

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
February 22, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 8:32 a.m. on Wednesday, February 22, 2017, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Chris Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblyman Jim Marchant
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman William McCurdy
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel
Carol Myers, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management,
Department of Administration
Miles R. Dickson, representing Nevada Community Foundation
Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber
of Commerce
Takiyah Butler, Coalition Manager, United Way of Southern Nevada
David Clyde, Government Affairs and Legal Supervisor, Regional Transportation
Commission of Southern Nevada
Jodi Tyson, representing Three Square
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada
Brian McAnallen, Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative Services,
City of Las Vegas
Susie Lee, President, Board of Directors, Communities in Schools of Nevada
Jared Busker, Policy Analyst, Children's Advocacy Alliance
James R. Wells, CPA, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor

Chairman Flores:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] There are three items on the agenda today: one presentation and two bills. We will listen to them in agenda order. The representative for the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration, please come to the table.

**Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management,
Department of Administration:**

The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management is codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 232.222 and is a revenue-generating agency that serves as the authority on federal and state regulations for grant management in Nevada. The Office is responsible for facilitating cooperative relationships to foster grant development and planning; ensuring training to address the needs of Nevada's grant workforce; analyzing and communicating trends in federal and state grant funding, regulations, and law; and providing technical assistance to all agencies as needed—conveying concepts, principles, and best practices of successful grant stewardship. It is our mission to achieve a streamlined, efficient, and sustainable grant landscape encouraging agencies and organizations to seek funds for programs that will contribute to a vibrant and sustainable community [page 2, ([Exhibit C](#))].

This Office has a unique role in that we neither receive nor manage grant dollars. Instead, the Office serves in a coordinating capacity for the development of grant applications, technical assistance, and training in grant management. Across the state, agencies have varying levels of capacity for grants—what one agency finds they can accomplish well, another may find they need assistance with the same topic. We work in many capacities dependent upon the specific agency need at the time.

Our organizational chart shows how small the Office is—three staff members and I make up the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management. Each staff member has assigned agencies they become an expert in. Projects are generally assigned through this matrix. In addition to agency application projects, each team member owns one of our agency's goals. Erin Hasty is essential in coordinating our outreach efforts with stakeholders across the state. Elizabeth Ashby is diligently working to standardize grant guidance and best practices. Eric Mager concentrates on our electronic capacities and data collection efforts [page 3, ([Exhibit C](#))].

It is no secret that federal funding is becoming more competitive. Improving collaboration is paramount to enhancing federal funding in Nevada. It is not enough for one agency to submit without partners. There is a greater demand for cross-agency collaboration and the leveraging of ongoing activities occurring within our communities.

Fortunately, this Office is positioned to function as a hub for this type of activity. We encourage coordination through several forums, including regional collaborators, state workgroups, and agency professionals [page 4, ([Exhibit C](#))]. Additionally, in the 78th Legislative Session, the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance was created within the Office. This body is committed to advising on methods and models to obtain and maximize federal funding. I encourage you to take a look at their annual report. It contains five recommendations for your consideration and is available on the website of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management ([Exhibit D](#)).

Over the biennium, the Office has assisted a variety of state, local, and nongovernmental organizations in submitting successful applications for federal funding, and we secured more than \$130 million in funding. These projects range from education—preschool and charter programs, reentry in corrections, apprenticeship expansion and diversification, to grant projects that respond to the national opioid epidemic.

However, assisting state and local agencies in submitting successful grant applications is only one piece of the puzzle to enhancing grants in Nevada. We must ensure that, once awarded, programs are implemented and managed efficiently and accurately. This Office is working to standardize policies where this can be accomplished through developing and vetting best practices with grant professionals across the state and seeking out or providing training to state and local governments and nongovernmental organizations. In addition, this Office is striving to present accurate, up-to-date information on the status of grants received, not received, and those available that are not pursued [page 5, ([Exhibit C](#))].

Unfortunately, we are finding that we are data-deprived. Ascertaining this information with any amount of accuracy is not readily available. Bringing us into the twenty-first century will require an automated grant management solution. The Governor's recommended *Executive Budget* includes an enhancement to secure a system that will eliminate the various Excel spreadsheets that many agencies currently utilize. This will increase capacity to manage a grant; it will standardize procedures across the state; it will provide stakeholders with greater real-time data reporting. The system will not only track funds already awarded to Nevada but also identify grants we can apply for and understand opportunities we are not applying for.

In addition to the system initiative, we are requesting an administrative assistant within this Office. During the 78th Legislative Session in 2015, the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management was moved into our own agency under the Department of Administration. Currently, many administrative tasks are performed by professional staff and are ad hoc, depending upon whoever is available to complete the task at the time. This position will provide support to the Office as well as the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance tasks, our regional forums, and the State Grant Workgroup.

Lastly, we are introducing a bill to revise the provisions of the acceptance of grants to allow an agency to request provisional approvals from the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Interim Finance Committee. This effort will expedite the implementation of grant activities—and it is also one of the five recommendations of the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance. I will provide testimony later this morning on this bill [page 6, ([Exhibit C](#))]. This concludes the agency presentation, and I welcome any questions.

Chairman Flores:

The Committee has asked every agency presenting questions concerning grants. The questions asked are: What grants are they applying for? What grants could they apply for in perpetuity? What grants have a sunset? What grants are a one-time deal? How many of the grant dollars are captured? How many dollars are matching, et cetera? I want to talk a little bit about supplanting. How is the grant process being incentivized for the agencies? It would be helpful if you could break that down for the Committee and me.

