

STATE OF NEVADA MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA NEVADA RESILIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Name of Organization: Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee Date and Time of Meeting: Monday, September 21, 2020 – 2:00 P.M.

Teleconference Only:

Call: 970-984-6000 Access Code: 26304113#

Pursuant to Section 1 of the Declaration of Emergency Directive 006 signed March 22, 2020, as extended by Declaration of Emergency Directive 029, signed July 31, 2020, the requirement contained in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 241.023(1)(b) that there be a physical location designated for meetings of public bodies where members of the public are permitted to attend and participate is suspended due to the COVID-19 emergency. Please see Attachment A. This meeting will be teleconferenced beginning at 2:00 p.m.

The Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (Committee) may take action on items marked "For Possible Action." Items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda at the discretion of the Chair. Items may be combined for consideration by the Committee at the discretion of the Chair. Items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time.

Please Note: Witnesses wishing to have their complete testimony/handouts included in the permanent record of this meeting should provide a written or electronic copy to the Committee administrative support staff. Minutes of the meeting are produced in a summary format and are not verbatim.

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call Chair, Chief Justin Luna, State Administrative Agent (SAA), and Vice-Chair, Deputy Chief Billy Samuels, Urban Area Administrator (UAA).
- 2. Public Comment (Discussion Only) No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
- **3. Approval of Minutes** (Discussion/For Possible Action) Chair, Chief Justin Luna, SAA, and Vice-Chair, Deputy Chief Billy Samuels, UAA. The Committee will discuss and review the minutes of the August 17, 2020, Committee meeting. The Committee may vote to amend and approve or approve the minutes as provided.

- 4. Review and Ranking of Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Allocations – (Discussion/For Possible Action) – Chair, Chief Justin Luna, SAA, and Kelli Anderson, Emergency Management Program Manager, DEM/HS. The Committee will evaluate and rank nine scenarios presented for future Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) allocations. The Committee will review the EMPG allocation rankings and vote to recommend an allocation scenario for distribution of future EMPG grant awards.
 - Due to this meeting being teleconferenced, Committee members will be asked to read into record their individual rankings for each scenario. Rankings will be tabulated by Committee staff, and a ranking summary will be read into record prior to the final Committee vote.
- 5. Overview of the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Process (Discussion Only) Chief Justin Luna, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security. The Committee will be provided an overview of the HSGP process to include HSGP timelines, release of the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), Metropolitan Statistical Analysis (MSA) rankings, Strategic Capacities to be Maintained, meeting timelines, reporting requirements, and potential deliverables from the State Administrative Agent (SAA), Urban Area Working Group, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee, Finance Committee, and the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security.
- 6. Public Comment (Discussion Only) No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
- 7. Adjourn (Discussion/For Possible Action)

This is a public meeting. In conformance with the Nevada Public Meeting Law, and pursuant to Sections 3 and 4 of the Declaration of Emergency Directive 006 signed March 22, 2020, as extended by Declaration of Emergency Directive 029, signed July 31, 2020, this agenda was posted or caused to be posted on or before 9:00 a.m. on September 16, 2020, at the following:

- Nevada Department of Public Safety's Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security Public Meeting Notifications/Information Website: DEM Public Meeting Website at <u>http://dem.nv.gov/DEM/2020 Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee/</u>
- Nevada Public Notice Website: <u>www.notice.nv.gov</u>

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have a disability or access requirements. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, or if you need to obtain meeting materials, please notify Karen Hall, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, 2478 Fairview Drive, Carson City, Nevada 89701 or (775) 687-0300. 24-hour advance notice is requested. Thank you.



DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY

DIRECTIVE 029

WHEREAS, in late 2019, the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention began monitoring an outbreak of respiratory illness caused by a novel coronavirus first identified in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China; and

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2020, the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses named this novel coronavirus "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2);" and

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2020, the World Health Organization named the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, "COVID-19;" and

WHEREAS, the World Health Organization advises that the novel coronavirus that causes COVID-19 virus is highly contagious, and spreads through respiratory transmission, and direct and indirect contact with infected persons and surfaces; and

WHEREAS, the World Health Organization advises that respiratory transmission occurs through both droplet and airborne transmission, where droplet transmission occurs when a person is within 6 feet of someone who has respiratory symptoms like coughing or sneezing, and airborne transmission may occur when aerosolized particles remain suspended in the air and is inhaled; and

WHEREAS, the World Health Organization advises that contact transmission occurs by direct contact with infected people or indirect contact with surfaces contaminated by the novel coronavirus; and

WHEREAS, some persons with COVID-19 may exhibit no symptoms but remain highly infectious; and

WHEREAS, on March 5, 2020, Clark County and Washoe County both reported the first known cases of COVID-19 in the State of Nevada; and

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared COVID-19 a pandemic; and

WHEREAS, on March 12, 2020, I, Steve Sisolak, Governor of the State of Nevada issued a Declaration of Emergency to facilitate the State's response to the COVID-19 pandemic; and

1

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2020, Donald J. Trump, President of the United States declared a nationwide emergency pursuant to Sec. 501(b) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C. 5121-5207 (the "Stafford Act"); and

WHEREAS, on March 14, 2020, I formed a medical advisory team to provide medical guidance and scientifically based recommendations on measures Nevada could implement to better contain and mitigate the spread of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, infectious disease and public health experts advised that minimizing interpersonal contact slows the rate at which the disease spreads, and is necessary to avoid overwhelming healthcare systems, commonly referred to as "flattening the curve"; and

WHEREAS, since the March 12, 2020 Declaration of Emergency, I have issued 28 Directives pursuant to that order to provide for the safety, wellbeing, and public health of Nevadans and the administration of the State of Nevada; and

WHEREAS, these Directives were promulgated to reduce interpersonal contact and promote social distancing to flatten the curve; and

WHEREAS, on April 30, 2020, I introduced the Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery plan that outlined a phased approach to reopening Nevada businesses and industry; and

WHEREAS, the Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery plan set forth a collaborative partnership between state and local governments that included the formation of the Local Empowerment Advisory Panel ("LEAP") to serve as a resource to local governments and local communities; and

WHEREAS, on May 9, 2020, the State of Nevada entered Phase One of the Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery plan; and

WHEREAS, on May 29, 2020, the State of Nevada entered Phase Two of the Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery plan; and

WHEREAS, prior to entering Phase Two, Nevada experienced a consistent and sustainable downward trajectory in the percentage of positive COVID-19 cases, a decrease in the trend of COVID-19 hospitalizations, and a decline in our cumulative test positivity rate from a maximum rate of 12.2% on April 24, 2020 to 6.3% on May 27, 2020 with a 33-day downward trend; and

WHEREAS, the intensity of COVID-19 infections in Nevada is exceedingly fluid. As of July 28, 2020, the State of Nevada has experienced over fifty days of an increasing trend of hospitalizations for confirmed COVID-19 cases; and

WHEREAS, as of July 28, 2020, the State of Nevada has experienced forty days of an increasing trend in its cumulative test positivity rate of COVID-19 cases; and

WHEREAS, as of July 28, 2020, there is no cure or vaccine for the COVID-19 disease; and

WHEREAS, because the virus causing COVID-19 is novel, scientific and medical treatment knowledge about the virus and how to limit its spread is improving regularly; and

WHEREAS, NRS 414.060 outlines powers and duties delegated to the Governor during the existence of a state of emergency, including without limitation, directing and controlling the conduct of the general public and the movement and cessation of movement of pedestrians and vehicular traffic during, before and after exercises or an emergency or disaster, public meetings or gatherings; and

WHEREAS, NRS 414.060(3)(f) provides that the administrative authority vested to the Governor in times of emergency may be delegated; and

WHEREAS, Article 5, Section 1 of the Nevada Constitution provides: "The supreme executive power of this State, shall be vested in a Chief Magistrate who shall be Governor of the State of Nevada;" and

NOW, THEREFORE, by the authority vested in me as Governor by the Constitution and the laws of the State of Nevada and the United States, and pursuant to the March 12, 2020, Emergency Declaration,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- SECTION 1: To the extent this Directive conflicts with earlier Directives or regulations promulgated pursuant to the March 12, 2020 Declaration of Emergency, the provisions of this Directive shall prevail.
- SECTION 2: The Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery plan is hereby reaffirmed. This plan provides for a federally supported, state managed, and locally executed reopening approach, under which county governments and local municipalities are delegated the authority to impose additional COVID-19-related restrictions on businesses and public activities. Restrictions imposed by county government or local municipalities may exceed the standards imposed by Declaration of Emergency Directives and any State or federal guidelines to the extent reasonable, or set forth under the LEAP guidelines, but in no case shall such local guidelines be more permissive than the provisions of this Directive and the disease management plans it authorizes.
- SECTION 3: The importance of the State's county and city governments committing significant energy, resources, and time to enforcing the provisions of this and previous directives and in mandating conformance with health and safety standards central to the continuing fight against COVID-19 is reaffirmed here in the strongest possible form. Local governments and individuals, businesses, and other organizations may adopt practices that exceed the standards imposed by Declaration of Emergency Directives and the disease management plans they authorize, guidelines promulgated by the Nevada State Occupational Safety and Health Administration (NV OSHA) or LEAP guidelines, but in no case shall business practices be more permissive than the provisions of this Directive, its authorized disease management plans, or those imposed by NV OSHA and the LEAP.
- SECTION 4: All directives promulgated pursuant to the March 12, 2020 Declaration of Emergency or subsections thereof set to expire on July 31, 2020, shall remain in effect for the duration of the current state of emergency, unless terminated prior to that date by a subsequent directive or by operation of law associated with lifting the Declaration of Emergency. Of note, Phase Two of the Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery remains in effect. Directive 026, Section 8, extending Directive 021, Phase Two of the Nevada United: Roadmap to Recovery plan, is hereby extended until the earlier of termination of these provisions by a subsequent directive or termination of the March 12, 2020 Declaration of Emergency to facilitate the State's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

- SECTION 5: The provisions of Section 4 do not extend to the recommencement of certain actions or directives, including Directive 025, previously terminated by express or implied order, or previously allowed to expire by operation of law.
- SECTION 6: Pursuant to NRS 414.060(3)(f), I hereby authorize and renew my call to all local, city, and county governments, and state agencies to enforce this Directive and regulations promulgated thereunder, including but not limited to, suspending licenses, revoking licenses, or issuing penalties for violating business, professional, liquor, tobacco, or gaming licenses issued by the local jurisdiction for actions that jeopardize the health, safety, or welfare of the public; conduct which may injuriously affect the public health, safety, or welfare; conduct that may be detrimental to the public peace, health, or morals; or any other applicable ordinance or requirement for such a license.
- SECTION 7: The State of Nevada shall retain all authority vested in the Governor pursuant to NRS Chapter 414.
- SECTION 8: This Directive is effective at 11:59 p.m. on Friday, July 31, 2020 and shall remain in effect until terminated by a subsequent directive promulgated pursuant to the March 12, 2020 Declaration of Emergency, or dissolution or lifting of the Declaration of Emergency itself, to facilitate the State's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.



IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Nevada to be affixed at the State Capitol in Carson City, this 31st day of July, in the year two thousand twenty.

Governor of the State of Nevada

Secretary of State

Deputy Secretary of State



Meeting Minutes Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

		DATE	August 17,	2020					
Attendence		TIME	02:00 PM						
Attendance		METHOD	Teleconfere	ence					
		RECORDER	Karen Hall	Karen Hall					
		Appointed Voting	g Member Atten	dance					
Member Name	Present	Member N	lame	Present	Member Name	Present			
Justin Luna – Chair	Х	Kelly Echeverria		Х	Carolyn Levering	Х			
Billy Samuels – Vice Chair	Х	Dave Fogerson		Х	Ryan Miller	Х			
Andy Ancho	Х	Jeanne Freeman		Х	Todd Moss	Х			
Roy Anderson	Abs	Mike Heidemann		Х	Tenielle Pereira	Х			
Travis Anderson	Х	Jill Hemenway		Abs	Shaun Rahmeyer	Abs			
Elizabeth Breeden	Abs	Eric Holt		Abs	Misty Robinson	Х			
James Chrisley	Х	David Hunkup		Х	Rachel Skidmore	Х			
Cassandra Darrough	Х	Jeremy Hynds		Х	Corey Solferino	Abs			
Darcy Davis	Х	Graham Kent		Abs	Malinda Southard	Х			
Craig dePolo	Abs	Mary Ann Laffoon		Х	Chris Tomaino	Х			
Bob Dehnhardt	Х	Chris Lake		Х	Mike Wilson	Х			
		Appointed Non-Vot	ing Member Att	andance					
Bunny Bishop	Х	Melissa Friend		Х	Kacey KC	Abs			
Rebecca Bodnar	Abs	Sheryl Gonzales		Х	Aaron Kenneston	Х			
Kate Callaghan	Х	Mojra Hauenstein		Х	Catherine Nielson	Х			
Felix Castagnola	Abs	Patricia Herzog		Х					
		Legal/Administrati	ve Support Atte	endance					
Representative			Entity		Present				
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy	eneral	Office of the Nevada Attorney General							
Karen Hall			Nevada Division of Emergency Management						

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chief Justin Luna, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEM/HS), called the meeting to order. Roll call was performed by Karen Hall, DEM/HS. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened discussion for the first period of public comment. Alfreida Jake, Elko Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone, spoke to her review of the meeting minutes from the July 28, 2020, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (Committee) meeting and concern that if a new tribe requests to use Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) funding, that it will take away from existing tribal or state allocations. Ms. Jake also inquired on the date new applications will be taken for EMPG 2021 allocations. Chief Luna indicated that he would follow-up on this issue with Ms. Jake after this meeting. The Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC) will identify tribal allocations, and the State will work with tribes that want to become eligible participants in the EMPG program.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Luna called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes of the July 28, 2020, Committee meeting. A motion to approve with no changes was presented by David Hunkup, Reno Sparks Indian Colony, and a second was provided by Mike Heidemann, Churchill County Office of Emergency Management. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Review of Current Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee Bylaws

Chief Luna opened discussion on this agenda item, and referred Committee members to Agenda Item #4a, the current version of the Committee's bylaws, and Agenda Item #4b showing proposed updates to the existing bylaws. The proposed changes included:

- Section I Authority [Page 1]: The addition of "in 2019" to the end of the first sentence.
- <u>Section IV Officers and Duties</u> [Page 2]: The second paragraph was amended to read, "The Committee will provide a report to the Governor, the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security, and the Legislative Counsel Bureau on or before February 1st of each year detailing the activities of the Committee.".
- Section X Amendments [Page 3]: The last paragraph was amended to read, "The Bylaws will be reviewed as frequently as required as determined by the Chair, but not less than once a year and may be amended when necessary by a vote of the Committee and subsequent approval by the Chair.".
- <u>Signature Section [Page 3]</u>: John C. Steinbeck's name was removed and replaced by Billy Samuels as the current Vice Chair.

Discussion ensued on the proposed updates, and David Hunkup suggested to eliminate the name of the Vice-Chair and Chair positions in the Signature Section of Page 3. This change would eliminate the need to change this information annually. Chief Luna indicated he was not aware of a specific reason for needing to include the names of the Vice-Chair or Chair in this section, and Samantha Ladich, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Nevada Office of the Attorney General, indicated that this change would be permissible.

Deputy Chief David Fogerson, East Fork Fire Protection District, motioned to approve the Committee bylaws with the proposed changes and the removal of the name section in the signature portion of the bylaws. Dr. Christopher Lake, Nevada Hospital Association, seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. The motion passed unanimously. A revised copy of the Committee bylaws will be sent to Committee members.

5. Discussion on Building Consistency in Threat and Hazard Terminology

Jon Bakkedahl, Emergency Management Program Manager, DEM/HS, briefed the Committee on the Nevada Threats and Hazards document provided as a handout for this agenda item. Mr. Bakkedahl noted that this is a a first attempt to standardize terminology involving threats and hazards across the state through the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and State Preparedness Report (SPR) process. Attempts were made to categorize threats and hazards into groups with sub-categorization, as grant processes often require specific terminology. Mr. Bakkedahl is looking for Committee feedback and will present a final draft of the document to the Committee when complete. The document will also be sent to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) for approval so that there is a single statewide platform for consistent terminology.

Sheryl Gonzales, Western Nevada Development District, inquired if the Committee could receive the Nevada Threats and Hazards document as a separate document to review. Chief Luna indicated that this document can be sent to the Committee as directed after this meeting. Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, thanked Mr. Bakkedahl for putting this document together, as there has not been consistency in the process pertaining to terminology that jurisdictions use on a regular basis.

Chief Luna indicated that any feedback for this document be sent directly to Mr. Bakkedahl, Karen Hall, or himself directly. David Hunkup inquired on the implementation process should the NCHS approve and adopt the terminology updates as discussed. Chief Luna indicated that this document is meant to be more of a tool that can be used statewide for consistency in planning purposes to ensure all jurisdictions are working from the same reference point. Mr. Bakkedahl added that this tool will be emphasized in the planning and grant process going forward to describe hazards and threats for consistency when reviewing grant applications. Instruction was given to the Committee to please get feedback to Mr. Bakkedahl by close of business on Friday, August 28, 2020.

6. Review of Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Allocations

Chief Luna opened discussion on the review of EMPG allocations and explained the handouts specific to this agenda item. Instruction was given to Committee members to review the 18 different allocation scenarios provided. Chief Luna indicated that he was confident that the Committee can identify those scenarios that should not be considered based on the negative impact to jurisdictions overall.

Deputy Chief David Fogerson indicated that this issue has been reviewed for many years with no resolve, and new options keep being added for consideration. In order to start the process of choosing a specific allocation model, Deputy Chief Fogerson motioned to select the allocation model noted on Page 6 of Handout #6b, Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base, with the caveat that he wants to include a special allocation to support Carson City for special events. The scenario on Page 6, in Deputy Chief Fogerson's opinion, lessens the impact to the least number of jurisdictions statewide including his own jurisdiction. Chief Luna indicated that the scenario on Page 6 may not be one of the scenarios that impacts the fewest jurisdictions, and he just wanted to be sure he understood the motion. Mike Heidemann agreed with Deputy Chief Fogerson, and although the scenario on Page 6 does impact a city in his jurisdiction, many of the emergencies are county-driven in response. Mr. Heidemann seconded the motion.

Chief Luna opened discussion on the motion. Jeremy Hynds indicated there is no perfect solution to this problem. There are a lot of jurisdictions that have been underfunded for a long time, and the solution chosen is a 5-year decision. Mr. Hynds suggested the original funding scenario of a .75% allocation may be the most beneficial for southern Nevada. There are a lot of people in southern Nevada rural areas, and those are the people that they rescue the most. Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County Office of Emergency Management, is on board with finding an equitable solution; however, the scenario on Page 6 is the worst scenario for Washoe County, and she would have difficulty in supporting this scenario, noting that it is the 5th highest reduction and may not be the most beneficial.

Chief Luna reminded the Committee that the goal is to identify a funding allocation based on a formula which will be presented to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Standard allocations assigned in the past have not been formula-based, and the effort is being made now to identify a formula-based solution. There are other scenarios that minimize reduction totals that are less than the allocation model presented on Page 6, and a summary of the reduction and jurisdictional impacts of all allocation models are as follows:

- Allocation Model on Page 4 approx. \$39,000 reduction impacting 5 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 5 approx. \$122,000 reduction impacting 10 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 6 approx. \$91,000 reduction impacting 6 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 7 approx. \$49,000 reduction impacting 7 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 8 approx. \$32,000 reduction impacting 4 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 9 approx. \$200,000 reduction impacting 14 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 10 approx. \$47,000 reduction impacting 6 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 11 Appears to be a duplicate of Page 8;
- Allocation Model on Page 12 approx. \$30,000 reduction impacting 3 jurisdictions;

DRAFT MINUTES – For approval at the September 21, 2020, NRAC Meeting

- Allocation Model on Page 13 approx. \$101,000 reduction impacting 8 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 14 approx. \$87,000 reduction impacting 10 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 15 approx. \$56,000 reduction impacting 5 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 16 approx. \$80,000 reduction impacting 5 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 17 approx. \$14,000 reduction impacting 5 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 18 approx. \$19,000 reduction impacting 3 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 19 approx. \$56,000 reduction impacting 3 jurisdictions;
- Allocation Model on Page 20 approx. \$120,000 reduction impacting 3 jurisdictions; and
- Allocation Model on Page 21 approx. \$31,000 reduction impacting 4 jurisdictions.

There are similar scenarios to that found on Page 6 that have a lesser overall jurisdictional impact, and Chief Luna asked the Committee to look at the scenario on Page 21. Rachel Skidmore, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, wanted to clarify that in all scenarios, if the information provided on the left-hand side of the page reflects the current allocations. Chief Luna indicated that the allocations specified in each scenario are the standard allocations. Ms. Skidmore referred to Page 1 allocations and believes that there is an issue in the allocation matching as approx. \$2,000,000 went to counties and cities; therefore, Ms. Skidmore indicated she may not be understanding the process on how this was developed. Chief Luna spoke to the standard allocations listed as the allocations that have been used in past years. The amounts reflected on Page 1 reflect totals that may have included reobligated amounts. Deobligations from jurisdictions and reobligations to other jurisdictions based on need are incorporated. Ms. Skidmore inquired on the lower portion of the scenarios, specifically in the green highlighted areas, and her understanding that this was a percentage allocation for the state. Looking at the fourth scenario, there is a 46% allocation to the State with 50% to cities and counties, and 3% to tribal jurisdictions. Ms. Skidmore asked if the State would then be taking only 46% moving forward. Chief Luna spoke to the award being divided 50/50 between the State and local jurisdictions, and the tribal percentage being taken out of the state's percentage. If a city does not have an eligible program, the allocation for that city gets moved to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, the allocation would be moved to the State.

Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County Office of Emergency Management, presented concern that what always seems to happen is that allocation is taken away from existing programs with high levels of performance and reallocated to programs that are less mature. Injuring an existing mature program is never a good thing. Chief Luna indicated that the goal is to find a consistent formula moving forward and one that minimizes impact. Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, spoke to the challenge in creating a formula when not every jurisdiction is equally represented on this Committee. It is difficult to separate the representatives of specific jurisdictions from these calculations. Dr. Freeman agreed with the earlier comments made by Deputy Chief Fogerson, Mr. Hynds, and Ms. Skidmore in that there is no perfect solution. There needs to be focus on the formula rather than the allocation model on Page 4 noting the base allocation going to the counties only, and then a tiered percentage broken down by population totals referenced on Page 3. The federal award is distributed to the states through a base allocation of .75%, and the rest is allocated using population. Therefore, providing a base to counties and cities is similar to the federal model.

Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas, spoke to having a base allocation that allowed programs to pay an individual responsible for the emergency management program. The population piece is the added allocation per capita. Ms. Levering inquired on which county programs were ineligible this year, with Chief Luna indicating that the counties not participating currently are denoted in the adjustment and are as follows: Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, and Lyon counties. Ms. Levering indicated that each of the scenarios then would have base allocation that would revert to the state. Chief Luna spoke to the EMPG program having some flexibility. EMPG can support personnel, but it does not have to be personnel; jurisdictions can choose eligible expenses to support their program. In the initial formula scenarios, 50% is allocated to local jurisdictions (cities/counties); if a county is

DRAFT MINUTES - For approval at the September 21, 2020, NRAC Meeting

not participating, then those funds would revert back to the State to be used to support emergency management in those areas. Allocations in this event can be used for state expenses or in the reobligation process. Ms. Levering indicated that if a county is not using its allocation, the state may not need their allocation as it is no longer a 50/50 split as the State is getting funding for those counties. Chief Luna reminded everyone that even with the revisions, the State portion is taking an overall reduction in each of the scenarios.

Rachel Skidmore spoke to the scenario on Page 6, and the reductions of \$91,000. Ms. Skidmore inquired if the deficit could cover the reductions to alleviate cutting programs or laying people off. Chief Luna spoke to how that would fit into a formula scenario. If any of these counties begin to participate, and have an eligible program, then other jurisdictions would take a reduction when and if that happens. Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, reminded the Committee that this is how this program has gotten to the same place by reobligating and deobligating funding without a solid formula. Previous allocation amounts have been supplemented with such deobligations and reobligations.

Deputy Chief Billy Samuels, Clark County Fire Department, inquired on which scenario most resembles the federal model. In discussion, the scenario on Page 7 appears to be close to the federal model with a base allocation to all cities and counties at .75% and no tiered allocation. The rest is based off population. Dr. Freeman also indicated that the scenarios on Pages 15 and 19 are similar but do use a tiered base allocation. Carolyn Levering indicated that the scenario on Page 13 has a base allocation for counties only at .75%. Jeremy Hynds indicated that it may be best to just mirror what the federal model is currently. Kelly Echeverria indicated that Mr. Hynds solution is one option, but consideration also must be given to those solutions with the least impacts in regard to overall reductions. No one wants to take reductions or impact local communities. Deputy Chief Fogerson indicated that the solution should follow federal guidelines, and counties should distribute the funding to the cities/towns.

Chief Luna spoke to the scenario on Page 13, noting .75% allocation to counties only as a base allocation, and the rest is distributed by population including counties and cities. This brings up the question if the scenario mirrors the federal model. It is a statutory requirement that counties are required to have an emergency management program. Deputy Chief Samuels inquired if Chief Luna is looking for a solution today. Chief Luna indicated that he is looking for a recommendation today, and currently there is a motion and a second for the scenario listed on Page 6 of Handout 6b. Deputy Chief Fogerson indicated that he could remove his motion if necessary, and that his motion was meant to start the conversation on how to address this problem. Mike Heidemann agree with Deputy Chief Fogerson, but if today's conversation results in having now two scenarios as noted on Page 6 and Page 13, and potentially others, the Committee could be in the same spot trying to identify the best solution. Mr. Heidemann wants to narrow this down and make a final decision by the next meeting. The motion was rescinded.

Chief Luna asked the Committee for feedback on which scenarios would be best, on which criteria should be considered, what impacts there are to jurisdictions, and a formula that everyone can agree upon. Dr. Kenneston reiterated that he is all in with coming up with a formula, but it needs to be a formula that creates the least amount of harm to established functioning programs. Chief Luna spoke to the scenario on Page 12 impacting two jurisdictions. Kelly Echeverria indicated that scenarios on Page 17 and 18 are possible choices addressing Dr. Kenneston's concerns. The scenario on Page 18 is the lowest for both. All scenarios are based on formulas. The scenario on Page 17 is based on a base allocation of .40% to all counties/cities, and a tiered base allocation for population, and the remaining allocation is based on population. The scenario on Page 18 is .50% to cities/counties, including a tiered population percentage, and the remaining balance distributed by population.

Carolyn Levering indicated her appreciation at the attempts to make the least impact, but those scenarios are very concerning to the City of Las Vegas. Ms. Levering indicated any scenario that puts the City of Las Vegas in the red is not acceptable. Deputy Chief Fogerson concurred with Ms. Levering on this issue. To decrease allocations in the largest communities is concerning. Mike Heidemann agreed, but one thing bigger cities have is more partnerships, and cuts to the rural areas is challenging also.

Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps, agreed that rural and tribal jurisdictions should not be hurt in this process, but larger communities must also be protected. If a formula is chosen, Ms. Laffoon wanted to know if that formula would then be used for the next five years in the EMPG funding allocations moving forward. Chief Luna indicated that the recommendation would be to base the formula on the next five years of EMPG allocations and referred the Committee to look at the sub notes within each funding scenario. Dr. Freeman indicated that it is important to understand that there are strong programs in both urban and rural areas. Dr. Darcy Davis, Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health, asked if the scenario choices can be narrowed down to county-based or another model. Per Chief Luna, that is up for discussion with the emphasis being on choosing a formula versus impact to jurisdictions.

Carolyn Levering spoke more to keeping with the idea that counties have a special and unique responsibility in the state for emergency management, and Ms. Levering motioned that scenarios #5, #6, and #13 be retained for further vetting and consideration. These scenarios allocate a base to each county, and the remainder is population based. Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District, seconded the motion. Dr. Kenneston indicated appreciation to what Ms. Levering proposed and agreed that counties have a unique responsibility to provide emergency management functions. However, he pointed out that in all three of those scenarios, the second largest county takes a large reduction in allocation. Ms. Levering indicated her concern over that issue as well, but this does help to frame the discussion a bit more. Kelly Echeverria again focused on the lowest impact, and these three options have significant impact to Washoe County. Dr. Davis inquired if these three scenarios are county-based. Chief Luna indicated that scenarios #5, #6, and #13 are county-based allocations that do not include tier-based percentages. The remainder is divided by population. Scenario #5 has .50%, #6 has 1.0%, and #13 has a .75% allocation.

David Hunkup inquired if there is a way to have the scenarios labeled for easier identification. Chief Luna indicated that the page numbers were being used to identify the specific scenarios. Mr. Hunkup indicated that the page numbers are hard to see.

Dr. Freeman spoke to the motion on the floor for scenarios #5, #6, and #13 to remain in consideration by the Committee, and if there could be additional scenarios added without a motion amendment. Chief Luna indicated that Ms. Levering can amend her motion if she chooses, or someone else can motion for another scenario choice. No other motions were presented. All were not in favor, with Ms. Echeverria indicating she was not in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

Chief Luna inquired if there are other scenarios that other Committee members would like to continue to discuss, and if so, to please put forth as a motion. Dr. Freeman motioned to keep the scenarios that start with a base allocation of .75% which includes scenarios #7, #10, #15, and #19. A second was provided by Jeremy Hynds. Carolyn Levering clarified if these scenarios will be included in addition to those in the first motion, and that is the case. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously. Chief Luna went over each scenario incorporated in the recent motions to include #'s 5,6,7,10,13,15, and 19.

Kelly Echeverria motioned to also include scenarios #17 and #18 as the lowest impact scenarios, with Deputy Chief Fogerson seconding the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

Chief Luna spoke to the scenarios now encompassed in the multiple motions put forth, with a comparison noted below:

Scenario #'s 5, 6 and 13 are similar county-only scenarios with base allocations and no tier-based allocation, and impact reductions in similar jurisdictions. Scenario #6 has a 1.0% base allocation to counties only, and out of the three scenarios, impacts the least number of jurisdictions (six jurisdictions at \$91,000). If looking at county only, Chief Luna inquired on the Committees preference for taking the least number of jurisdictions and overall least amount of reductions in Scenario #6.

Scenario #7 is a base allocation to all cities and counties at .75% and has lower reduction totals of approx. \$49,000 impacting seven jurisdictions. Kelly Echeverria confirmed that Scenario #7 is the same as the federal model. Chief Luna indicated that scenarios #7 and #13 would have to be considered if looking at that model, and whether to give allocations to counties only or cities and counties both. There is a Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 414.090 provision requiring each county establish an emergency management program. There is not a clean path to any of the scenarios, but the path is close with #7 and #13. Dr. Freeman indicated that the jurisdictions getting hit hard have strong viable programs. Carolyn Levering indicated a preference for scenario #7, but has concerns about Carson City as the State Capitol, and the argument can be made that the State Capitol receives special consideration and there could be a way to reduce the impact to Carson City as a result.

Chief Luna spoke to making considerable progress today, and he will take this feedback and come back with the scenarios motioned today to drill down further, and to explore Carson City's reduction mitigation. If a recommendation is not made next month, because of the timing of the grant application, the State will have to decide based on the information discussed. Chief Luna thanked the Committee for their input and time committed to this issue. Carolyn Levering wanted clarification on the specific scenarios that are included for further consideration. Chief Luna indicated that those scenarios are #'s 5,6,7,10,13,15,17,18 and 19.

7. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened discussion for the second period of public comment. No public comment was presented.

8. Adjourn

Chief Luna called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion to adjourn was provided by Jeremy Hynds, and a second was provided by Mike Heidemann. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.

