use. He said non-public safety staff were reallocated to address critical pandemic needs, such as homeless efforts, the ISO-Q facility, and a child care facility for city and public safety staff throughout the Las Vegas Valley. He said the category also included administration/enforcement of COVID-19 related issues, including the state shutdown and re-opening, and enforcement of all state directives.

Moving on to page 94 of the meeting packet, Mr. Ameling reiterated that \$400,000 was allocated for medical expenses ([Exhibit B](#)). He said, although it seemed like a small amount, the city received other grant funds that were applied to the medical expenses category. He said the city purchased PPE and allocated funding to support community testing.

Mr. Ameling said the Economic Support category was one of the largest categories for the City of Las Vegas. He said funds were allocated for small business assistance grants. The funds were allocated in two tranches, the first of which was \$4.0 million. Due to the success of the program, the city allocated a second tranche of \$2.0 million. Mr. Ameling said small business assistance grants of \$4,000 were awarded to 1,500 businesses through the program.

Continuing, Mr. Ameling said also within the Economic Support category was the housing assistance program. He stated that the program was supported with \$1.0 million in CRF and approximately \$3.0 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. He noted that the average housing assistance grant was \$3,400. To date, the program had received 1,700 applications. He said the City of Las Vegas hoped to award over 1,000 grants through the program. Mr. Ameling remarked that the city did not have adequate funding to award grants to every small business and individual in need.

Also included in the Economic Support category was the Dine Out Downtown program, which was funded with \$100,000. He said the program allowed for the closure of certain city streets, which provided restaurants and businesses adjacent to those streets an outdoor dining area where people could get take-out orders and eat while also adhering to the social distancing directive.

The final category was All Items Not Listed Above (page 94, [Exhibit B](#)). Mr. Ameling said the primary expenditure in that category was \$100,000 toward the Healthy Parks program. Through the program, technology was installed at parks to ensure that people were using the parks safely.

Senator Goicoechea asked if there was a payback provision should the federal government determine that the funds were used erroneously.

Mr. Adams said City of Las Vegas staff spent significant time examining the regulations and engaging with the Treasury guidelines to ensure that the city's strategy was consistent with the guidelines. The City of Las Vegas believed all expenditures adhered to the guidelines. Mr. Adams said he had been in contact with other City Managers around the nation, and likewise, Mr. Ameling had been in contact with other CFO's around the nation. Numerous cities had utilized the same strategy as the City of Las Vegas; therefore, the city thought the strategy was sound. He believed it would pass muster in an audit by the Office of the Inspector General. Mr. Adams indicated that the City of Las Vegas, not the state, would be responsible for payback if required, because the city received a direct allocation.

In response to a comment by Senator Goicoechea, Mr. Adams said early on in the pandemic the Treasury guidelines were unclear as to whether the CRF had to be expended by the end of the state's fiscal year (FY 2020). It was not until later that the guidelines were clarified. Therefore, the City of Las Vegas deliberately chose to employ a strategy that expended the majority of the funds by the end of FY 2020. At the end of June 2020, the Treasury issued a report profiling the expenditure of the entire CRF on a national level. He said Las Vegas was one of only a few cities nationwide that had spent more than 90% of the funds by the end of June. Mr. Adams said there was an old axiom in federal funding that it was difficult to ask for more money while funds still remained. He thought that Las Vegas was well positioned to obtain funding in the future based on the fact that it had already spent a majority of the CRF allocation.

Senator Brooks recalled that Clark County's per capita allocation was based on the county population minus the City of Las Vegas population, and the city and county received the same amount per capita. He said there were shared services associated with the pandemic that were provided by Clark County. For example, county and state dollars were provided to the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) and the University Medical Center (UMC) for COVID-19 response. He remarked that both organizations played a significant role in response efforts in Southern Nevada. Senator Brooks asked if the City of Las Vegas contributed CRF to help with those services.

Mr. Adams replied that the City of Las Vegas had not specifically contributed to those services; however, the city had coordinated with Clark County on a number of efforts related to direct expenditures inside the city, such as the ISO-Q facility. He stated that the City of Las Vegas had provided the Cashman Center to be used as the ISO-Q facility. Per an arrangement between the City of Las Vegas and Clark County, the county paid for the capital cost of building the facility and the city paid for the operations of the facility for the duration of its operation.

Continuing, Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas did not look at the CRF in isolation. He said there were three types of funding that were deployed for pandemic response efforts, the first of which was the CRF. In addition, the city had received FEMA funding. Also, because the City of Las Vegas was an entitlement city, the city received sizable plus ups in the entitlement programs,

mostly with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Mr. Adams said a lot of the funding was used to stand up programs for services in the city tandem with what was being done in the rest of the region. For example, the City of Las Vegas established pop-up testing sites at numerous locations throughout the city using city dollars. In addition, the Cashman Center was committed as a permanent regional testing facility, and hopefully in the future, it would be used as a maximum support center, as part of a regional effort. Mr. Adams said all those resources were fungible, with no one thing directed at a specific purpose. He said the city was fortunate to have full-time emergency management staff with experience in working with FEMA. The city's emergency management staff immediately applied for and obtained FEMA funding for PPE and other supportive work. Mr. Adams thought the City of Las Vegas had been a good regional partner; however, Las Vegas was the 26<sup>th</sup> largest city in the United States, which meant there were many problems and needs to address.

Senator Kieckhefer thought it appeared that one of the city's top priorities had been to avoid a rift. He said he did not question whether the expenditures were in line with Treasury guidance; however, he wondered why the City of Las Vegas chose to use almost 90% of the CRF allocation to backfill budgeted payroll costs when many Las Vegas residents were unemployed, unhealthy, and struggling. He asked about the city's decision-making process related to maintaining the structure of city government versus deploying those resources to help the city's residents.