Connie Lucido:

Supplanting is against the *Code of Federal Regulations* and is reviewed at the time of the audit. The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance has interviewed agencies and performed research over the past year. They found the primary incentive is to bring federal dollars in and to create or enhance the programs for Nevadans. Oftentimes, the State General Fund budget for agencies will decrease when the agencies bring in federal dollars. I think that is where the supplanting question originates.

Chairman Flores:

That helps to answer why agencies are not actively applying for additional grant money. There is no incentive because if they receive a federal dollar, they may lose out on a state dollar. I would like to open up the conversation to the Committee members.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Section 1, subsection 1 of Assembly Bill 98 removes the cap on employees. Could you explain that?

Connie Lucido:

Currently, A.B. 98 states that the Administrator shall employ two persons. As a result of this language, this Office was at risk in the last budget process of losing our fourth position. That is the reason for removing the language. It does not allow us to add positions without going through the budget and funding process.

Assemblywoman Neal:

During your presentation, you discussed improving data dissemination [page 2, ([Exhibit C](#))]. What is happening in that area?

Connie Lucido:

Data dissemination is something this Office has struggled with. We can provide data on the grants the Office has touched, data on grants available, and data on single-point-of-contact grants. Some federal grants require a single point of contact, and NRS 232.225 requires agencies to notify this Office. We can provide information concerning the single point of contact.

The problem is real-time data on grants is housed within each agency. To pull that information would require resources and time. That is one reason for pursuing a grants system. The grants system would allow organizations to discover grants, manage dollars received and spent, and track grant applications.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Would this system provide a summary of grants? Would this system provide a status on the grant, such as denied or not pursued? Is that one of the goals?

Connie Lucido:

The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management actively engages with an agency to develop an application, and we are aware of the status. I am not aware if a grants system will do that automatically. Some grants systems pull in notices of available opportunities, but I do not know what resources are included other than the grant is available.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Are agencies penalized when they do not respond within a given timeline? How quickly should they respond to the Office to provide information on the grants? Is there any kind of reasonableness in time? Can it be six months later that the agency responds and updates the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management?

Connie Lucido:

The agencies have a requirement to report the grant at the time of receipt. It is located in NRS 232.225, but I do not believe there is a time frame stated. It is upon submission, and the agencies know that.

Assemblywoman Neal:

There was a situation when this Office was not in existence. As an example, the Department of Motor Vehicles received a federal grant to modify their system and revoke someone's license for failure to pay child support. There are collateral consequences for accepting that money. At the end of the day, it looks good, sounds good, but it may not be a good policy because it does not make a lot of sense to revoke the license of a person who needs to get to work to pay child support.

Assemblyman Kramer:

There are multiple sources of information concerning grants. I worked in local government, and quite often we heard of grants from the Administrative Office of the Courts or the Office of the Attorney General. Some agencies are very comfortable running their own grant program. What would be the involvement of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management for the different classes of grants?

Connie Lucido:

The Office is a state agency under the Department of Administration, and our function is to support state agencies. State agencies sometimes coordinate and collaborate with local agencies to accomplish the goals of their grants. This Office will collaborate with local aid departments, local government, and nonprofit organizations as resources permit. This Office has not had a situation where we turned away that level of assistance in the last biennium.

However, there are restrictions at the point of implementation. For every two applications submitted, we are successful in one of them. This Office has a high completion rate. Once the funds are received, we have limited resources to assist with the implementation. I will use the Community Development Block Grant as an example. The state agency receiving the federal dollars will send out a request for proposal. Local and nonprofit organizations make applications to the request for proposal. In those instances, the Office cannot assist in building an application. It may appear as favoritism to a local or nonprofit organization. However, we do directly assist local organizations that are not engaging the state.

Assemblyman Kramer:

My question was concerning grants that agencies get familiar with. Would those grants still go through the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management?

Connie Lucido:

Thank you for the clarification. Yes, those grants do come through this Office. A year and a half ago we were engaged in the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant (SABG). This year the Office will engage in the same process. The SABG is considered formula funding as opposed to competitive funding. But more and more, this Office is seeing formula grants that were once thought of as reoccurring moving towards competitive, performance-based awards.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

I was looking at the amount of federal dollars awarded in the fiscal year (FY) 2015 versus FY 2016 [page 5, ([Exhibit C](#))]. Why is there such a significant drop between the two years?

Connie Lucido:

That question is hard to answer without an analysis of opportunities that were available for both years. It is possible the type or variety, of federal dollar was not available for application in FY 2016. It may be agencies using our assistance in FY 2015 are developing grant applications on their own in FY 2016.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

I am interested because it is roughly a \$30 million difference. You may follow up with the Committee later. How are we taking advantage of federal reentry program dollars to potentially drive down Nevada's recidivism rate? Do you have any information on how Nevada is taking advantage of those dollars?

Connie Lucido:

A year or two ago this Office assisted the Department of Corrections with a Second Chance Act reentry strategic planning grant. Those funds were received. The Department of Corrections went through a year of planning with several partners. Last summer, this Office assisted them in applying for the implementation funds associated with their strategic planning. Those funds were awarded, and Nevada is one of five or six states that were selected. The Department of Corrections is in the midst of implementing those activities.

Every year the U.S. Department of Justice releases a Justice Reinvestment Initiative. This initiative allows states to look at programs that are not working and move the funds to programs that are. This opportunity has been available for the last three years but requires a task force be in place. Director Dzurenda has plans to create an official task force that can begin to tackle those larger issues. The Department of Corrections is at the beginning stages of the process. The application process will begin in February or March of next year.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

Is there a large interest in Nevada for taking advantage of these resources? Is effectiveness measured for the grant applications?