	A		Percent	Percent		Percent		Percent
	April 1 2000	JULY 1 2000	Cnange 4/00 - 7/01	Cnange 7/00 - 7/01	JULY 1 2001	Cnange 7/01 - 7/02	JULY 1 2002	Change 7/02 - 7/03
State of Nevada	1,998,257	2,066,831	6.7%	3.2%	2,132,498	3.4%	2,206,022	4.1%
Counties		-						
Cities								
Towns								
Carson City	52,457	53,095	3.3%	2.0%	54,171	1.2%	54,844	0.7%
		a a a (=	• • • • •	–			0 - ((0	.
Churchill County	23,982	26,247	3.9%	-5.0%	24,928	0.8%	25,116	2.8%
Fallon	7,536	8,386	8.3%	-2.7%	8,162	0.2%	8,178	1.5%
Clark County	1,375,765	1,425,723	8.0%	4.2%	1,485,855	4.3%	1,549,657	4.6%
Boulder City	14,966	15,519	-1.4%	-4.9%	14,760	0.6%	14,842	0.6%
Henderson	175,381	198,691	12.2%	-1.0%	196,780	6.5%	209,486	3.8%
Las Vegas	478,434	483,448	5.2%	4.1%	503,188	2.3%	514,640	2.7%
Mesquite	9,389	15,605	27.2%	-23.5%	11,940	10.7%	13,216	5.1%
North Las Vegas	115,488	124,936	10.7%	2.4%	127,897	6.3%	135,967	7.4%
Bunkerville	877	909	30.8%	26.2%	1,147	2.9%	1,180	-1.3%
Enterprise	21,138	21,905	60.9%	55.3%	34,017	35.8%	46,193	34.2%
Indian Springs	1,339	1,387	9.9%	6.1%	1,471	5.8%	1,557	4.0%
Laughlin	7,800	8,083	-20.8%	-23.5%	6,181	3.6%	6,403	8.6%
Моара	711	736	30.1%	25.5%	925	16.3%	1,076	26.8%
Moapa Valley	8,770	9,088	-35.3%	-37.6%	5,672	10.7%	6,277	0.7%
Mt. Charleston	885	917	-10.5%	-13.6%	792	7.7%	853	2.3%
Paradise	166,260	172,297	11.2%	7.3%	184,870	1.6%	187,746	-1.3%
Searchlight	741	767	-0.7%	-4.2%	735	11.7%	822	30.6%
Spring Valley	125,607	130,168	6.3%	2.5%	133,469	4.4%	139,290	8.0%
Summerlin	4,675	4,845	64.9%	59.1%	7,708	58.8%	12,239	33.2%
Sunrise Manor	154,616	160,231	11.4%	7.5%	172,237	2.5%	176,587	2.7%
Whitney	14,422	14,946	17.2%	13.1%	16,899	12.3%	18,979	8.8%
Winchester	29,658	30,735	17.2%	13.1%	34,767	-2.2%	33,994	1.1%

		Percent		Percent	nt Percent			Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1
	2003	7/03 - 7/04	2004	7/04 - 7/05	2005	7/05 - 7/06	2006	7/06 - 7/07	2007
State of Nevada	2,296,566	5.0%	2,410,768	4.5%	2,518,869	4.1%	2,623,050	3.6%	2,718,337
Counties									
Cities									
Towns			-		_	-			_
Carson City	55,220	1.7%	56,146	1.7%	57,104	1.0%	57,701	0.0%	57,723
			•						
Churchill County	25,808	1.2%	26,106	1.8%	26,585	3.0%	27,371	-0.7%	27,190
Fallon	8,301	1.2%	8,398	-0.7%	8,339	-0.5%	8,299	1.8%	8,452
Clark County	1,620,748	5.8%	1,715,337	4.7%	1,796,380	4.4%	1,874,837	4.2%	1,954,319
Boulder City	14,934	0.8%	15,058	1.0%	15,203	1.8%	15,478	2.5%	15,863
Henderson	217,448	5.8%	229,984	4.8%	241,134	4.2%	251,321	3.5%	260,161
Las Vegas	528,617	4.0%	549,571	3.7%	569,838	1.8%	579,840	1.8%	590,321
Mesquite	13,895	14.3%	15,881	3.4%	16,423	7.5%	17,656	6.4%	18,787
North Las Vegas	146,005	13.0%	164,971	9.2%	180,219	10.2%	198,516	6.0%	210,472
Bunkerville	1,165	1.7%	1,185	1.1%	1,198	-1.6%	1,179	6.5%	1,255
Enterprise	62,001	27.9%	79,299	20.3%	95,377	24.9%	119,100	20.8%	143,917
Indian Springs	1,619	2.6%	1,661	1.1%	1,679	13.6%	1,907	-13.0%	1,659
Laughlin	6,952	16.6%	8,105	1.5%	8,226	2.8%	8,458	4.1%	8,807
Моара	1,364	-12.0%	1,200	5.1%	1,261	-20.5%	1,003	19.7%	1,201
Moapa Valley	6,323	3.6%	6,549	2.7%	6,726	1.8%	6,845	18.1%	8,085
Mt. Charleston	873	2.4%	894	-1.7%	879	-8.3%	806	46.4%	1,179
Paradise	185,304	1.9%	188,768	1.5%	191,650	-2.8%	186,370	-0.2%	185,935
Searchlight	1,073	3.1%	1,106	-1.6%	1,088	-29.8%	764	4.4%	798
Spring Valley	150,402	7.2%	161,286	2.5%	165,335	4.1%	172,110	2.7%	176,815
Summerlin	16,300	9.5%	17,841	13.5%	20,256	7.1%	21,692	21.8%	26,415
Sunrise Manor	181,354	1.9%	184,801	0.9%	186,511	2.9%	191,858	0.1%	191,966
Whitney	20,640	5.3%	21,738	24.9%	27,155	22.1%	33,144	9.2%	36,182
Winchester	34,378	-1.3%	33,917	3.8%	35,208	-0.9%	34,874	7.7%	37,561

	Percent		Percent		Percent			Percent	Percent
	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	April 1	JULY 1	Change	Change
	7/07 - 7/08	2008	7/08 - 7/09	2009	7/09 - 7/10	2010	2010	4/10 - 7/11	7/10 - 7/11
State of Nevada	0.8%	2,738,733	-1.0%	2,711,206	0.5%	2,700,551	2,724,634	0.8%	-0.1%
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Carson City	-0.2%	57,600	-1.9%	56,506	-1.2%	55,274	55,850	1.4%	0.4%
Churchill County	-0.8%	26,981	-0.5%	26,859	-1.9%	24,877	26,360	1.0%	-4.6%
Fallon	9.5%	9,258	-1.6%	9,113	-2.3%	8,606	8,903	0.0%	-3.3%
Clark County	0.7%	1.967.716	-0.8%	1.952.040	0.9%	1.951.269	1.968.831	0.8%	-0.1%
Boulder City	5.2%	16.684	-3.7%	16.064	-4.4%	15.023	15.359	2.1%	-0.2%
Henderson	3.6%	269,538	-0.7%	267,687	-0.2%	257,729	267,270	2.8%	-0.9%
Las Vegas	0.5%	593,528	-0.4%	591,422	-0.8%	583,756	586,536	0.8%	0.3%
Mesquite	5.1%	19,754	4.7%	20,677	-1.1%	15,276	20,440	11.5%	-16.6%
North Las Vegas	2.0%	214,661	0.2%	215,022	1.1%	216,961	217,482	3.2%	2.9%
Bunkerville	-7.6%	1,160	5.3%	1,222	2.7%	1,256	1,255	-4.5%	-4.5%
Enterprise	4.0%	149,713	0.5%	150,473	9.8%	165,435	165,285	-2.9%	-2.8%
Indian Springs	-10.3%	1,488	-2.8%	1,447	-6.3%	1,357	1,356	-13.9%	-13.8%
Laughlin	-0.5%	8,761	-9.7%	7,914	-0.6%	7,874	7,867	-9.0%	-8.9%
Моара	-16.9%	998	5.4%	1,052	0.8%	1,061	1,060	31.0%	31.1%
Moapa Valley	-11.8%	7,134	1.9%	7,269	3.1%	7,503	7,496	1.9%	2.0%
Mt. Charleston	-5.2%	1,118	-5.0%	1,061	0.6%	1,069	1,068	-38.7%	-38.7%
Paradise	-2.0%	182,264	-1.8%	178,974	3.5%	185,472	185,304	-2.1%	-2.0%
Searchlight	-6.1%	750	-4.2%	718	3.4%	744	743	-23.2%	-23.1%
Spring Valley	0.1%	176,910	-1.4%	174,458	1.3%	176,872	176,712	-2.5%	-2.4%
Summerlin	6.0%	27,992	1.2%	28,342	4.7%	29,694	29,667	-15.3%	-15.3%
Sunrise Manor	-3.2%	185,745	-3.2%	179,808	-2.6%	175,365	175,206	8.9%	9.0%
Whitney	0.0%	36,164	4.2%	37,690	-0.2%	37,637	37,603	3.9%	4.0%
Winchester	-1.1%	37,141	-5.1%	35,235	-0.3%	35,174	35,142	-5.2%	-5.2%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1						
	2011	7/11 - 7/12	2012	7/12 - 7/13	2013	7/13 - 7/14	2014	7/14 - 7/15	2015
State of Nevada	2,721,794	1.0%	2,750,217	1.8%	2,800,967	1.5%	2,843,301	1.9%	2,897,584
Counties									
Cities									
Towns			_		-				-
Carson City	56,066	-1.1%	55,441	-1.4%	54,668	-1.3%	53,969	0.6%	54,273
	0 - (00)			a aa/l		0.00/	07 (00	.	0 - 100
Churchill County	25,136	0.4%	25,238	0.3%	25,322	-0.9%	25,103	0.1%	25,126
Fallon	8,609	1.1%	8,706	0.0%	8,706	-0.7%	8,645	1.4%	8,770
Clark County	1 967 722	1.0%	1 988 195	2.2%	2 031 723	1 9%	2 069 450	2.4%	2 118 353
Boulder City	15 335	2.8%	15 759	-0.8%	15 635	0.0%	2,005,400	1.2%	15 813
Henderson	264 839	0.8%	266 846	2.8%	274 270	2.0%	280 928	2.5%	287 828
l as Venas	588 274	0.0%	589 156	1.6%	598 520	2.4%	610 637	1.7%	620,935
Mesquite	17 038	-1.5%	16 778	4.2%	17 477	4.5%	18 262	4 4%	19 061
North Las Vegas	223.873	-0.8%	222.009	1.9%	226.199	1.9%	230.491	2.1%	235.395
Bunkerville	1.199	-9.6%	1.084	-1.5%	1.067	-2.7%	1.039	5.7%	1.097
Enterprise	160,632	1.4%	162,872	4.8%	170,699	2.0%	174,064	5.6%	183,755
Indian Springs	1,169	2.0%	1,192	0.9%	1,203	1.4%	1,220	1.2%	1,235
Laughlin	7,166	17.4%	8,414	5.0%	8,835	1.4%	8,963	2.5%	9,186
Моара	1,390	-21.8%	1,086	0.7%	1,094	23.6%	1,352	0.8%	1,363
Moapa Valley	7,647	-10.2%	6,868	0.0%	6,871	-0.3%	6,851	0.3%	6,875
Mt. Charleston	655	-1.3%	647	0.7%	651	-2.5%	635	2.9%	653
Paradise	181,635	1.7%	184,745	1.7%	187,949	1.6%	191,047	0.9%	192,810
Searchlight	571	-30.7%	395	0.3%	397	-13.2%	344	0.8%	347
Spring Valley	172,483	7.2%	184,910	2.1%	188,818	1.3%	191,342	3.5%	197,958
Summerlin	25,141	0.5%	25,260	6.3%	26,855	1.4%	27,244	3.9%	28,300
Sunrise Manor	191,007	2.9%	196,570	1.6%	199,754	1.5%	202,710	2.0%	206,720
Whitney	39,122	-0.5%	38,910	2.4%	39,857	1.8%	40,567	2.7%	41,662
Winchester	33,329	-5.1%	31,634	1.0%	31,960	1.4%	32,413	1.1%	32,770

	Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	Change	JULY 1						
	7/15 - 7/16	2016	7/16 - 7/17	2017	7/17 - 7/18	2018	7/17 - 7/18	2019
State of Nevada	1.9%	2,953,375	1.1%	2,986,656	2.4%	3,057,582	1.8%	3,112,937
Counties								
Cities								
Towns								
Carson City	1.7%	55,182	0.5%	55,438	1.1%	56,057	0.2%	56,151
								1
Churchill County	0.6%	25,266	0.5%	25,387	1.0%	25,628	0.8%	25,832
Fallon	1.2%	8,874	1.8%	9,030	1.1%	9,125	0.6%	9,184
Clark County		0 400 404	4.00/	0 400 040	2.00/	0.054.475	4.00/	0 000 004
	2.3%	2,166,181	1.3%	2,193,818	2.0%	2,251,175	1.9%	2,293,391
Boulder City	3.1%	16,298	-1.1%	16,121	-1.4%	15,887	1.9%	16,188
Henderson	2.3%	294,359	2.2%	300,709	3.2%	310,244	2.4%	317,660
Las vegas	1.4%	629,649	0.5%	633,028	1.8%	644,113	1.4%	653,350
Mesquite	4.9%	19,991	4.2%	20,838	8.2%	22,557	5.6%	23,827
North Las Vegas	2.3%	240,708	1.1%	243,339	2.2%	248,701	2.7%	255,327
Bunkerville	-0.1%	1,096	-5.0%	1,042	0.7%	1,049	1.0%	1,060
Enterprise	2.6%	188,503	2.7%	193,572	6.6%	206,266	2.7%	211,761
Indian Springs	1.9%	1,259	0.4%	1,264	-10.0%	1,138	12.8%	1,283
Laughlin	2.1%	9,380	3.1%	9,672	3.6%	10,017	-0.2%	10,001
Моара	0.6%	1,370	-25.1%	1,026	39.6%	1,433	-0.1%	1,430
Moapa Valley	1.3%	6,967	2.1%	7,115	1.6%	7,231	1.9%	7,368
Mt. Charleston	1.8%	665	0.2%	666	2.4%	682	2.6%	700
Paradise	-0.6%	191,705	1.0%	193,712	1.5%	196,586	2.1%	200,698
Searchlight	2.6%	356	2.0%	364	1.0%	367	4.0%	382
Spring Valley	6.7%	211,232	2.4%	216,228	3.7%	224,158	1.1%	226,723
Summerlin	6.1%	30,013	1.6%	30,492	4.6%	31,894	1.0%	32,199
Sunrise Manor	1.6%	209,932	0.1%	210,216	1.5%	213,341	1.3%	216,021
Whitney	5.9%	44,110	0.8%	44,449	2.2%	45,419	2.0%	46,328
Winchester	0.6%	32,972	0.3%	33,065	1.0%	33,402	2.1%	34,095

			Percent	Percent		Percent		Percent
	April 1 2000	JULY 1 2000	Change 4/00 - 7/01	Change 7/00 - 7/01	JULY 1 2001	Change 7/01 - 7/02	JULY 1 2002	Change 7/02 - 7/03
State of Nevada	1,998,257	2,066,831	6.7%	3.2%	2,132,498	3.4%	2,206,022	4.1%
Counties								
Cities								
Towns								
Douglos County	41.250	12 101	E 20/	0.00/	12 150	1 00/	44 212	2 10/
Cordnorwillo	41,209	43,101	0.3%	0.0%	43,450	1.0% 5.6%	44,212	5.1%
Gardnerville	3,377	3,320	14.0%	9.2%	3,001	0.0% 1.00/	4,065	0.2%
Genoa	230	240	-4.5%	-0.0%	224	1.3%	221	1.0%
Minden	2,097	2,010	0.1%	1.3%	2,001	-1.1%	2,030	1.4%
Elko County	45,291	50,756	3.0%	-8.1%	46,668	-0.2%	46,577	-1.7%
Carlin	2,161	2,395	2.5%	-7.5%	2,215	-6.4%	2,074	-1.4%
Elko	16,708	18,642	2.3%	-8.3%	17,093	-2.4%	16,690	-2.0%
Wells	1,346	1,563	-11.5%	-23.8%	1,191	16.6%	1,389	-1.1%
West Wendover	4,721	3,867	-2.3%	19.3%	4,614	4.9%	4,839	-2.2%
Jackpot	1,178	1,310	9.3%	-1.7%	1,287	0.1%	1,288	-1.3%
Montello	191	216	-5.1%	-16.3%	181	0.0%	181	0.0%
Mountain City	135	150	-2.6%	-12.4%	132	-4.0%	127	-1.6%
Esmeralda County	971	1.513	6.9%	-31.4%	1.038	8.4%	1.125	-0.8%
Goldfield	369	574	35.0%	-13.4%	498	-11.9%	438	0.2%
Silver Peak	148	230	9.8%	-29.6%	162	-20.9%	128	-3.5%
Euroka County	1 651	1 8/7	_8 8%	-18 5%	1 506	-8 1%	1 38/	2.6%
Croscopt Vallov	1,001	1,047	-0.0%	-10.3%	1,500	-0.1/0	1,304	2.0 /0
Euroka (town)	330	509	-9.7 /0	-19.3%	290	-0.3 /0	219	7.4/0
Euleka (lowii)	499	000	-0.6%	-13.6%	470	-7.0%	434	2.9%
Humboldt County	16,106	18,149	0.4%	-10.9%	<u>16,1</u> 64	0.9%	16,308	0.9%
Winnemucca	7,174	8,884	-2.4%	-21.2%	7,001	3.3%	7,234	0.6%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1						
	2003	7/03 - 7/04	2004	7/04 - 7/05	2005	7/05 - 7/06	2006	7/06 - 7/07	2007
State of Nevada	2,296,566	5.0%	2,410,768	4.5%	2,518,869	4.1%	2,623,050	3.6%	2,718,337
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Douglas County	45,603	4.8%	47,803	4.8%	50,108	3.3%	51,770	1.2%	52,386
Gardnerville	4,316	17.4%	5,067	1.9%	5,165	7.4%	5,550	-2.8%	5,394
Genoa	229	6.6%	244	1.4%	248	1.6%	252	0.2%	252
Minden	2,870	2.6%	2,945	1.3%	2,983	8.4%	3,234	0.2%	3,239
Elko County	45,805	1.5%	46,499	2.3%	47,586	1.6%	48,339	4.3%	50,434
Carlin	2,045	9.6%	2,240	1.0%	2,261	0.9%	2,281	0.6%	2,295
Elko	16,354	4.8%	17,140	4.1%	17,850	1.9%	18,183	1.3%	18,427
Wells	1,373	2.4%	1,406	1.2%	1,423	1.9%	1,449	4.0%	1,508
West Wendover	4,732	2.1%	4,830	0.4%	4,848	0.5%	4,871	1.8%	4,958
Jackpot	1,271	0.8%	1,281	-0.6%	1,273	1.6%	1,293	-5.9%	1,217
Montello	181	-1.1%	179	1.2%	181	-3.7%	175	-5.7%	165
Mountain City	125	-1.3%	123	-1.8%	121	3.1%	125	3.5%	129
						-			
Esmeralda County	1,116	5.3%	1,176	8.5%	1,276	-1.1%	1,262	-2.1%	1,236
Goldfield	439	3.1%	453	-3.3%	438	-1.7%	430	4.2%	448
Silver Peak	124	2.4%	127	-0.9%	126	-7.1%	117	6.9%	125
	-					-			
Eureka County	1,420	4.4%	1,484	0.1%	1,485	-1.7%	1,460	-0.1%	1,458
Crescent Valley	300	1.4%	304	2.2%	311	-5.9%	292	-1.2%	289
Eureka (town)	446	1.7%	454	-2.9%	440	-1.7%	433	-0.4%	431
	-	•		•		•		•	
Humboldt County	16,457	1.4%	16,692	3.6%	17,293	2.6%	17,751	1.7%	18,052
Winnemucca	7,280	-0.4%	7,249	2.1%	7,401	3.3%	7,643	0.0%	7,646

	Percent		Percent		Percent			Percent	Percent
	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	April 1	JULY 1	Change	Change
	7/07 - 7/08	2008	7/08 - 7/09	2009	7/09 - 7/10	2010	2010	4/10 - 7/11	7/10 - 7/11
State of Nevada	0.8%	2,738,733	-1.0%	2,711,206	0.5%	2,700,551	2,724,634	0.8%	-0.1%
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Douglas County	-0.5%	52,131	-1.4%	51,390	-4.2%	46,997	49,242	1.4%	-3.2%
Gardnerville	0.3%	5,412	-3.0%	5,250	-5.1%	4,756	4,983	15.0%	9.8%
Genoa	1.3%	255	0.2%	256	-4.7%	233	244	-7.2%	-11.5%
Minden	0.7%	3,261	-1.0%	3,229	-0.5%	3,067	3,213	-2.7%	-7.1%
Elko County	0.3%	50,561	1.5%	51,325	1.5%	48,818	52,097	2.1%	-4.3%
Carlin	1.2%	2,322	1.0%	2,345	1.1%	2,368	2,370	0.3%	0.3%
Elko	0.0%	18,424	0.0%	18,428	2.2%	18,297	18,842	5.0%	1.9%
Wells	1.1%	1,524	-0.6%	1,515	1.1%	1,292	1,531	-9.1%	-23.3%
West Wendover	0.6%	4,990	-0.9%	4,945	1.1%	4,410	4,999	1.4%	-10.6%
Jackpot	0.4%	1,222	-3.1%	1,184	1.1%	1,103	1,197	-12.7%	-19.5%
Montello	0.4%	165	1.3%	167	1.0%	156	169	-49.3%	-53.3%
Mountain City	0.9%	130	-7.0%	121	0.9%	112	122	-9.3%	-16.4%
Esmeralda County	0.3%	1,240	-4.3%	1,187	-3.5%	783	1,145	5.4%	-27.9%
Goldfield	-7.5%	415	6.4%	441	-9.4%	274	400	5.3%	-28.0%
Silver Peak	45.9%	182	-22.7%	141	-8.3%	88	129	32.6%	-9.3%
Eureka County	6.5%	1,553	0.6%	1,562	3.0%	1,987	1,609	0.4%	23.9%
Crescent Valley	-2.2%	283	0.2%	283	4.5%	366	296	8.3%	33.8%
Eureka (town)	9.6%	473	2.1%	483	3.3%	616	499	-0.8%	22.4%
Humboldt County	-0.2%	18,014	-1.8%	17,690	3.8%	16,528	18,364	3.7%	-6.7%
Winnemucca	0.2%	7,659	-0.9%	7,593	4.8%	7,396	7,961	6.0%	-1.5%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1
	2011	7/11 - 7/12	2012	7/12 - 7/13	2013	7/13 - 7/14	2014	7/14 - 7/15	2015
State of Nevada	2,721,794	1.0%	2,750,217	1.8%	2,800,967	1.5%	2,843,301	1.9%	2,897,584
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Douglas County	47,661	0.7%	48,015	1.0%	48,478	0.2%	48,553	-0.7%	48,223
Gardnerville	5,469	0.5%	5,495	0.8%	5,541	4.0%	5,760	-0.2%	5,751
Genoa	216	1.3%	219	0.6%	220	-1.5%	217	-1.1%	215
Minden	2,984	0.9%	3,010	-0.6%	2,993	2.7%	3,072	0.0%	3,072
		ار مع ما		I					/
Elko County	49,861	3.8%	51,771	3.1%	53,384	0.0%	53,358	0.4%	53,551
Carlin	2,376	0.0%	2,376	20.0%	2,851	-4.2%	2,731	-0.1%	2,727
Elko	19,209	6.2%	20,406	2.7%	20,958	-0.4%	20,865	-0.7%	20,714
Wells	1,174	9.0%	1,280	2.1%	1,307	8.0%	1,411	-2.8%	1,371
West Wendover	4,470	-2.3%	4,367	2.0%	4,453	-0.7%	4,420	1.3%	4,478
Jackpot	963	-5.1%	914	1.0%	923	-1.8%	907	-1.0%	898
Montello	79	-23.5%	60	-0.3%	60	-6.3%	56	-0.9%	56
Mountain City	102	7.4%	110	-0.7%	109	-1.6%	107	-7.0%	100
Esmoralda County	925	1 20/	860	0.20/	959	7 0%	0.26	0.40/	022
Coldfield	020	4.3 /0	250	-0.2 /0	202	7.9%	920	-0.4 /0	923
Silver Book	200	-9.970	209	12.070	293	-1.2/0	129	-3.7 %	202
Silver Feak	117	9.4 /0	120	5.4 /0	132	-3.2 /0	120	4.0 /0	155
Eureka County	1,994	0.8%	2,011	0.7%	2,024	-6.0%	1,903	-2.2%	1,862
Crescent Valley	396	-6.5%	370	0.2%	371	0.8%	374	0.0%	374
Eureka (town)	611	17.3%	717	0.4%	720	-3.9%	691	0.8%	697
Humboldt County	17 135	1 5%	17 38/	0.4%	17 457	-0.4%	17 388	- 1 0%	17 057
Winnemucca	7 830	2.0%	7 907	2.4%	8 185	-0. 4 /0	8 042	-1.3%	7 802
WINITEINULLA	7,009	2.0 /0	1,591	2.4/0	0,100	-1.0 /0	0,042	-3.0 /0	7,002

	Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	Change	JULY 1						
	7/15 - 7/16	2016	7/16 - 7/17	2017	7/17 - 7/18	2018	7/17 - 7/18	2019
State of Nevada	1.9%	2,953,375	1.1%	2,986,656	2.4%	3,057,582	1.8%	3,112,937
Counties	•		•					
Cities								
Towns								
			_					
Douglas County	0.0%	48,235	0.1%	48,300	1.6%	49,070	1.0%	49,537
Gardnerville	0.5%	5,780	-1.5%	5,693	3.2%	5,874	2.8%	6,036
Genoa	-0.5%	213	0.0%	213	2.5%	219	0.8%	220
Minden	1.2%	3,110	2.6%	3,191	2.5%	3,270	0.7%	3,293
Elko County	0.8%	53.997	-1.3%	53.287	1.9%	54.326	1.5%	55.116
Carlin	-1.6%	2,684	-2.5%	2,617	-0.2%	2,613	1.9%	2,663
Elko	0.0%	20,704	0.4%	20,789	1.8%	21,158	0.2%	21,199
Wells	1.3%	1,388	-5.5%	1,312	4.0%	1,365	0.1%	1,366
West Wendover	-0.1%	4,474	-6.1%	4,201	4.9%	4,406	1.4%	4,469
Jackpot	0.0%	897	-4.2%	860	0.6%	865	13.0%	978
Montello	11.6%	62	0.6%	63	0.2%	63	1.0%	64
Mountain City	-4.1%	95	-8.4%	87	-15.4%	74	9.0%	81
Esmeralda County	4 5%	964	0.6%	970	-0.1%	969	1 4%	982
Goldfield	-0.6%	260	1.2%	263	4.4%	274	2.8%	282
Silver Peak	-7.6%	123	-1.1%	122	-17.2%	101	-0.5%	100
Function Country	5.00/	4 050	4 40/	1 000	1.00/	4 054	0.00/	4.055
Eureka County	5.2%	1,959	-1.4%	1,932	1.0%	1,951	0.2%	1,955
	-0.5%	372	2.0%	380	-3.2%	307	3.7%	381
Eureka (town)	5.1%	732	-4.3%	701	4.8%	734	-2.4%	(17
Humboldt County	-1.2%	16,853	0.7%	16,978	0.1%	16,989	0.5%	17,079
Winnemucca	-0.4%	7,772	2.3%	7,947	-1.1%	7,856	0.6%	7,903

			Percent	Percent		Percent		Percent
	April 1	JULY 1	Change	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change
	2000	2000	4/00 - 7/01	7/00 - 7/01	2001	7/01 - 7/02	2002	7/02 - 7/03
State of Nevada	1,998,257	2,066,831	6.7%	3.2%	2,132,498	3.4%	2,206,022	4.1%
Counties								
Cities								
Towns								
Lander County	5,794	6,822	-0.6%	-15.5%	5,761	-3.7%	5,547	-4.9%
Austin	305	359	2.3%	-13.1%	312	-5.5%	295	-8.0%
Battle Mountain	3,453	4,066	-11.5%	-24.8%	3,056	-9.3%	2,770	-5.3%
Kingston	219	258	25.6%	6.7%	275	-6.9%	256	5.7%
Lincoln County	4,165	4,420	-7.3%	-12.7%	3,861	0.5%	3,879	-3.3%
Caliente	1,123	1,132	13.6%	12.7%	1,276	-17.0%	1,058	11.8%
Alamo	478	507	-23.2%	-27.7%	367	20.6%	442	-3.1%
Panaca	632	671	-12.8%	-17.8%	552	2.2%	564	-4.0%
Pioche	840	892	-25.3%	-29.6%	628	8.3%	680	-3.0%
Lyon County	34,501	37,393	8.2%	-0.2%	37,329	3.9%	38,777	6.4%
Fernley	8,830	9,570	7.9%	-0.4%	9,529	9.6%	10,440	12.2%
Yerington	2,883	3,210	0.2%	-10.0%	2,889	-1.0%	2,859	1.5%
Mineral County	5,071	6,270	-6.5%	-24.3%	4,743	-1.0%	4,695	-0.2%
Hawthorne	3,134	3,875	-3.8%	-22.2%	3,013	-0.6%	2,995	0.0%
Luning	86	106	3.8%	-16.1%	. 89	4.4%	93	-1.3%
Mina	307	380	-1.8%	-20.6%	302	-5.7%	284	-2.2%
Walker Lake	333	412	-1.0%	-19.9%	330	-1.5%	325	-2.1%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1						
	2003	7/03 - 7/04	2004	7/04 - 7/05	2005	7/05 - 7/06	2006	7/06 - 7/07	2007
State of Nevada	2,296,566	5.0%	2,410,768	4.5%	2,518,869	4.1%	2,623,050	3.6%	2,718,337
Counties		-		-				-	
Cities									
Towns									
Lander County	5,277	1.5%	5,357	2.8%	5,509	2.7%	5,655	1.6%	5,747
Austin	271	8.1%	293	-1.6%	288	-0.3%	287	-4.4%	275
Battle Mountain	2,623	0.9%	2,645	1.8%	2,692	1.8%	2,740	3.8%	2,845
Kingston	271	-11.7%	239	20.5%	288	6.3%	306	1.0%	309
Lincoln County	3,749	1.9%	3,822	1.7%	3,886	2.6%	3,987	5.0%	4,184
Caliente	1,184	-14.4%	1,014	0.2%	1,015	-1.4%	1,002	8.7%	1,089
Alamo	428	3.1%	441	-2.9%	428	0.7%	432	-1.0%	427
Panaca	541	2.1%	552	1.8%	562	-0.7%	558	6.7%	595
Pioche	659	1.5%	669	4.3%	698	0.7%	703	12.6%	791
Lyon County	41,244	8.2%	44,646	9.4%	48,860	10.6%	54,031	3.5%	55,903
Fernley	11,718	17.6%	13,775	18.7%	16,357	15.2%	18,850	3.9%	19,585
Yerington	2,902	0.3%	2,912	2.3%	2,980	9.3%	3,257	1.9%	3,319
Mineral County	4,687	-0.3%	4,673	-0.9%	4,629	-5.0%	4,399	-0.5%	4,377
Hawthorne	2,995	-0.9%	2,968	-0.4%	2,956	-0.9%	2,931	1.0%	2,960
Luning	91	5.6%	97	-9.5%	87	-7.0%	81	-2.4%	79
Mina	278	6.8%	297	-7.0%	276	-21.2%	218	-5.9%	205
Walker Lake	318	0.0%	318	-2.5%	310	2.9%	319	-6.2%	299