Mr. Adams replied that one of the city's biggest challenges was economic-related. During the 2019 Legislative Session, he testified about the unique financial challenges faced by the City of Las Vegas compared to other cities in the region. He said Las Vegas was essentially a landlocked city. There were few areas for new ad valorem tax growth that could fuel governmental expenditures. When the pandemic began, it became evident that the City of Las Vegas would default in January 2021. He said that was the severity of the deficit in relation to the total budget and available fund balances. Mr. Adams said, to maintain the city's fiscal vitality, the City of Las Vegas had to determine how to get the CRF into the city's budget to avoid a catastrophic financial failure. He said that was the underpinning of the city's decision.

Continuing, Mr. Adams said the city disbursed funds into the community as much as possible. The City of Las Vegas was fortunate to receive plus ups from HUD, as well as FEMA and other funds, all of which were used for small business assistance, and housing and homeless assistance. He remarked that it had been a balancing act. Mr. Adams said, if the federal government allocated additional funding, the City of Las Vegas would be in a better position to disburse more dollars into the community now that the city's financial condition was stabilized.

Senator Kieckhefer said he appreciated the difficulty that local governments faced as it related to financing through property tax; however, he questioned the city's decision to try to keep the government whole rather than distributing resources to people in need. He said the purpose of government was to serve, not employ. He added that those structural changes would not end in January.

He said the state would probably have to help address some of the city's problems. Senator Kieckhefer thought there were higher-priority needs that should have been addressed first.

Chair Frierson asked if the City of Las Vegas segregated its CRF allocation for the purpose of tracking expenditures and transparency.

Mr. Ameling thought it was unusual how the Treasury distributed the CRF. He said the City of Las Vegas received the wire transfer of \$118.9 million without any prior communication from the federal government. He said the Treasury released the population formula after the funds were distributed. The guidelines were released around the time the funds were received, which provided the initial view of eligible expenditures by category. Subsequently, the City of Las Vegas decided from an accounting standpoint to segregate expenditures through a series of accounting codes. The city established multiple COVID-19 related account codes, such as personnel and various external expenditure codes, so that expenditures could be tracked and reported in the manner expected by the federal government. He reiterated that the City of Las Vegas was a direct entitlement agency for CDBG funds, so staff was familiar with government accounting and grant coding. Mr. Ameling noted that the table on page 92 of the meeting packet showed the categorization breakdown as required by the federal government ([Exhibit B](#)).

Chair Frierson asked if the City of Las Vegas was confident the funds would be fully expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline, and whether there was an alternate plan for any unused funds.

Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas had expended approximately 97% of the funds to date, and the remaining funds had been committed to Catholic Charities and the housing assistance program. He anticipated that the remaining balance would be depleted quickly; therefore, the funds would be fully expended by the deadline.

In response to a question from Chair Frierson, Mr. Adams said, in the event that a balance remained, the funds would be used for housing assistance.

Assemblyman Roberts recalled that 90% of the city's CRF allocation was used for payroll expenses. He understood that the city contributed funding for the LVMPD. He asked for a breakdown of how the funds were expended.

Mr. Ameling said the City of Las Vegas had two public safety departments – the Department of Public Safety, which included Ball City Marshals and the corrections function, as well as Las Vegas Fire and Rescue. In addition, the city partnered with Clark County in terms of funding the LVMPD. He stated that the total CRF allocation for those three departments was \$104.9 million as shown on page 92 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit B](#)). He said \$4.3 million was used for budgeted personnel and services that were diverted from a substantially different use. Mr. Ameling said he would provide the Subcommittee with a breakdown of expenditures for each of the public safety departments.

Assemblyman Roberts asked how much was allocated to the LVMPD. Mr. Ameling said he did not have that information readily available; however, he would provide it to the Subcommittee.

Assemblyman Roberts asked how the City of Las Vegas would close the shortfall if funds had to be returned to the federal government due to erroneous use.

Mr. Adams did not think there would be a need to close a shortfall. He said the Treasury regulations and guidance were specific, and the approach employed by the city was spot on. As Mr. Ameling alluded to earlier, the city had a great deal of experience in working with grant programs. He said city staff was very familiar with grant program compliance and regulations. Mr. Adams believed that the expenditures were 100% consistent with Treasury guidelines and regulations.

In response to a question from Assemblyman Roberts, Mr. Adams believed that the city would not need to repay the funds, because the guidelines were very clear. He said the same day that the City of Las Vegas received the CRF allocation, the Treasury published four pages of guidelines that were fairly general. Since then, the Treasury had released more specific guidance for recipients. Mr. Adams stated that each time the Treasury guidance was updated it reinforced and supported the city's method of expenditure.

Assemblyman Roberts noted that a considerable part of his district was in the City of Las Vegas. If the city had to repay the funds, it would be a serious issue; therefore, he hoped that Mr. Adams was correct.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno stated that the local municipalities that testified prior to the City of Las Vegas had not spent nearly the amount of money on regular budgetary operations as Las Vegas. She understood that City of Las Vegas staff had prior experience with grants and regulations; however, the CRF was new and the guidelines had changed at least nine times since the funds were disbursed. If 90% of the city's allocation was used for salaries and backfilling regular government operations, she asked who had supported residents in need. She also asked how much the City of Las Vegas contributed toward the efforts of the Nevada National Guard in Las Vegas.

Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas had to create a balanced budget by mid-May. The city had about 30 days from the day the CRF allocation was received to determine how to interface the funds with the city's FY 2020 budget. He said the city considered the philosophy of the CARES Act, which was to disburse funds into the community. The city believed that direct CARES Act funds, such as the stimulus payments, funding for the PPE program, and many other facets of the act, had positively impacted the community. Mr. Adams said one of the things the city was basing its projections on was a shared economic projection by two prominent local economists. The economists expressed that the impact of the CARES Act was working its way through the national and regional economies. The impact from the CARES Act on the community was so substantial that there

was a large plus up in the economy. Mr. Adams said the City of Las Vegas believed that the intent of the CARES Act and the money that went to larger governmental entities was to help financially shore up those counties and cities in the same way the CARES Act did for businesses and households through various mechanisms.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno recalled that at the beginning of the year the City of Las Vegas expected to break even or have a surplus of funds. She thought utilizing the CRF to shore up the city's budget was a contradictory statement. Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno asked if the City of Las Vegas had laid off staff or made other budget cuts. Also, if the federal government determined the funds had been used inappropriately, she asked what budget cuts would be implemented by the city.