Connie Lucido:

A grant application includes performance measures, and those would be measured at the agency or community level.

Assemblyman Daly:

I would like clarification on the focus of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management. I understood you to say the Office is state-focused and coordinates with local government agencies depending on the situation. Is that correct? What is the average grant? Or is the range from \$10,000 to \$10 million?

Connie Lucido:

The clarification is semicorrect. The focus of this Office, as well as state agencies, is to bring federal dollars into Nevada. One of the things this Office does is determine who the most competitive partner is to submit the application. In some instances, the state is not the most competitive, and we seek out local and nonprofit partners and assist them in making the application.

In answer to your question, the average grant is from \$400,000 to \$700,000. The largest grant in this biennium is the Preschool Development Grant, a grant jointly administered by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. This grant is approximately \$46 million over the project period and requires a large match. The lower grant amounts are strategic grants and necessary in order to bring in the larger implementation grants.

Chairman Flores:

Where does Nevada rank in receiving competitive grant awards?

Connie Lucido:

Nevada ranks very low; per capita Nevada is fiftieth. We have increased our per capita rating, but that is attributed to the Medicaid expansion dollars that came in two years ago. If those numbers are included, Nevada is closer to thirty-eighth per capita. I can research and get back to the Committee with the information.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Who tracks the funding when the state partners with a local government or nonprofit? What is the relationship after the grant has been written? Is the state responsible for reporting back to the grantor?

Connie Lucido:

We will assist and work with all agencies or organizations to put together a competitive application. If they are a local or nonprofit, they submit the application and are responsible

for the implementation and the reporting. This Office does not have implementation resources. We do not assist in the next phase of grant management. We can provide training and technical assistance on those activities, but we do not assist with the implementation or reporting after the award.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I would like to follow up regarding Nevada being last in receiving grant awards. Is it possible that Nevada does not do the match required by some grants?

Connie Lucido:

That is a point of discussion. I believe it is one of the recommendations in the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance's list of five—to pursue some sort of match pilot and see what the return on investment would be. I believe that is something that can be addressed. I do not think that is Nevada's largest barrier.

I remembered my third point to Assemblyman McCurdy's question concerning the difference between FY 2015 and FY 2016. In FY 2015, this Office was very aggressive in submitting grant applications. We found implementation issues after receiving those awards. Now, we are more closely vetting announcements that come in and the capabilities of the agency or nonprofit group submitting the application.

Chairman Flores:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 98.

Assembly Bill 98: Revises provisions governing the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management of the Department of Administration. (BDR 18-580)

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Assembly District No. 13:

I will provide an introduction to Assembly Bill 98 together with Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams, Miles Dickson, and Paul Moradkhan. The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration plays a critical role in receiving federal grant money into Nevada. The Office is revenue-generating, which is unique among our state agencies.

The Office serves as an authority on state and federal regulations for grant management. The Office works with the state agencies to identify, secure, manage, and maintain federal grants. In fiscal year (FY) 2015 and FY 2016, the Office assisted with 113 grants resulting in \$131 million awarded. That is a return of \$219 for each salary dollar invested by the Office.

The Office was created in 2011 by Senate Bill 233 of the 76th Session. It was created by statute with the intent of addressing Nevada's grant needs. There are a lot of grant opportunities available that Nevada is not seeking. The Office coordinates and manages the different agency requests and their needs in order to be successful in obtaining federal grants.

According to the state's 2015 grant capacity survey, less than 49 percent of state agencies had staff exclusively dedicated to grant management or ensuring federal compliance. Forty-eight percent of the surveyed agencies indicated they utilized the Office for assistance. I would like to turn some time over to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams.

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42:

I appreciated all the questions the Committee asked because this is exactly why the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management was created. The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance proposed five recommendations. Two of those are proposed by A.B. 98. The first provision concerns the question Assemblyman Ellison asked about employees. Currently, there is a cap on the number of employees that the Office can employ. That restricts the Office in their capacity to support state agencies with their grant application requests. The Office must stay within their appropriation and the boundaries given by the Legislature, but the A.B. 98 provision allows the Office to grow as Nevada grows.

The second provision is the statutory prioritization for certain grants. Some agencies get more attention than others because *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 232.224 has set priorities. Removing the prioritization will provide the Office with more flexibility to serve all agencies equally.

I would like to thank the members of the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance, of which former Assemblyman Derek Armstrong and Senator Pete Goicoechea were members. Assemblyman Paul Anderson and I are here together to show the Committee that this is a bipartisan effort and it is about doing what is best for Nevada. The technical questions will be answered by the two gentlemen to my right.

Miles R. Dickson, representing Nevada Community Foundation:

The Nevada Community Foundation has actively supported the creation of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management. The Nevada Community Foundation has been involved in this conversation for some time and looks forward to our future involvement. Mr. Paul Moradkhan and I will do our best concerning the technical expertise Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams referred to.

Many thanks to Assemblyman Paul Anderson and Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams for sponsoring A.B. 98 and their ongoing leadership to seek solutions and propose improvements that will position Nevada to receive federal grant funds. Additionally, the Nevada Community Foundation would like to acknowledge the hard work and positive direction of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management's Chief, Connie Lucido.

In conversations with her and the staff, I find them exceptionally professional and proactive with the state's best interest in mind. Advancing Nevada in this space will not be easy, and it will take people like Connie and her team, as well as leadership from the Committee, to make that possible.