	Percent		Percent		Percent			Percent	Percent
	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	April 1	JULY 1	Change	Change
	//07 - //08	2008	//08 - //09	2009	//09 - //10	2010	2010	4/10 - //11	//10 - //11
State of Nevada	0.8%	2,738,733	-1.0%	2,711,206	0.5%	2,700,551	2,724,634	0.8%	-0.1%
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Lander County	2.5%	5,891	1.9%	6,003	-0.2%	5,775	5,992	3.7%	-0.1%
Austin	12.4%	309	-1.7%	304	2.8%	301	312	-43.1%	-45.2%
Battle Mountain	2.7%	2,922	1.5%	2,967	-1.5%	2,816	2,922	18.1%	13.8%
Kingston	3.5%	320	3.3%	331	-0.8%	316	328	-60.5%	-61.9%
Lincoln County	4.0%	4,352	-0.8%	4,317	7.3%	5,345	4,631	-1.1%	14.1%
Caliente	-1.1%	1,077	2.7%	1,106	3.5%	1,130	1,144	-7.3%	-8.5%
Alamo	8.5%	464	-1.9%	455	10.6%	608	503	3.1%	24.7%
Panaca	8.4%	645	2.1%	659	-5.0%	757	626	3.2%	24.8%
Pioche	-0.7%	785	6.6%	837	0.3%	1,014	839	-8.0%	11.2%
Lyon County	-0.1%	55,820	-3.6%	53,825	-2.8%	51,980	52,334	0.9%	0.2%
Fernley	0.1%	19,609	-3.5%	18,929	-2.6%	19,368	18,434	-2.4%	2.5%
Yerington	0.2%	3,324	-5.6%	3,138	-3.3%	3,048	3,034	3.8%	4.3%
Mineral County	0.6%	4,401	1.7%	4,474	-0.1%	4,772	4,471	-3.6%	2.9%
Hawthorne	0.3%	2,970	1.9%	3,028	5.5%	3,409	3,194	-11.8%	-5.8%
Luning	0.6%	80	-1.4%	79	-0.8%	83	78	5.7%	12.8%
Mina	1.4%	207	-0.2%	207	-14.1%	190	178	-32.1%	-27.5%
Walker Lake	1.8%	305	3.8%	316	0.6%	339	318	-9.5%	-3.5%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1
	2011	7/11 - 7/12	2012	7/12 - 7/13	2013	7/13 - 7/14	2014	7/14 - 7/15	2015
State of Nevada	2,721,794	1.0%	2,750,217	1.8%	2,800,967	1.5%	2,843,301	1.9%	2,897,584
Counties		-		-					
Cities									
Towns									
Lander County	5,988	3.9%	6.221	2.0%	6.343	3.4%	6.560	-4.8%	6.247
Austin	171	1.0%	173	-2.2%	169	0.7%	170	-2.6%	166
Battle Mountain	3.326	2.9%	3.421	6.9%	3.657	4.0%	3.804	-6.1%	3.573
Kingston	125	-0.9%	124	0.1%	124	2.9%	128	-5.9%	120
C C		I		ľ					
Lincoln County	5,284	-3.5%	5,100	-1.6%	5,020	-0.3%	5,004	1.7%	5,088
Caliente	1,047	4.0%	1,089	-1.9%	1,068	-1.1%	1,056	-0.7%	1,049
Alamo	627	-7.0%	583	0.0%	583	-0.9%	578	0.3%	580
Panaca	781	6.5%	832	-2.5%	811	-1.7%	797	-1.8%	783
Pioche	933	-13.2%	810	-2.5%	790	-0.7%	784	-5.1%	744
Lvon County	52.443	-0.4%	52.245	1.4%	52.960	0.7%	53.344	-0.1%	53.277
Fernley	18,896	-0.3%	18,831	0.8%	18,987	0.5%	19,077	-0.7%	18,936
Yerington	3,165	-2.3%	3,094	0.4%	3,106	-0.4%	3,095	3.1%	3,191
Mineral County	4 601	1 7%	4 679	-0.4%	4 662	-1 7%	4 584	-1.0%	4 539
Hawthorne	3,008	2.6%	3,075	-0.3%	3,002	-1 7%	3 023	0.4%	3 035
	88	12.3%	0,000 99	1.0%	100	-1.8%	98	3.1%	101
Mina	129	25.3%	162	0.9%	163	-1.6%	160	-4.9%	153
Walker Lake	307	13.7%	349	-0.7%	346	-5.0%	329	14.7%	378

	Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	Change	JULY 1						
	7/15 - 7/16	2016	7/16 - 7/17	2017	7/17 - 7/18	2018	7/17 - 7/18	2019
State of Nevada	1.9%	2,953,375	1.1%	2,986,656	2.4%	3,057,582	1.8%	3,112,937
Counties								
Cities								
Towns								
Lander County	0.2%	6,257	-0.9%	6,200	-2.2%	6,065	0.7%	6,109
Austin	0.3%	166	0.0%	166	0.2%	167	-6.2%	156
Battle Mountain	-0.4%	3,559	-2.4%	3,473	-2.5%	3,387	0.1%	3,391
Kingston	13.3%	136	-9.5%	123	-0.5%	123	-0.5%	122
Lincoln County	0.69/		2.20/	E 170	1 60/		0.00/	E 064
	-0.0%	5,057	2.2%	5,170	1.0%	5,255	0.2%	5,204
Callente	-1.7%	1,031	3.4%	1,066	1.6%	1,084	0.2%	1,086
Alamo	13.8%	660	2.0%	673	1.6%	684	0.2%	686
Panaca	1.9%	798	-0.2%	797	1.6%	810	0.2%	811
Pioche	3.9%	773	1.4%	784	1.6%	797	0.2%	798
Lyon County	0.7%	53,644	1.9%	54,657	1.6%	55,551	1.7%	56,497
Fernley	0.6%	19,042	1.4%	19,300	2.5%	19,790	3.1%	20,396
Yerington	-0.9%	3,162	1.3%	3,202	6.9%	3,424	-0.2%	3,418
Mineral County	0.9%	4 578	2 1%	4 674	0.3%	4 690	0.9%	4 730
Hawthorne	-5.5%	2 868	6.9%	3 066	0.0%	3 065	1.2%	3 100
Luning	22.1%	123	-15.2%	105	1.6%	106	0.9%	107
Mina	13.6%	173	-0.2%	173	0.7%	174	0.1%	174
Walker Lake	6.8%	403	-20.1%	322	1.6%	327	0.9%	330
			I I	I I				

	April 1 2000	JULY 1 2000	Percent Change 4/00 - 7/01	Percent Change 7/00 - 7/01	JULY 1 2001	Percent Change 7/01 - 7/02	JULY 1 2002	Percent Change 7/02 - 7/03
State of Nevada	1,998,257	2,066,831	6.7%	3.2%	2,132,498	3.4%	2,206,022	4.1%
Counties			•	•				-
Cities								
Towns								
Nye County	32,485	35,924	5.8%	-4.3%	34,384	1.9%	35,039	4.6%
Amargosa	1,165	1,271	0.0%	-8.4%	1,164	0.6%	1,171	-0.2%
Beatty	1,150	1,255	-4.0%	-12.0%	1,104	-1.3%	1,089	-0.9%
Gabbs	318	459	5.0%	-27.3%	334	-4.3%	320	-1.9%
Manhattan	123	135	-0.7%	-9.2%	123	-0.7%	122	10.7%
Pahrump	24,181	26,399	9.5%	0.3%	26,470	4.0%	27,527	4.8%
Round Mountain	1,036	1,131	-16.7%	-23.7%	864	-9.8%	779	0.7%
Tonopah	2,827	3,086	-1.7%	-9.9%	2,779	-12.9%	2,422	2.4%
Pershing County	6,693	7,458	2.7%	-7.8%	6,873	0.9%	6,937	0.4%
Lovelock	2,003	2,772	7.0%	-22.6%	2,144	5.7%	2,267	6.1%
Imlay	234	261	4.3%	-6.4%	244	-1.4%	241	-1.1%
Storey County	3,399	3,897	9.3%	-4.7%	3,714	-2.0%	3,639	2.7%
Gold Hill	169	194	5.2%	-8.2%	178	-3.3%	172	4.2%
Virginia City	892	1,023	2.1%	-10.9%	911	-3.1%	882	2.4%
Washoe County	339,486	333,566	4.1%	5.9%	353,271	1.7%	359,423	3.8%
Reno	180,480	182,818	3.5%	2.2%	186,883	0.5%	187,834	4.2%
Sparks	66,346	66,420	8.2%	8.0%	71,753	4.9%	75,255	4.2%
White Pine County	9,181	10,650	-4.3%	-17.5%	8,783	0.9%	8,863	-0.2%
Ely	4,041	5,118	-8.6%	-27.8%	3,695	5.2%	3,886	-1.5%
Lund	161	187	-9.3%	-21.8%	146	0.2%	146	0.5%
McGill	1,184	1,374	-10.6%	-22.9%	1,059	1.1%	1,071	-0.4%
Ruth	404	469	-9.5%	-22.0%	366	1.9%	373	-0.3%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1						
	2003	7/03 - 7/04	2004	7/04 - 7/05	2005	7/05 - 7/06	2006	7/06 - 7/07	2007
State of Nevada	2,296,566	5.0%	2,410,768	4.5%	2,518,869	4.1%	2,623,050	3.6%	2,718,337
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Nye County	36,651	4.2%	38,181	8.2%	41,302	8.5%	44,795	3.4%	46,308
Amargosa	1,169	3.6%	1,211	14.3%	1,383	3.7%	1,435	4.7%	1,503
Beatty	1,079	-9.1%	981	5.2%	1,032	-0.7%	1,025	3.3%	1,059
Gabbs	314	0.9%	316	-1.4%	312	0.4%	313	3.0%	322
Manhattan	135	-4.8%	128	-3.2%	124	-1.9%	122	14.5%	140
Pahrump	28,847	5.6%	30,465	9.1%	33,241	10.2%	36,645	3.5%	37,928
Round Mountain	784	-2.1%	767	-3.1%	744	5.9%	787	5.5%	831
Tonopah	2,481	-5.6%	2,341	11.3%	2,607	-0.3%	2,600	0.4%	2,610
Pershing County	6,967	-4.8%	6,631	1.6%	6,736	3.2%	6,955	1.7%	7,075
Lovelock	2,405	-1.0%	2,381	-0.8%	2,363	2.7%	2,427	1.6%	2,465
Imlay	238	-5.4%	225	-1.0%	223	2.5%	228	1.9%	233
Storey County	3,736	1.6%	3,797	5.7%	4,012	2.4%	4,110	4.4%	4,293
Gold Hill	180	5.4%	189	0.7%	191	6.3%	203	3.0%	209
Virginia City	904	-1.8%	887	5.7%	938	1.7%	954	5.9%	1,011
Washoe County	373,233	2.7%	383,453	3.5%	396,844	3.1%	409,085	2.2%	418,061
Reno	195,727	1.8%	199,249	3.8%	206,735	3.7%	214,371	2.9%	220,613
Sparks	78,435	4.1%	81,673	4.8%	85,618	2.6%	87,846	1.8%	89,449
White Pine County	8,842	1.4%	8,966	3.4%	9,275	2.9%	9,542	0.5%	9,590
Ely	3,829	3.5%	3,962	5.1%	4,166	3.8%	4,325	-0.7%	4,294
Lund	147	0.0%	147	6.1%	156	3.7%	162	1.5%	164
McGill	1,066	1.2%	1,079	2.8%	1,109	3.2%	1,145	-1.8%	1,125
Ruth	372	1.9%	379	3.9%	394	2.9%	405	-1.3%	400