Mr. Adams replied that the city was facing a \$200.0 million deficit near the end of FY 2020. Even with the \$118.9 million CRF allocation, the City of Las Vegas still made an additional \$80.0 million in cuts across the city. The policy decision faced by the city at that time was how much to cut from public safety. He noted that the Las Vegas City Council had made public safety its top priority continuously for 16 years, and the city wanted to maintain that priority; however, without the use of the CRF, the city would have been forced to make deep cuts within public safety for the first time in history. Those cuts would have included brown outs at fire stations, unit shut downs and layoffs. Consequently, the city created a funding strategy for the budget, which deployed the use of CRF and \$80.0 million in cuts predominantly within non-public safety functions. Mr. Adams said it was a policy decision that was made with the city council out of economic necessity.

Continuing, Mr. Adams said he believed that the City of Las Vegas was different from its peer jurisdictions. He said the city was landlocked, and although the Consolidated Tax had been performing well at the beginning of the pandemic, property tax had been stubbornly low. He said there were only so many places from which to generate property tax. Consequently, the city was faced with a difficult financial situation, which was the driving factor for maintaining essential functions, including public safety functions.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno stated that it was the same policy decision that had to be addressed by every local government as well as the state. She asked the City of Las Vegas to provide the Subcommittee with a list of specific budget cuts to help the Subcommittee understand the city's policy decisions and expenditures. She stated that public safety costs related to the LVMPD were shared between the city and the county.

Chair Frierson remarked that Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno's question was not specifically related to public safety. He stated that clearly the Subcommittee supported public safety. The broader question was about priorities and decisions.



Mr. Adams apologized. He said he did not mean to insinuate that the Subcommittee did not support public safety. Instead, his intention was to explain a quick series of policy decisions. For perspective, the City of Las Vegas had to cut \$100.0 million from the budget over 3 years during the Great Recession; however, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the city had to cut \$200.0 million in 30 days, which was not an easy decision to make. In addition, the decision had to be made in concert with city council.

Chair Frierson said the Subcommittee certainly understood the enormity of the task. He understood that things happened quickly and there was a short timeframe in which to utilize the funds; therefore, the City of Las Vegas made a decision to expend the funds quickly hoping that the city would be in a better position should additional funds become available. He thought other jurisdictions had been more concerned about the “how”, not necessarily the “what”, as it related to the CRF.

Mr. Adams confirmed that Chair Frierson’s comments were accurate. He stated that the City of Las Vegas believed that maintaining essential functions served the community. He said, as a local unit of government, everything the city did served the community, especially within public safety.

Chair Frierson reiterated that it was not just about public safety. He understood the sense of urgency to make sound funding decisions. He agreed that everything done by local government and state government served the community. Chair Frierson said he was not judging which approach was most prudent. The Subcommittee’s function was to discuss the funding expenditures, make the best use of the allocated funds, and ensure that funds did not have to be returned to the federal government. He thought the City of Las Vegas was confident that it had allocated the funds in a manner that was best for the city.

In response to a question from Assemblywoman Tolles, Mr. Adams said the requested information could be provided to the Subcommittee quickly. Mr. Ameling added that the information could be provided by next week.

Assemblywoman Tolles asked if the information provided by the city would be made available to the public.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, LCB, said, at the conclusion of the meeting, staff would compile a list of questions, which would be sent to various testifying entities. The agency responses would subsequently be forwarded to the members of the Subcommittee. However, the responses could be posted on the website if requested by Chair Frierson.

Chair Frierson said he would make that determination at a later date.

## E. City of Reno

Dylan Shaver, Chief of Staff to the City Manager, City of Reno, congratulated Scott Adams, City Manager, City of Las Vegas, on his career in city government and upcoming retirement. He also thanked Senator Kieckhefer for his commitment to work on property taxes for the city.

Mr. Shaver said, at the end of June 2020, the Governor announced that the City of Reno would receive a \$46.0 million CRF allocation. He noted that the city solicited the funds as soon as it became known the state would receive a direct allocation. He thanked everyone who made the allocation possible for the City of Reno, because it allowed the city council to develop beneficial programs for the city.

Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno received the first half of the allocation on August 11, 2020, which gave the city 117 days in which to spend the funds. He said the city worked diligently to develop a plan with input from key stakeholders across the community. The city received proposals from nonprofit organizations as well as input from elected leaders, which was used to develop a program that would deliver the best benefit to citizens. He noted that the process was done with full transparency, and the public was involved in every step. To that point, four additional public hearings pertaining to the CRF allocation had been scheduled to allow the Reno City Council an opportunity to remain flexible and adjust the spending targets between now and the end of the year, and to ensure the public had an opportunity to be included in the process, especially if it involved programs that would help residents through a difficult time.

Mr. Shaver said it was important to have a spending plan for such a large sum of money, but it was also important to have comprehensive internal controls. Therefore, the City of Reno developed a multi-check system to avoid misuse of funds. He said the city's internal team, comprised of the finance department, legal team, and City Manager staff, was responsible for reviewing each CRF certification form, which was required for anyone proposing to use the funds (page 100, [Exhibit B](#)).

Mr. Shaver said, much like everywhere, the needs of the community were infinite. The City of Reno worked hard to identify multiple categories of need throughout the community and then allocated resources to meet those needs.

Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno established several business relief programs at a total cost of \$5.0 million (page 102, [Exhibit B](#)). He stated that one such program provided support for local artists and musicians through a local nonprofit organization. Another provided economic assistance to businesses that were shut down the longest and hardest hit by the virus. Lastly, a small business relief program was established for women- and minority-owned businesses. He noted that approximately \$9.5 million in applications and requests had been received to date, which reflected the incredible economic impact across the state due to the pandemic.

Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno wanted to allocate funding for housing support in a manner that did not duplicate the state's efforts. He noted that a total of \$4.5 million was allocated for housing support. A portion of that funding was provided to the Reno Housing Authority to supplement the Residential Rental Assistance program. Mr. Shaver said the city also put out a request for proposal for a landlord/tenant mediation program, and collaborated with weekly motels on an economic relief program. He noted that many of the state's most vulnerable citizens lived in weekly motels; therefore, it was important to maintain their housing. Lastly, Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno had been closely watching the Eviction Prevention Program. He stated that the City of Reno had an agreement with the Justice Court which allowed a city attorney to be stationed at the court full time to intervene in the event of an eviction case. He said, with evictions delayed, the city would most likely have to reallocate those funds to a different traunch.

Moving on to page 104 of the meeting packet, Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno allocated approximately \$7.9 million to support the community's unsheltered population; a population that was sadly increasing, in part due to the pandemic. He stated that the City of Reno operated a local homeless shelter, the Community Assistance Center, in partnership with Washoe County, the City of Sparks, and nonprofit organizations. The strategy of a homeless shelter was to accommodate as many people as possible; however, that went against the coronavirus. To avoid turning people away, the homeless population was relocated to an event center in one of Reno's redevelopment areas until a more permanent and acceptable solution could be found. Mr. Shaver said a series of temporary tents, like the one shown on page 104 of the meeting packet, had been set up at the facility to allow for a more sheltered area ([Exhibit B](#)). The City of Reno continued to consider other options, especially as winter approached. He said it was critical that people were not turned out onto the streets during a challenging time, but it was also important to protect them from risk of exposure to the virus. Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno, in partnership with Washoe County and the City of Sparks, set aside significant resources to find a solution that would protect the homeless community from the virus and also provide shelter during the winter months.

Mr. Shaver said food insecurity had very quickly become a challenge; therefore, the City of Reno set aside \$1.25 million to address the issue. The funds would be used to support the food bank, the UNR food pantry, and the Washoe County School District (WCSD) (page 105, [Exhibit B](#)). He remarked that many children relied on school breakfasts and lunches. An unfortunate side effect of children not attending school was that they did not get those meals, even though they were still in need. Mr. Shaver said the city was happy to partner with the school district in a number of ways, the most significant being the food distribution program.

Moving on to page 106 of the meeting packet, Mr. Shaver stated that the city allocated \$1.3 million to support socially-distanced programming in the parks ([Exhibit B](#)). The funds were used to support nonprofit and business entities which provided services that replaced services typically offered through the park programs. Mr. Shaver remarked that it was not the appropriate time to offer senior recreation

programs, and due to the economic downturn, the city had to lay off staff that typically performed those duties. However, the city used the opportunity to do good in the community by obtaining dozens of proposals from community groups interested in stepping up to this particular challenge and conducting their business in a socially-distanced manner that would support park users and vulnerable residents.

Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno, in partnership with the WCSD, was able to provide 5,400 laptops to at-risk students. He said the agreement was months in the making and totaled approximately \$2.5 million. Mr. Shaver said the WCSD approached the City of Reno shortly after the state funding allocations were announced to request the city's help in supporting families with the greatest need. He said distance learning presented many challenges, and there was not an end in sight; therefore, it was important to support the school district as well as entities that were facilitating distance learning, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs.

Mr. Shaver said the pandemic had resulted in a rise in mental health crises; thus, the city wanted to find a way to enhance the Mobile Outreach Safety Team (MOST). He recalled discussions during the 31<sup>st</sup> Special Session (2020) about the importance of sending social workers into the community. Mr. Shaver explained that the partnership with MOST allowed the police to go to a situation where it may not be appropriate for an officer to go. He said the city was also entertaining proposals to expand suicide prevention education to students in middle school and high school. In addition, the city was working with partners in the region to establish a diversionary program to ensure people experiencing a mental health crisis did not go to emergency rooms, which took up valuable space for other medical emergencies and potentially exposed patients to the virus unnecessarily.

Referring to page 109 of the meeting packet, Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno did not have the capability of allowing staff to work from home indefinitely, nor was the building optimized to slow the spread of the virus ([Exhibit B](#)). Thus, the city set aside funds to allow temperature screening services, install touchless faucets, install Plexiglas shields at all customer interface counters, and provide equipment to personnel required to participate in remote meetings. The funds were also used for a mobile vaccination unit (page 109, [Exhibit B](#)). When a vaccine became available, the mobile vaccination unit would allow the city to deliver the vaccine to as many places as possible, and ensure it was distributed equitably throughout the community.

Mr. Shaver said there were a handful of direct city expenses. Those costs included paid leave for people infected with the coronavirus; PPE supplies; overtime costs for first responders and other staff; and unemployment compensation claims for personnel that were laid off due to the pandemic.

Mr. Shaver said the City of Reno was part of the Regional Emergency Operations Center (REOC) with Washoe County and the City of Sparks. He said the City of Reno contributed \$8.82 million in case FEMA funding did not come through. Mr. Shaver remarked that it did not appear at any time in United States history that

FEMA had to pay out Stafford grants to literally every state, county and city in the nation all at once to the tune of trillions of dollars. Therefore, the city found it prudent to ensure that CRF was allocated to cover the commitment to the REOC through the end of the year to avoid having to use the city's general fund. Mr. Shaver noted that if the FEMA reimbursements were provided in a timely fashion, the city would reallocate the CRF for a different purpose.

Concluding, Mr. Shaver said it had been an honor to serve the community during this difficult time. He thanked the Subcommittee for its efforts in addressing the crisis.

Chair Frierson asked if the City of Reno was confident that the funds would be fully expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline.

Mr. Shaver replied that, in every category, the city had experienced overages in terms of requests. For the business programs alone, there were literally millions of dollars in requests that the city was unable to fulfill. The City of Reno believed there were many venues that would allow for the expenditure of the funds. The larger concern was the mechanics of putting all the expenditures through the standard municipal check writing process between now and December 30, 2020. Mr. Shaver stated that he would work as many hours as possible to ensure the checks were issued before the deadline.