Chairman, I would like to address your question of where Nevada ranks. Nevada is forty-ninth. That is a slight increase from fiftieth where Nevada has rested for decades. Nevada was ranked lower than fortieth in the 1980's because of emergency relief from a winter storm in northern Nevada. I think the rankings tell part of the story but to quantify what that means, according to the Pew Charitable Trust, Nevada is at forty-ninth. If Nevada moved up one to forty-eighth, the per capita increase would yield about \$250 million in grant funding a year. That is a significant amount of money.

If I might address a concern Assemblyman McCurdy expressed pertaining to the swing from FY 2015 to FY 2016, I would submit to the Committee that the point of ongoing engagement in this work is to reduce the number of swings. Additionally, it is to set up a system in Nevada with the ability to aid in making the right grant choices, how many grants Nevada should have, and what is the share of federal revenue versus local revenue for programs and services.

As many of you know, Nevada has been one of the lowest-performing states in terms of receiving competitive federal grants for decades. The low grant rates hinder the state's ability to provide services and programs at the optimal quality and quantity. For the past six years, Nevada has taken critical steps to address this challenge, thanks to leadership from the Legislature, the Office of the Governor, and state staff. Today we are beginning to turn the corner. Nevada is significantly better than five years ago.

The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management was established in 2011 by a unanimous act of the Legislature following recommendations from the Spending and Government Efficiency (SAGE) Commission. The SAGE Commission found Nevada insufficient in grant receipt and its approach to receiving grants. As mentioned by the bill sponsor, the Office is a revenue-generating agency with a tremendous return rate of \$219 for every \$1 invested in state salaries.

Assembly Bill 98 will modify the Office's enabling language intending to create greater flexibility. For one, it allows them to scale their operation with additional staff permitted by the Legislature, if and when appropriate. Specifically, modifications in section 1, subsection 1, remove the statutory cap for the number of employee positions. The language allows the Administrator to employ the number of positions he or she deems necessary within the approved budget process. The money appropriated will drive the number of positions. This brings the Office in alignment with other state agencies operations.

Secondly, the Office would have the ability to service agencies equally. Assembly Bill 98 removes language in section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (d), that directs the Office to prioritize grant work for certain departments. This change will create flexibility for the Office to work on grants based on factors such as the high potential of the award, the size of the award, the capacity to deliver the grant program, et cetera. The change is not intended to discourage grant work in the areas name ([Exhibit E](#)).

I had the opportunity to meet with a few Committee members yesterday. Some of you questioned why a priority was set in the first place. I looked at the 76th Session and found over 11 bills that dealt with grants issued as a result of the SAGE Commission's report. These 11 bills were combined into a late amendment which included the prioritization.

The flow of federal dollars and the state's priorities change regularly. It would be beneficial to the Office to focus on factors such as high return on investment and success; and priorities of the Legislature, the Governor, and citizens of Nevada.

The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance was created in the 78th Session in 2015. It was composed of representatives from local government, nonprofits, the business community, two elected legislators, the Administrator of the Office, and the Director of the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor. These individuals conducted eight hearings to form recommendations. The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance went through testimony; research; and received input from nonprofits, local governments, and state staff. Assembly Bill 98 is in line with one of their recommendations.

[Supporting documentation ([Exhibit F](#)) was submitted but not discussed.]

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce:

The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce often gets asked why we care about this issue. The Chamber believes in supporting the efforts at the state level because it complements our efforts at the federal level. The Chamber commits resources towards a federal delegation located in Washington, D.C. We believe it makes sense to secure more dollars and bring them back to Nevada for the benefit of all Nevadans.

One of the reasons for requesting the flexibility in A.B. 98 is when the administration changes in Washington, D.C., so do the spending priorities. It is thought, with this current administration, there will be more dollars available for transportation projects. Nevada has done well in terms of grant awards for the Department of Transportation and the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. The Chamber has submitted many letters of support over the year for tire grants. Transportation projects are very important to northern Nevada, southern Nevada, and rural Nevada.

The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management has been great to work with, and the creation of the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance in 2015 is another step forward. The Southern Nevada Forum is made up of elected officials, community stakeholders, citizens, and the business community. The Southern Nevada Forum works with the local community in a variety of legislative areas to move the region forward. This benefits southern Nevada, northern Nevada, and rural Nevada.

Assemblyman Joiner:

I worked at the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and participated in federal grant applications. I was an advocate in 2011 for the Office and recall why DHHS

was added to the priority list. At the time, DHHS was the largest agency in the state, and it was thought they would need their own grant officers. The prioritization was added because the Legislature was noting that health and human services, energy, and economic development were priorities. I think the Legislature should put into statute what we think the long-term overarching priorities for Nevada should be, rather than leaving it to political changes. If these three items are changed, how will the Office prioritize? Is the Office spending too much time on DHHS at the expense of other agencies?

Miles Dickson:

The reality of federal grants is they are the third- or fourth-largest category of spending at the federal level. Federal domestic spending is between \$600 billion and \$800 billion annually. The figures do not include direct payments such as Medicaid, Social Security, or retirement. My recommendation for the Office is to focus on factors such as high return on investment and successfully applying and delivering a grant program.

The rate of those dollars has not changed too much over the last five or six administrations. The priority of the dollars and where they are directed has changed significantly. A state is prudent not to set statutorily a set of priorities that implies the priorities will be followed regardless of what the federal government is allocating. The strategic way to approach federal grants—for a state, local government, or nonprofit—is to have an adept understanding of where the federal government dollars will be categorized.

If the organization has a work plan or mission that is consistent with the direction of the federal government, they can actively compete for those dollars. One state or multiple states working together have very little impact in shifting federal priorities and where their dollars are spent.

**Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management,
Department of Administration:**

I would echo much of what Mr. Dickson has said. The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management prioritizes projects dependent upon the competitiveness, level of partners, and interest of a particular application. It is not necessarily the department or division the request is coming from.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Two sessions ago, the Governor appointed several grant writers and last session a couple more were added. Were they in the same departments or were they different departments?

Connie Lucido:

At that time, the Office had an Administrator and two grant writers. The workload was heavy, and there were more overtime hours spent than overtime hours available. We requested a third executive grant analyst position that was provided in the 78th Session in 2015, and this created an issue with NRS 232.223.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Are there any performance guidelines for the Office staff?

Connie Lucido:

Due to the small size of the Office, many of our projects are worked on by several staff members. We assign a lead to a particular project, and a grant application does not leave this Office without several sets of eyes on it. To set a performance measure for an individual grant writer would not speak to the actual activities that are occurring in the Office. We do have a performance measure that measures the dollars used in assisting a submission versus the salary dollars in this Office. Over the next biennium, the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management will work towards adding more performance measures and welcome any suggestions the Committee may have.

Miles Dickson:

States that operate effectively in terms of both their process as well as their federal grant outcomes often have a state-level office like Nevada's Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management. The Office is a hub of activity and not exclusively responsible for grants but plays a supporting role, coordinating role, and a professional development role. On some occasions, the Office takes the lead on grant applications.

I believe what has happened in Nevada over the last few years was a growth within larger departments whose capacity for federal grants is significant. The Department of Health and Human Services is going to be far and away the largest recipient for the foreseeable future. The ideal scenario is a centralized grants office that can provide coordination and an occasional leadership role. There is also growth in their own infrastructure and talent, and the reliance on external agencies or adjacent departments is lessened. Arizona has been successful in strengthening their central grants office and driving progress.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Section 1, subsection 1, states "...purpose, employ such persons as he or she deems necessary." To whom is "he or she" referring?

Connie Lucido:

That particular sentence is referring to the Administrator or chief, who currently is me.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Should the language be changed to "Administrator" versus "he or she"?

Miles Dickson:

I defer to the Legislative Counsel Bureau staff for the best construction of the sentence.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I am trying to understand why the language is "he or she" versus "Administrator."

Miles Dickson:

That is a good question, and we can work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau staff to modify the language.

Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel:

It seems pretty evident that "he or she" refers to the "Administrator," but the language can be modified to make that explicit.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Section 1, subsection 1, states, "The Administrator of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management shall" Should "shall" be changed to "may"?

Jim Penrose:

"Shall" imposes a duty to employ the persons. "May" makes the statement permissive. In this context, either term would work.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone in Las Vegas in support of A.B. 98?

Takiyah Butler, Coalition Manager, United Way of Southern Nevada:

I am speaking in support of A.B. 98 on behalf of the United Way of Southern Nevada, as well as members who have been participating in Southern Nevada Strong conversations on improving the amount or frequency of the federal grants that Nevada receives in our region and in our state.

United Way focuses on promoting collaboration to address large, complex issues in our community to move toward healthier communities. I want to speak from the perspective of collaboration and why it is so important the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management is given the flexibility to provide capacity and support, as well as helping our local organizations and agencies to connect with the proper state agencies to apply for federal funding.

Our local level collaboration efforts are multisector. We engage businesses, chambers of commerce, community members, and academic institutions. We want to ensure we are connecting to policy and individuals within state agencies ensuring the highest impact possible. Having the Office available to local agencies and organizations allows them to connect to the right persons at the state level, ensures they have kept abreast of state agency work, and are kept knowledgeable of available opportunities.

United Way promotes the collection of data and building capacities for local organizations to succeed in their grant implementation phase. We understand implementation is not the Office's majority of work, but it is an area where we can supplement. In order to get to the point of implementation, it is necessary to have the Office connect local organizations to the opportunities at the federal level and the proper state agencies.

I would like to commend Ms. Lucido and the Office for their work thus far. I would like to commend my local community members who are making sure we have this conversation on increasing federal funds. These monies make it possible to address larger issues and help us to make things better.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone in Carson City in support of A.B. 98?

David Clyde, Government Affairs and Legal Supervisor, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada is also responsible for Southern Nevada Strong which is southern Nevada's first federally recognized regional plan. A cornerstone of Southern Nevada Strong is increasing the availability and effective use of private and federal funds. Their plan specifically addresses increasing grant capacity; improving grant communication; and coordination among local and state governments. We are in support of this bill and believe the flexibility that A.B. 98 provides will make Nevada more competitive for receiving federal grant awards. For those reasons, we are in support of this bill.

Jodi Tyson, representing Three Square:

Three Square's food bank has been a part of Southern Nevada Strong since it was implemented. We have enjoyed the opportunities to create more robust regional plans and to include nutrition in those plans. Our recent work with the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management has been beneficial because sometimes nutrition does not always fall under the category people think. A lot of our federal grants have come through the State Department of Agriculture. In the last year, we have been building a relationship with the Office to bridge the gap for our regional plan and how we can partner with the state to support nutrition as it relates to health and human services and the DHHS agency.