#### F. Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities

Wesley Harper, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities (League), said it was an honor to be able to present to the Subcommittee. Mr. Harper, on behalf of all member municipalities that received an allocation, expressed appreciation for the funding, which had not been taken for granted.

Mr. Harper said, when the CARES Act was announced, the League wanted to ensure it was well educated on the provisions of the act as well as work in harmony and consistency with NACO to avoid duplication of efforts. He said the League had spent time ensuring it had a clear understanding of the rules and expectations of the federal government. The League also had discussions with each member municipality as well as the City of North Las Vegas to ensure they all had a clear understanding of how the funds could be spent. Mr. Harper said the League was appreciative that NACO allowed the League to utilize training content developed by NACO for the audit component, as well as programming that helped jurisdictions remain in compliance.

Referring to page 114 of the meeting packet, Mr. Harper said the League represented 24 member municipalities ([Exhibit B](#)). Of those 24 members, 4 were located in Clark County (Las Vegas, Mesquite, Henderson and Boulder City). He stated that the City of Reno and Carson City were also members. Mr. Harper stated that the presentation would focus on 12 of the 14 member municipalities that were allocated funding by the state. Of the \$90.0 million that was allocated,

Reno received \$47.0 million and Carson City received \$10.0 million, which was about 63% of the total allocation.

Mr. Harper said most municipalities received the first half of their allocation from the state between late July and early August 2020, and most had received the second half of their allocation to continue providing benefits to residents. The majority of member municipalities elected to take the second half of their allocation in a single upfront distribution, and a few chose to use the reimbursement method to ensure they were spending as needed. Mr. Harper said he had conversations with each of the 12 municipalities as well as the City of Reno and Carson City, and all intended and were on track to spend the entire allocation by the deadline.

Continuing, Mr. Harper said the priorities of each local government varied based upon the needs of residents; however, the basic expenditure categories were public safety and retrofitting for buildings such as city hall and other public spaces, for the safety of employees and the public. He stated that retrofitting focused on social distancing directives, as well as installing or improving distance technology. Mr. Harper said the League encouraged collaboration between member cities and the counties in which they resided to bring the highest and best benefit to residents. For example, Fallon and Churchill County collaborated on the business grant program; the Cities of Reno and Sparks worked with Washoe County, particularly around the issue of homelessness; West Wendover and Elko County collaborated on communitywide testing; and Winnemucca and Humboldt County worked together on small business reimbursements.

Continuing, Mr. Harper said other areas of significant spending among the municipalities included quarantine efforts and assisting students in hybrid education models. In addition, a significant amount of money had been invested in PPE and specialized cleaning.

Mr. Harper stated that Henderson, Boulder City and Mesquite were in a difficult situation due to the amount of allocation they received. He explained that the allocation provided to other cities and counties in the state equated to approximately \$184.45 per person; however, the per-person allocation provided to Henderson, Boulder City and Mesquite was half that amount. Mr. Harper stated that the allocations for the three municipalities were provided by Clark County, not the state. He noted that the cities were very appreciative of the gesture. He said Clark County had COVID-19 related expenses that would have completely exhausted its direct allocation, notwithstanding, the county recognized the needs of the three municipalities, and rearranged its finances in such a way to provide allocations to Henderson, Boulder City and Mesquite.

Continuing, Mr. Harper said NACO and the League met with the Governor's Office on June 22, 2020, to discuss the issue. It was indicated in that meeting that the Subcommittee would have an influence on how the state might look to address the inequity. He said NACO and the League were hopeful that the Subcommittee agreed that every Nevadan should have the same equitable benefit of the funding, and that it would share that opinion with the Governor.

Senator Goicoechea recalled there were some recent issues related to the West Wendover schools. He asked if the city or county had reached out to the Elko County School District to discuss the matter.

Mr. Harper said he did not recall the schools being a topic of discussion during his recent conversation with the City of West Wendover.

Chair Frierson said he appreciated the League's advocacy on behalf of Southern Nevada municipalities. To the extent that it was in a position to make a recommendation regarding additional funds, the Subcommittee would keep the League's comments in mind. He thought the Subcommittee meetings in general helped shine a light on the situation.

## **V. REVIEW OF THE PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION CONCERNING EVICTIONS – SENATE BILL 1 (32<sup>ND</sup> SPECIAL SESSION).**

Agenda Item V was taken out of order.

Honorable James Hardesty, Supreme Court Justice, thanked the Subcommittee for allowing him to present earlier to accommodate his schedule.

Justice Hardesty said, on October 2, 2020, Supreme Court staff provided LCB Fiscal Analysis Division with a letter and attachments related to the status of the Eviction Mediation Program (page 117, [Exhibit B](#)). Since the 32<sup>nd</sup> Special Session (2020) and the Governor's approval of Senate Bill (S.B. 1), the Access to Justice Commission expanded the work program and workgroup to include landlord and realtor representatives. He said the workgroup spent an extensive amount of time producing draft rules, which were later submitted to the Nevada Supreme Court. The Supreme Court then held public hearings on the draft rules, entered a tentative set for further comment, and on October 6, 2020, entered an order approving the final rules for what was captioned *Temporary Residential Summary Eviction Mediation Rules*. The rules became effective on October 15, 2020. Justice Hardesty said the rules addressed mediation for landlord/tenant summary eviction disputes and potential disputes under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 40.254.

Continuing, Justice Hardesty said there were two voluntary mediation programs already in place, both of which related to mediation between parties prior to court involvement. The first program was a mediation program stood up by the Las Vegas Justice Court in collaboration with the Neighborhood Justice Center. The second program was an eviction prevention program adopted by the City of Sparks. He noted that both programs addressed mediation prior to the filing of an eviction case with the courts.

Justice Hardesty noted that a copy of the rules that were approved by the Supreme Court had been provided to the Subcommittee (page 119, [Exhibit B](#)). He said there were still some items that had to be completed prior to October 15, 2020, to stand up the program. The first was the appointment of Home Means Nevada, Inc. as the administrator for the program. He said the organization had accepted that responsibility, and was currently working with a vendor to complete the portal that would allow access by the courts and



mediators for appointment purposes, and the communication of settlements and other information between tenants and landlords.