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada:

The Retail Association of Nevada is in favor of A.B. 98, and we give a lot of credit to the Legislature for creating the Office. I would like to address two concerns. First, Assemblyman Carrillo mentioned how the head of the Office is referred to. Is it an administrator or chief? That is a concern of ours. Assemblywoman Joiner referred to section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (d). This section provides the flexibility to seek an educational grant opportunity that would have more impact rather than something that might fall under DHHS. The Office would have the ability to explore the best return on investment opportunity for Nevada.

Brian McAnallen, Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas:

We appreciate Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams and Assemblyman Paul Anderson for bringing this bill forward. There has been a lot of discussion in the Southern Nevada Forum over the last year and a half on this matter. We are in full support for any opportunity that can maximize federal dollars for our state's benefit. We seek grants at the city level

whenever possible. The opportunity to partner with state offices is fundamental to the success of the state and moving Nevada up from forty-ninth. We think the flexibility will help us seek a broader array of federal grants.

Susie Lee, President, Board of Directors, Communities in Schools of Nevada:

I am approaching this bill in support, primarily from a nonprofit role in the realm of education. The needs of our communities outweigh the resources we have in Nevada. Our ability to work together and access more federal grants will benefit our state. I fully support this bill and ask that you do as well.

Jared Busker, Policy Analyst, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

The Children's Advocacy Alliance is in support of A.B. 98.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anybody else here or in Las Vegas that would like to speak in support of A.B. 98? [There was no one.] Is there anybody who would like to speak in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anybody who would like to speak in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Presenters, please come back to the table for last-minute remarks.

Miles Dickson:

It is very heartening to see local governments, nonprofits, and state staff all speak in support of A.B. 98.

Paul Moradkhan:

Mr. Abney, Director of Government Relations of the Chamber of Reno, Sparks, and Northern Nevada asked me to express their support for the A.B. 98; he could not be here this morning.

Chairman Flores:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 98 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 81.

Assembly Bill 81: Revises provisions governing the acceptance of gifts and grants by state agencies. (BDR 31-244)

Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration:

Assembly Bill 81 is sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Department of Administration. The bill streamlines the process for review and approval of denial for the acceptance of a gift or grant by a state agency.

Specifically, the bill allows a state agency to request provisional approval from the Legislative Counsel Bureau's (LCB) Interim Finance Committee (IFC) once a grant application has been submitted. Additionally, it increases the threshold for a state agency to

accept a gift or grant that is approved by the Governor and is not being used to hire employees. Lastly, it allows a state agency to carry forward the work program of an unexpended balance of a grant previously authorized by the IFC.

Under existing law, the acceptance of a gift or grant by a state agency from any source requires approval by the IFC. Once submitted, the IFC has 45 days to approve or deny the request. The IFC meets six times a year and requires agenda items to be submitted at least 45 days in advance of the committee meeting. Therefore, depending on the calendar of activities, it can take anywhere from 45 days to 120-plus days for a grant acceptance request to be processed.

This time frame often hinders an agency's ability to swiftly and successfully implement grants in relation to when the grant notice is received. Often, agencies report a resistance to apply for grant funds due to the long time frame required to bring a grant into the state's financial management system.

This bill will allow the state agency to request provisional approval from the IFC once it applies for a grant instead of waiting until after the grant is awarded.

This change will maintain the IFC's oversight function while reducing the time frame for the process. When a provisionally approved grant is awarded and consistent with approval terms, the award is deemed finally approved, and implementation can begin.

If it is not consistent, the award will be deemed disapproved, and the agency is required to resubmit to the IFC to seek approval before implementation can occur. Additionally, this bill increases thresholds for a state agency to accept governmental grants from \$150,000 to \$300,000 and gifts and grants from nongovernmental sources from \$20,000 to \$40,000 if they are used for purposes other than hiring employees. This revision will promote a greater opportunity for agencies to apply while continuing the IFC oversight and transparency. The acceptance of these awards will continue to be reported to the LCB Fiscal Analysis Division.

Finally, the bill will allow IFC's approval to be effective for the duration of the entire period of which grant activities are being completed. This includes awards that cross over fiscal years. The revision removes this duplicative step and will further streamline the grant implementation and management.

In my written testimony, the current process versus an award that goes through the proposed provisional process is illustrated [page 2, ([Exhibit G](#))]. The red line points out where the IFC process begins, and in the proposed variation the time frame for grant implementation is cut in half. This concludes my testimony, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Daly:

I want to ensure that the IFC is completely involved and there is not an unintended shift of authority from one branch to another.

Connie Lucido:

Assembly Bill 81 does not change the IFC oversight except to increase the threshold level. The IFC is notified of the award received and provided a presentation. Oftentimes, an agency submits a grant application with a 12-month implementation period. If a grant is awarded January 1, the agency has missed the deadline for the IFC's February meeting. The agency must wait until the April IFC meeting to bring the grant award funds into the state. The agency has missed three months of the grant implementation period. Agencies view the delay as prohibitive, and many decide not to pursue the grant application.

The proposed provision allows agencies to submit the grant application and at the same time submit for provisional approval to the IFC. The IFC submission includes the work the agency has completed and the dollar amount of the grant. As an example, using January 1 again, an agency receives a notice of grant award with the same terms that were presented to the IFC for provisional approval. The agency would notify LCB and the Budget Division, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, to remove the provisional approval and allow the implementation to begin in January as opposed to April.

Assemblyman Daly:

I understand the provisional process through your example. The Committee wants to ensure we are not giving too much additional flexibility from the current IFC approval process.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Please explain section 2, subsection 5, paragraph (a), where the value is changing from \$20,000 to \$40,000 and also, paragraph (b) where the value is changing from \$150,000 to \$300,000. Is the purpose not to report to the IFC?

Connie Lucido:

The gifts and or grants are still reported to the IFC. The dollar amounts were derived by looking at awards received over the biennium. The threshold change is approximately 20 percent. The Committee asked the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management to review IFC agenda items and determine how accepted awards were affected. The Office is currently researching this information and will report back to the Committee.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

If a grant is provisionally approved and awarded at a larger amount, will the agency be required to resubmit to IFC for approval of the larger amount?

Connie Lucido:

Yes, that is correct. Many large grant awards have a time period of two to five years. When the IFC provides the initial acceptance, the agency begins implementation. Oftentimes, the federal agency responsible for the grant award will amend the grant awards' second and subsequent years. This is because federal dollars fluctuate.

Resubmitting to the IFC is a duplicative effort and could cause potential harm to the agency. If the agency was not permitted by IFC to accept the additional money in the second year, it

could result in a loss of projects or programs. It damages the relationship with the federal funder and might trigger a notice of collection. In essence, the agency accepted money for a year to begin a project that is no longer approved to continue.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Has Nevada received grants in the past for more than the submitted award? If so, how many?

Connie Lucido:

Typically, an agency will not receive more dollars than what it applied for. If there is a change, it is usually downward. There was an instance where a prescription program was awarded \$300,000, and additional supplemental federal funds became available. The funds were not part of the initial award, and the award was resubmitted to the IFC.

Assemblyman Marchant:

Assembly Bill 81 removes and expands some limitations, modifies the IFC process, and increases the dollar thresholds. Do you know why the dollar thresholds were included initially?

Connie Lucido:

I do not have the answer to that question but will get back to the Committee.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What is the rationale behind increasing the threshold?

Connie Lucido:

Agencies apply for grant funding that is consistent with their strategic plans and priorities set by an advisory council, the Legislature, or the Governor. The intent of increasing the threshold is to assist agencies in bringing in a greater number of federal awards. Agencies are less likely to pursue smaller grant awards because of the expected delay in the IFC acceptance process. The provision is to streamline the process.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Section 2, subsection 5, paragraph (a) states, "Gifts, including grants from nongovernmental sources, not" Can you provide an example of gifts the Office receives that are eligible and would benefit the Office? I am interested in gifts less than \$40,000 that might occur.

Connie Lucido:

Gifts are nongovernmental funds and could be State General Fund dollars. I am not versed on gifts because my business is grant awards. The Office does not receive gifts. I can reach out to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor to get an answer for you.

Chairman Flores:

What scenarios might occur if the grant threshold is raised from \$150,000 to \$300,000?

Connie Lucido:

The threshold does not come into play because the IFC has a more restrictive policy. If a category exceeds \$75,000, it must go through the IFC.

Chairman Flores:

Please walk the Committee through an example of where in the process the streamlining is important.

Connie Lucido:

My apologies, I am not versed in work programs and the acceptance of IFC. I would request another speaker, or perhaps we can meet offline. I believe the Governor's Office of Finance would be better able to answer the question.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone in the audience who could break down the process for the Committee?

Miles R. Dickson, representing Nevada Community Foundation:

The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance spent close to a year receiving testimony and in conversations on this issue, asking the question, Why is Nevada not submitting more grant applications? Areas for improvement were the processing of grants, match funding, knowledgeable staff, and Nevada's conformance to federal standards.

The processing of grants is what A.B. 81 addresses. Let us look at grant awards above the threshold. I am a state administrator, and I submit an application for \$1 million grant on January 1. On March 1, I receive a notice of intent to award—a nonbinding agreement indicator from the federal government. On April 1, I receive a notice of grant award—the formal announcement that my grant has been awarded. I submit my request for approval to the IFC, and it is scheduled for the next meeting approximately 45 days later. If I received my notice of grant award May 1, I could be waiting up to 90 days or more.

The delay means dollars sit in accounts longer and the funds are not getting delivered to the committed programs and services. I am required to do 12 months' of work in 9 months. As a result, I may need to return funds or be penalized going forward. It begs the question, How many times might the delay in processing inhibit an agency administrator from applying?

Chairman Flores:

How many days in advance must an IFC request be submitted?

Miles Dickson:

My understanding is 45 days. There may be some flexibility, and I will defer to someone who has the specific knowledge of the process.

Chairman Flores:

If an agency has missed the 45-day window, is there a mechanism to reach out to IFC staff and have an item added to the agenda?

Miles Dickson:

Yes. Currently, the law allows for emergency circumstances and expeditious requests. The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance discussed using an expeditious request, which has a 15-day timeline, as one solution to the time delay. The expeditious request is intended to move issues of imminent priority through. It is not intended as a standard for submitting requests to the IFC.

Chairman Flores:

Would modifying statute to a 15-day requirement provide the same benefit?

Miles Dickson:

The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance recommended the provisional approval submission because it maintains IFC oversight and permit the IFC to go through its usual process. If the IFC approves the request and the grant award comes in, the Governor's Office of Finance and legislative fiscal staff are still responsible for verifying the provisional approval meets the terms of the grant. The language in section on page 5, line 22, "Does not exceed by 10 percent or \$75,000, whichever is more. . ." addresses the situation when a grant is awarded for a dollar amount less than provisionally approved.

Assemblyman Ellison:

When match funding occurs, how will it be reconciled with the provisional approval process?

Miles Dickson:

The provisional approval process aligns the IFC's oversight process with the agency's need for grant request approval. When match funding occurs, there is a tremendous amount of work for state agencies and the Governor's Office of Finance to ensure reconciliation. There is no consistent match process at the state or federal level in terms of gifts and grants acceptance.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I would like as much information as possible concerning the grant request approval process prior to the bill going to the floor.