Continuing, Justice Hardesty said the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was planning to initiate a work program, which would utilize \$2.0 million CRF to compensate mediators who were appointed under the program. In addition, a compensation range had been established for those mediators. He said the AOC was advised that 114 mediators qualified to be appointed as program mediators, which would occur on October 12, 2020, or October 13, 2020. Those mediators would then be available for mediations to take place. Justice Hardesty said the AOC was planning to use current staff and existing procedures to process invoices for payment without an increase in cost to the program or to the state beyond the Supreme Court AOC's current budget resources.

Justice Hardesty noted the following cautionary items. To the extent that the CRF was not expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline, and there were no other resources available after that date, the rules specifically provided that the funds would sunset and the program would terminate. The Supreme Court was aware that other resources may be available to perpetuate the mediation program after the deadline, but no definitive source had been identified. If the CRF expired at the end of the year as currently provided, there would not be funds to operate the program, and the rules called for the termination of the program.

In addition, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) entered a moratorium on evictions soon after Governor Sisolak extended the current state moratorium under Emergency Directive 31 until October 15, 2020. However, the CDC moratorium was extended through the end of 2020. He said that raised the question about how many eviction matters would actually proceed in light of the CDC moratorium.

Justice Hardesty stated that the Supreme Court had been coordinating with the Office of the State Treasurer, Clark County, and the Reno Housing Authority, to allow mediators to connect with representatives of entities that were disbursing rent relief funds. It was critical to the success of the program that mediators, while sitting with landlords and tenants in mediation hearings, were able to communicate with and contact rent relief fund disbursement groups to ensure that the tenant qualified for the funds, could access them, and that the funds would be disbursed promptly. The Supreme Court had also worked closely with the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) to establish phone lines to allow mediators, while sitting with tenants, to call and determine the status of the tenant's access to undisbursed unemployment compensation. Justice Hardesty said those were critical, pragmatic pieces to a successful mediation program in this context.

In response to a question from Chair Frierson, Justice Hardesty clarified that the amount of CRF to compensate program mediators was \$2.0 million.

Chair Frierson asked if the program would naturally end on January 1, 2021, or if the program would be forced to end due to lack of funding. He said, although the

Subcommittee was hearing from entities that had received and expended CRF, the Subcommittee could also pass along recommendations.

Justice Hardesty said, practically speaking, the CRF must be expended by December 30, 2020. The only source of funding available to the mediation program to compensate mediators was the CRF. When the funds expired, the Supreme Court would not have funding with which to compensate mediators. Likewise, that would prevent the court from being able to operate an effective mediation program after the end of the year, which was the reason the program would sunset after that date. Justice Hardesty said he appreciated that the Subcommittee was looking into the matter, because he was concerned there would be a confluence of events. First, the funds were set to expire on December 30, 2020, the way they were currently allocated and appropriated by Congress. Second, with the CDC moratorium due to expire on December 31, 2020, there would be no further limitation on landlords' ability to pursue evictions. He noted that he was not speaking about the propriety or impropriety of the situation, he was just stating a fact. Justice Hardesty said there would be little use for the eviction program in the fall due to the CDC moratorium on evictions; however, after the moratorium was lifted, there would be no funds to handle eviction mediations, which would be a problem.

Chair Frierson said it appeared that the state was largely dependent on additional federal aid based on Justice Hardesty's comments. Justice Hardesty concurred.

Senator Goicoechea asked if the CDC moratorium would prevent evictions in Nevada until December 31, 2020, even though the state's moratorium expired October 15, 2020. Justice Hardesty said he would have to equivocate on expressing an opinion, because the issue may eventually come before the Supreme Court. The CDC moratorium provided, by its terms, that it precluded this type of eviction until December 31, 2020. Whether the CDC regulation or guidelines were legal or not were issues that were being litigated around the country, and may be litigated in Nevada.

Chair Frierson said, with the expiration of the state moratorium, it did not preclude negotiating evictions, such as the development of a repayment plan, so that individuals were not required to pay back rent as soon as the moratorium was lifted. However, he noted that those types of negotiations would still require payment to mediators.

Justice Hardesty agreed. He said there was still value in mediation. Although some people had suggested during comments to the court that mediation programs might be ineffective, the fact of the matter was that mediation was a very successful method to resolve disputes. He thought mediation was helpful at any point. However, in the absence of funding, mediators would not be available to effectuate that effort.

Chair Frierson said the state could only hope for additional federal aid at the very least. Justice Hardesty agreed.

Chair Frierson asked if the state could pay for a couple months of mediation in advance to allow the program to go beyond December 30, 2020.

Justice Hardesty said he would defer that question to the Office of the State Treasurer and the Office of the Governor; however, it was his understanding that the funds must be expended, not just encumbered, by December 30, 2020, which created the pragmatic problem discussed earlier.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson stated that the tenant or the landlord may initiate the mediation process, and both parties would be provided information about the mediation. She asked how many meetings were typical in mediation cases, and over what period of time would those meetings occur.

Justice Hardesty replied that under S.B. 1, there was a 30-day stay in the eviction process in order to accommodate the mediation process. That did not mean that mediation was limited to one meeting; however, it certainly meant that an effort would be made to reduce the number of sessions, especially if the answer to the problem was accessing relief funds or unemployment benefits to pay outstanding rent and resolve the issue. He said it was entirely possible that a combination of things would occur in the course of mediation that might require more than one or two sessions, but the mediation process was not expected to exceed a 30-day period. He stated that there were some tight notification and communication periods within the rules. Justice Hardesty expressed his appreciation to Home Means Nevada, Inc. for assisting the court in setting up portals to help facilitate the program.

Assemblyman Roberts asked if the program was still available during the moratorium for people willing to go to mediation.

Justice Hardesty replied that there were two mediation programs in place. One was a voluntary program for tenants and landlords. The program was established by the Las Vegas Justice Court in collaboration with the Neighborhood Justice Center. He said some statistics were available based on recent communication from the Las Vegas Justice Court, and interestingly, most of the requests for mediation came from landlords. Justice Hardesty said the mediation process was encouraged, because it helped facilitate and match up tenants and landlords with relief dollars. He said this particular mediation program applied to and was mandatory when the parties invoked the court process. Justice Hardesty noted there was significant effort occurring in courts around the state. He said the rules mandated a requirement of communication at the Clerk's Office, but legal aid organizations, landlords, and tenant organizations were urging people to voluntarily seek access to the funds and resolve the issue before it went to court.

Justice Hardesty said it was unclear what would happen after October 15, 2020, when the moratorium in Nevada was lifted. He said opinions may differ about the application of the CDC moratorium when there was no further moratorium from the Office of the Governor. Consequently, there may be cases coming before the courts after that date that would warrant mediation or to which mediation would be sought. Justice Hardesty stated that the wording in the CDC regulations seemed to extend the moratorium to a tenant who submitted an affirmation of eight or nine subject matters, which were listed in the regulations. As long as the tenant did that, there was a prohibition against summary eviction or other types of evictions.

Chair Frierson thanked Justice Hardesty for presenting the information about the summary eviction program. He said Nevada would be ready in the event there was a change in direction from the federal government on flexibility, relief or extensions.

Justice Hardesty thanked the Legislature for assistance with the program. He said he would be happy to provide the Subcommittee with as many updates as possible.

## **VI. REVIEW OF THE RESIDENTIAL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FUNDED WITH CORONAVIRUS FEDERAL AID.**

Zach Conine, State Treasurer, said it was an honor to share with the Subcommittee the efforts by the Office of the State Treasurer and other agencies to accelerate economic recovery in the state.

Mr. Conine stated that housing instability led directly to economic instability. He said that fact was never more evident than during the Great Recession when people were forced to move due to foreclosures. When people were experiencing instability, they were less likely to spend money, which decreased tax revenue. He noted that much of the state's income was driven by discretionary spending.

Mr. Conine said the Office of the State Treasurer became involved early on when the Office of the Governor authorized the housing assistance program. He said, according to the Aspen Institute, approximately 140,000 households in Nevada were at risk of eviction during the third quarter of FY 2020. That number increased to approximately 180,000 households at the end of the fourth quarter of FY 2020. Mr. Conine agreed with Justice Hardesty that Nevada was approaching a strange place where the need for eviction help would be greatest after the CRF expired. He stated that the Office of the State Treasurer would continue to advocate at the federal level.

Continuing, Mr. Conine said the number of Nevadans at risk of eviction would continue to rise due to the discontinuation of the \$600 additional federal Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). He stated that the benefit of PUA from an economic perspective was significant across the state.

Mr. Conine said, on June 22, 2020, the Office of the State Treasurer was given authority by the Office of the Governor to proceed with commercial and residential rental assistance programs. On July 14, 2020, the Office of the State Treasurer appeared before the Interim Finance Committee to obtain approval for the residential assistance program using \$30.0 million in CARES Act funding. He said the program began accepting applications on July 20, 2020. However, Clark County paused the application process on August 17, 2020, to allow the system to catch up and to determine how many applications were from people applying to multiple agencies. On September 25, 2020, the system shifted for the Nevada Rural Housing Authority (NRHA) and the Reno Housing Authority (RHA), transitioning from confirmation to attestation. Mr. Conine stated that Clark County would re-open the housing assistance program next week using a new process with additional resources to help distribute funds more quickly. He noted that Clark County would also transition to an attestation model.

Mr. Conine said one of the biggest hurdles in processing applications was ensuring that all the necessary information was provided during the process. In Reno, 26% of applications among eligible individuals were closed due to the amount of time it took to submit and review applications and involve landlords; however, the attestation method would hasten the process. The attestation method required the recipient to confirm need and fall within all required categories. He stated that the rules of the program were not changed, just the amount of information that was required up front. Mr. Conine said applications were being processed more quickly since the NRHA and the RHA implemented the attestation method. He was hopeful that would also be the case in Clark County.

Mr. Conine believed that the \$73.5 million currently in the program would be expended by the December 30, 2020, deadline. He noted that the total need for the program was approximately \$1.2 billion. He stated that the agencies would ensure the funds were fully expended in hopes of receiving additional federal funds.

Mr. Conine said Clark County allocated \$30.0 million toward the housing assistance program. In addition, the state allocated \$20.0 million to the program. In addition, the state allocated \$10.0 million to support the eviction mediation program. He thought the majority of those funds would likely end up in Clark County. Mr. Conine said the state also allocated \$5.0 million toward the housing assistance program in Washoe County. In addition, the City of Sparks allocated \$2.0 million to the housing assistance program in Washoe County and the City of Reno allocated \$1.5 million. Lastly, the state allocated \$5.0 million in housing assistance for the rural counties.

Mr. Conine said it had been a pleasure working with the Nevada Housing Division (NHD). He said the NHD staff were true public servants.

Stephen Aichroth, Administrator, NHD, Department of Business and Industry (B&I), thanked the Office of the State Treasurer, Clark County Social Services, the RHA, and the NRHA for their collaborative efforts in providing housing assistance to Nevadans.

Mr. Aichroth said, as the state was developing the housing assistance program, Clark County was also developing a program. Through discussions with Clark County, the state used the county's program as a blueprint, adopting the same eligibility criteria for statewide consistency. As noted, Clark County allocated \$30.0 million to the program, and the state provided \$20.0 million in reserves. When the \$30.0 million was depleted, Clark County could access the \$20.0 million. That would be done on a draw down basis, which would take approximately four working days to process.

Continuing, Mr. Aichroth said the state allocated \$5.0 million to the RHA for Washoe County. Since transitioning to the attestation process, the RHA had reached out to approximately 500 applicants with incomplete applications. He noted that a number of those applicants were expected to be converted to eligible recipients. Mr. Aichroth said the RHA had indicated that it may not utilize all of the funding by December 30, 2020, due to the additional funding provided by the Cities of Reno and Sparks; however, he noted there was a clawback provision in the agreement so the funds could be reallocated to Clark County or the NRHA if necessary. In regard to rural housing assistance, the NRHA

had processed approximately \$821,000 in disbursements. The NRHA anticipated that \$3.8 million in state funding would be expended by December 30, 2020. Mr. Aichroth stated that the NHD anticipated the demand for housing assistance would increase significantly when the eviction moratorium expired.