Assemblyman Marchant:

Are taxpayers on the hook when grant funds run out and resources are still employed? For example, people have been hired, or another type of expense was committed, how is that handled?

Miles Dickson:

The agency must know what obligations are required and what occurs in the event of noncompliance. I do not think that occurs for grants below \$150,000. The larger funded programs with match funding may burden the taxpayers.

James R. Wells, CPA, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor:

The intent of A.B. 81 is to expedite the process of receiving federal monies. Currently, federal grants entering the state system are postaward. The agency receives a notice of grant award from the federal agency and if the grant threshold is exceeded, the IFC approval process begins.

The agency must submit the work program or budget amendment to the IFC six weeks in advance of their meeting date. The Governor's Office of Finance must receive the notice of grant award two to three weeks before that date which increases the IFC submission time to eight or nine weeks. This results in a two-month time frame before work can start on a grant. The intent of A.B. 81 is to get provisional approval from the IFC on the submission of an application for a federal grant. We explain the commitment if there is a match, the maintenance effort required by the state, and how those will be fulfilled. For example, if a \$1 million grant is awarded and the state has a 10 percent match, the preapproval process allows the agency to start putting people in place and working the program as opposed to a two- or three-month delay.

Assembly Bill 81 is attempting to reduce the delay. Discretionary grants are typically small in dollar amount. Grants over the threshold must go to the IFC, and some have very restrictive time frames. The agency has a limited time to install the program, wrap it up, and report on it. The emergency work program provision is sometimes used, but we try not to.

Assembly Bill 81 is an attempt to get the Legislature involved early, letting them know what is being applied for, what is intended, and get the provisional approval on the grant application. When the grant is awarded, the agency can get the work program up and running.

If the grant exceeds the IFC approved amount by 10 percent or \$75,000, it must be resubmitted to the IFC. For example, an agency applied for a \$1 million grant but received \$1.5 million. The IFC must be informed what will be done with the additional \$500,000 not included in the original request to the IFC. The intent is not to exclude the IFC or the Legislature from any oversight activities. It is to expedite the implementation of federal grants.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Is there a possibility of adding a policy goal into the bill? For example, consider removing the expedited process when certain benchmarks are met.

Connie Lucido:

My apologies, I am not exactly sure what you mean.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Sometimes a bill has benchmarks or checkpoints that relate to a policy goal. For example, Nevada does not want to be number 49 on the list of grant awards. The authority for the provisional approval process would fall out once the policy goal is met, such as Nevada moves its rank to number 25.

Jim Wells:

If I understand correctly, the provisional approval process would be a temporary fix, and at a certain point, the provisional process would be eliminated. In my opinion, A.B. 98 was not necessarily put in place solely to move Nevada from forty-ninth up the list. It will help that process, but more importantly, it is the ability to implement the federal dollars when they are awarded.

It is to expedite the ability to get a program up and running. If the provisional approval process was removed at a certain point in time, the agencies would be placed back in the situation that occurs today, taking nine to ten weeks to receive permission to move forward with the grant. That may not be in the best interest of the constituents of the grant.

Chairman Flores:

Has the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance had an opportunity to speak to the IFC staff in contemplating this bill? Were there conversations concerning strategy and the best way to solve the present issues?

Jim Wells:

Assembly Bill 81 was derived from Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance meetings. The Council has two legislators that are nonvoting members. The intent is they will work with LCB's fiscal staff to ensure they are included in the discussion. I personally have not had discussions with the LCB fiscal staff and the impacts on this bill.

Chairman Flores:

It is easy for us to reach out to the IFC. I wanted to know so we could put that on the record. Is there anyone wishing to speak in support of this bill?

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce:

The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce is in support of this and believes this is an important conversation for our state.

Brian McAnallen, Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas:

We hate the idea of losing time in initiating these grants and setting those agency folks behind the curve trying to catch up, spend the dollars, get organized, and implement the grants. I have heard anecdotally that some folks have passed on grant opportunities because they do not want to be in a crushed time frame to meet the deadlines of the federal grants.

If that is the case, it is worrisome on our part. Assembly Bill 81 provides the opportunity to get in front of the IFC, talk to the Legislature, get the grant process moving. The City of Las Vegas supports that idea.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone else wishing to speak in support of this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to speak in the neutral position on this bill? [There was no one.] Bill presenters, please come forward for closing remarks.

Connie Lucido:

The Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management believes A.B. 81 is very important to our state agencies. Allowing for a provisional approval process within the IFC will provide a greater amount of federal funds to Nevada. I would be happy to do additional research on the threshold questions.

Chairman Flores:

I am closing the hearing on Assembly Bill 81 and opening up for public comment. [There was none.] The meeting is adjourned [at 10:40 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Carol Myers
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Agency Overview: Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination & Management," dated February 22, 2017, presented by Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration.

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "2016 Annual Report," by the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance, submitted by Connie Lucido, Chief, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration.

[Exhibit E](#) is a document titled "Assembly Bill 98," submitted by Miles R. Dickson, representing Nevada Community Foundation.

[Exhibit F](#) is a document titled "The Federal Grant Competitiveness Project: Ensuring Nevada Receives its Fair Share of Federal Grant Funding," dated 2017 Legislative Session, submitted by Miles R. Dickson, representing Nevada Community Foundation.

[Exhibit G](#) is written testimony presented by Connie Lucido, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration regarding Assembly Bill 81.