With regard to duplication of funding, Mr. Aichroth stated that housing assistance payments were issued directly to landlords. The housing assistance agencies required proof of rental rules as well as a lease agreement before payment was authorized.

Mr. Aichroth noted that the NHD spoke with the Office of the Governor, the Office of the State Treasurer, Justice Hardesty, the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Clark County and DETR on a weekly basis to provide updates concerning the expenditure of the funds so that everyone was aware of the status of the program.

## **VII. REVIEW OF THE COMMERCIAL RENTAL ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM FUNDED WITH CORONAVIRUS FEDERAL AID.**

Zach Conine, State Treasurer, discussed the Commercial Rental Assistance Grant (CRAG) program, a program which allowed Nevada businesses to access up to \$10,000 in rental assistance to maintain operations. He stated that the funding would support more than 800 Nevada businesses.

Mr. Conine said, on June 22, 2020, the Office of the Governor authorized the Office of the State Treasurer and the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) to establish the CRAG program. The program was brought before the IFC on July 29, 2020, and went live on August 10, 2020. He said the CRAG program began receiving applications on August 24, 2020, and continued for two weeks. Mr. Conine said the standardized disbursement was \$10,000 regardless of the amount of loss, as long as the rent owed exceeded \$10,000. In addition, the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) limits were removed to ensure businesses were not excluded from the program.

Mr. Conine said the IFC had expressed concerns with the eligibility requirements of the CRAG program. Consequently, the Office of the State Treasurer worked with GOED to remove most of the concerning requirements. However, home-based businesses were still ineligible for the CRAG program due to the lack of a work-related lease. In addition, individuals and businesses that were illegal at the federal level, primarily cannabis-related businesses, were ineligible for the program.

Mr. Conine said all applications for the CRAG program were due September 23, 2020; however, the deadline was flexible if applicants experienced a technology problem or had difficulty with their landlord. He stated that the funds would be disbursed in about two weeks if the Board of Examiners granted approval at its October 13, 2020, meeting.

With regard to outreach efforts, Mr. Conine said GOED sent program information to 800 businesses. In addition, Unclaimed Property staff at the Office of the State Treasurer reached out to 13,000 businesses that filed unclaimed property in the state, and the Gaming Control Board reached out to small taverns in Nevada knowing that many were excluded from the PPP at the beginning of the process. He stated that the Office of the

State Treasurer also did significant outreach. In the past 90 days, a team of two staff managed 6,000 emails from potential recipients, which equated to approximately 2,000 emails a month, or 65 emails per day, seven days a week. In addition, the Office of the State Treasurer had conducted more than 25 outreach events.

Mr. Conine provided the following facts about the CRAG program:

- The highest number of applications had been submitted from zip code 89102.
- Applications had been received from art organizations, sandwich shops, jewelry stores, Certified Public Accounting firms, dry cleaners, churches, doggy day cares, dance studios, technology companies, etc.
- Small business advisors throughout the state had worked with businesses owned by single parents, non-native English speakers, and business owners that had to go to a library to obtain the program information.
- Applications had been received from businesses that had been in the state for more than 30 years and did not qualify for local programs. They were happy to qualify for the CRAG program.
- The program had heard from corporate landlords that were working directly with tenants on the application process and ensuring the paperwork was complete.
- Applicants had expressed how important the CRAG program was for their business, and how much of an impact the pandemic had on their livelihoods.

Mr. Conine thanked the staff at the Office of the State Treasurer, GOED, and B&I. He also thanked the vendor, National Development Corporation, and all the accountants, lawyers and small business advisors and partners that helped small businesses walk through the process. Mr. Conine said he greatly appreciated all of the outreach efforts by members of the Legislature, which had helped many businesses remain operational.

Assemblywoman Tolles asked if a report was available showing the breakdown of businesses by type, zip code, etc. Mr. Conine said a report would be made available as soon as the final awards were disbursed.

Assemblywoman Tolles asked if the report would indicate demographic information, such as awards to women-owned businesses and minority-owned businesses. Mr. Conine said the CRAG program prioritized businesses that were owned by women, minorities, veterans, and the disabled, as well as nonprofit organizations. Therefore, the report would include that information, or at least the aggregate highlights and percentages.

Senator Parks asked if the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority was a participant in the housing assistance program.

Mr. Conine said the NRHA covered the rural areas and the RHA covered Washoe County. He stated that Clark County had taken the lead on housing assistance in Southern Nevada, and the county worked with 14 community partners; however, that did not include the Southern Nevada Housing Authority.



Senator Brooks thanked Mr. Conine for providing the necessary resources to share with businesses in his district. He noted that zip code 89102 was in his district, so he was pleased to hear that outreach efforts had been effective. Mr. Conine thanked Senator Brooks for his advocacy.

Chair Frierson thanked Mr. Conine for his availability over the last several months with respect to CARES Act questions.

#### **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Pursuant to Sections 2 through 9, inclusive, of Chapter 2, *Statutes of Nevada 2020*, 32<sup>nd</sup> Special Session, pages 9 through 11, there was no physical location for this meeting. The meeting was broadcast on the Nevada Legislative website at [www.leg.state.nv.us](http://www.leg.state.nv.us). Public comment was accepted live via telephone. Written comments were also accepted by e-mail, facsimile, and mail before, during, and after the meeting.

There was no public comment.

#### **IX. ADJOURNMENT.**

Chair Frierson thanked Subcommittee members for their time and patience. He asked members to provide suggestions on subject matters for future meetings. He said those suggestions would be taken into consideration if another meeting was scheduled.

Chair Frierson adjourned the meeting at 2:34 p.m.

---

Carla Ulrych, Committee Secretary

---

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chair