	Percent		Percent		Percent			Percent	Percent
	Change	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1	Change	April 1	JULY 1	Change	Change
	7/07 - 7/08	2008	7/08 - 7/09	2009	7/09 - 7/10	2010	2010	4/10 - 7/11	7/10 - 7/11
State of Nevada	0.8%	2,738,733	-1.0%	2,711,206	0.5%	2,700,551	2,724,634	0.8%	-0.1%
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Nye County	2.3%	47,370	-2.1%	46,360	-1.9%	43,946	45,459	1.3%	-2.1%
Amargosa	1.2%	1,521	-8.5%	1,392	7.2%	1,442	1,492	-7.7%	-10.8%
Beatty	-3.3%	1,024	-14.0%	880	5.0%	893	924	9.6%	6.0%
Gabbs	3.1%	332	-4.9%	316	-3.8%	294	304	-4.0%	-7.2%
Manhattan	-1.3%	138	-1.8%	135	-1.7%	129	133	-5.9%	-9.0%
Pahrump	2.5%	38,882	-1.6%	38,247	-1.2%	36,538	37,796	1.3%	-2.1%
Round Mountain	2.3%	850	-1.5%	837	-3.7%	779	806	-1.0%	-4.3%
Tonopah	0.7%	2,628	-1.8%	2,580	-3.6%	2,405	2,488	-2.5%	-5.7%
Pershing County	1.6%	7,192	-0.6%	7,149	-0.2%	6,753	7,133	1.4%	-4.0%
Lovelock	-0.3%	2,458	-1.9%	2,411	-5.7%	1,894	2,274	14.6%	-4.5%
Imlay	4.4%	243	-4.1%	233	-0.1%	233	233	-31.3%	-31.3%
Storey County	2.1%	4,384	-1.5%	4,317	-1.9%	4,010	4,234	2.8%	-2.6%
Gold Hill	1.6%	212	-2.4%	207	-2.4%	191	202	24.4%	17.8%
Virginia City	1.5%	1,027	-1.5%	1,011	-1.3%	945	998	-9.1%	-13.9%
Washoe County	1.4%	423,833	-1.7%	416,632	0.2%	421,407	417,379	0.0%	1.0%
Reno	1.1%	223,012	-2.2%	218,143	-0.4%	225,221	217,282	-1.1%	2.5%
Sparks	2.5%	91,684	-0.5%	91,237	1.2%	90,264	92,331	2.3%	0.0%
White Pine County	2.5%	9,694	-1.3%	9,570	-0.7%	10,030	9,503	-0.3%	5.3%
Ely	1.3%	4,352	-1.4%	4,291	-1.3%	4,255	4,235	-3.9%	-3.4%
Lund	-4.2%	157	0.3%	158	2.7%	178	162	16.6%	27.8%
McGill	0.3%	1,128	-1.7%	1,109	-0.1%	1,215	1,108	-3.8%	5.4%
Ruth	1.8%	407	-1.3%	402	-0.7%	437	399	-4.0%	5.3%

		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	JULY 1	Change	JULY 1						
	2011	7/11 - 7/12	2012	7/12 - 7/13	2013	7/13 - 7/14	2014	7/14 - 7/15	2015
State of Nevada	2,721,794	1.0%	2,750,217	1.8%	2,800,967	1.5%	2,843,301	1.9%	2,897,584
Counties									
Cities									
Towns									
Nye County	44,513	-0.5%	44,292	1.0%	44,749	1.6%	45,456	1.3%	46,050
Amargosa	1,331	1.7%	1,353	-0.8%	1,342	6.2%	1,426	-2.1%	1,396
Beatty	979	3.2%	1,011	-4.5%	966	1.0%	975	-0.2%	973
Gabbs	282	-3.9%	271	-4.4%	259	-5.6%	245	-5.6%	231
Manhattan	121	3.4%	125	-0.7%	124	6.9%	133	0.9%	134
Pahrump	36,995	-1.1%	36,593	1.2%	37,030	1.6%	37,626	2.3%	38,482
Round Mountain	771	4.9%	809	1.6%	822	2.9%	846	-1.0%	837
Tonopah	2,346	8.8%	2,552	1.6%	2,593	-0.6%	2,578	-9.0%	2,345
Pershing County	6,847	2.4%	7,013	-1.9%	6,882	-2.4%	6,714	0.5%	6,750
Lovelock	2,171	-10.8%	1,936	2.6%	1,987	-1.8%	1,952	-3.1%	1,893
Imlay	160	16.1%	186	31.5%	244	5.4%	257	-23.9%	196
Storey County	4,123	-0.5%	4,103	-2.1%	4,017	-1.1%	3,974	0.3%	3,984
Gold Hill	238	-14.1%	204	-2.1%	200	0.6%	201	0.0%	201
Virginia City	859	-3.4%	830	1.3%	841	-1.1%	832	0.0%	831
Washoe County	421,593	1.4%	427,704	1.1%	432,324	1.0%	436,797	1.2%	441,946
Reno	222,801	3.2%	229,859	1.0%	232,243	1.3%	235,371	1.4%	238,615
Sparks	92,302	-2.3%	90,214	1.5%	91,551	0.9%	92,396	1.3%	93,581
White Pine County	10,002	-0.6%	9,945	1.5%	10,095	1.2%	10,218	1.2%	10,336
Ely	4,089	-0.6%	4,066	0.8%	4,100	1.6%	4,165	-2.6%	4,056
Lund	207	-0.4%	206	0.2%	206	0.8%	208	-5.5%	197
McGill	1,168	0.6%	1,175	0.2%	1,177	2.0%	1,200	-3.2%	1,161
Ruth	420	-0.5%	418	1.5%	424	1.2%	429	1.2%	434

	Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	Change	JULY 1						
	7/15 - 7/16	2016	7/16 - 7/17	2017	7/17 - 7/18	2018	7/17 - 7/18	2019
State of Nevada	1.9%	2,953,375	1.1%	2,986,656	2.4%	3,057,582	1.8%	3,112,937
Counties					-		-	
Cities								
Towns								
Nye County	-0.7%	45,737	1.4%	46,390	3.2%	47,856	1.3%	48,472
Amargosa	-0.4%	1,390	-3.3%	1,344	-1.2%	1,327	0.0%	1,327
Beatty	-2.3%	950	1.2%	961	1.4%	974	2.5%	998
Gabbs	-2.1%	226	-3.4%	218	0.6%	220	0.7%	221
Manhattan	-2.7%	130	-3.3%	126	1.7%	128	7.3%	138
Pahrump	-0.6%	38,238	2.1%	39,023	3.7%	40,473	1.5%	41,069
Round Mountain	-4.6%	799	-3.3%	772	-0.5%	768	-0.7%	763
Tonopah	-2.3%	2,291	0.9%	2,311	-2.2%	2,259	-4.3%	2,163
Pershing County	-0.8%	6,693	0.7%	6,743	1.7%	6,858	1.1%	6,935
Lovelock	1.2%	1,915	0.9%	1,933	1.7%	1,965	1.0%	1,985
Imlay	6.0%	208	-0.3%	207	-2.0%	203	2.5%	208
Storey County	1.5%	4,043	1.0%	4,084	3.5%	4,227	0.7%	4,258
Gold Hill	1.2%	204	-0.8%	202	2.7%	207	-0.6%	206
Virginia City	1.6%	845	0.6%	850	4.4%	887	1.9%	904
Washoe County	1.4%	448,316	0.8%	451,923	1.8%	460,237	2.1%	469.801
Reno	1.5%	242,158	1.0%	244,612	1.7%	248,806	2.6%	255,170
Sparks	2.3%	95,726	1.3%	96,928	3.3%	100,140	2.4%	102,543
White Pine County	0.8%	10.413	2.8%	10.705	-0.2%	10.678	1.4%	10.826
Ely	0.2%	4,065	4.9%	4,267	-2.8%	4,149	1.6%	4,217
Lund	2.9%	202	1.2%	205	0.7%	206	-0.6%	205
McGill	0.4%	1,166	2.2%	1,191	-0.4%	1,186	0.1%	1,187
Ruth	0.8%	437	2.8%	450	-0.2%	448	1.4%	455

	EMPG Histo	orical Allocations		
	2016	2017	2018	2019
Battle Mountain Band	9,863.00	9,863.00	9,863.00	0
Carson City	72,274.00	72,274.00	72,274.00	\$ 72,274.00
Churchill County	15,536.00	15,536.00	15,536.00	\$ 15,536.00
Clark County	529,000.00	529,000.00	529,000.00	\$ 529,000.00
Douglas County	57,239.00	57,239.00	57,239.00	\$ 57,239.00
Duckwater Tribe	37,419.00	37,419.00	36,419.00	\$ 37,419.00
Elko County	28,924.00	-	28,924.00	\$ 28,924.00
Fallon (City of)	28,082.85	28,924.00	28,082.85	\$ 28,082.85
Fallon Shoshone/Paiute Tribe	27,185.00	28,082.85	20,240.00	\$ 27,185.00
Henderson (City of)	157,243.03	157,243.03	151,484.12	\$ 157,243.03
Humboldt County	3,000.00	2,068.00	15,518.40	\$ 16,443.00
Las Vegas (City of)	391,886.00	391,886.00	421,345.07	\$ 437,900.00
Lincoln County	23,592.00	23,592.00	23,592.00	\$ 23,592.00
Mesquite (City of)	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	0
Mineral County	20,723.00	20,723.00	20,723.00	\$ 20,723.00
N Las Vegas (City of)	151,407.00	151,407.00	151,484.12	\$ 151,407.00
Nye County	42,596.00	42,596.00	42,596.00	\$ 42,596.00
Pershing County	12,500.00	12,500.00	9,050.00	\$ 12,500.00
Pyramid Lake Tribe	20,613.00	20,613.00	20,613.00	\$ 20,613.00
Reno (City of)	142,130.00	142,130.00	142,130.00	\$ 142,130.00
Reno Sparks Indian Colony	19,000.00	19,000.00	19,000.00	\$ 19,000.00
Storey County	17,807.00	17,807.00	17,057.00	\$ 17,807.00
Washoe County	170,877.00	170,877.00	160,877.00	\$ 170,877.00
Washoe Tribe	22,000.00	-	-	0
West Wendover (City of)	24,417.00	24,417.00	24,417.00	\$ 24,417.00
White Pine County	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Total	2,075,313.88	2,025,196.88	2,067,464.56	2,072,907.88

Not Participating	Past Allocations
Elko City of	29,044.00
Elko Bank Council	16,661.00
Washoe Tribe	21,589.00
Wells Band	2,944.00
Goshute	9,679.00
Moapa Bank	14,056.00
Duck Valley Tribe	19,001.00
Lyon County	46,991.00
Esmeralda	11,970.00
Eureka	3,100.00
Lander	2,900.00
Total	177,935.00

Updated 02/26/20

	2010 Census	7/1/19		
Counties Only	Population	Population	# Change	% Change
Carson City	55,274	56,151	877	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	377	2.32%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	578	6.72%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	165,680	18.88%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	69,594	11.92%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	38,366	17.68%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	59,931	23.25%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	8,551	55.98%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	2,540	5.40%
Elko	44,408	50,647	6,239	14.05%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	59	1.34%
Esmeralda	783	982	199	25.42%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	(32)	-1.61%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	551	3.33%
Lander	5,775	6,109	334	5.78%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	(81)	-1.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	4,517	8.69%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	(42)	-0.88%
Nye	43,946	48,472	4,526	10.30%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	182	2.70%
Storey	4,010	4,258	248	6.18%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	6,166	5.82%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	12,279	13.60%
Reno	225,221	255,170	29,949	13.30%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	796	7.94%
Nevada Counties	2,700,551	3,112,935	412,384	15.27%
		2		

https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population Statistics and Reports/

	2010 Census	7/1/19	# Ob	04 O b an an	Tiered
Counties Only	Population	Population	# Change	% Change	Base %
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	165,680	18.88%	4.00%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	69,594	11.92%	3.75%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	59,931	23.25%	2.00%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	38,366	17.68%	2.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	29,949	13.30%	2.00%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	6,166	5.82%	1.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	12,279	13.60%	1.75%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	4,517	8.69%	1.25%
Carson City	55,274	56,151	877	1.59%	1.25%
Elko	44,408	50,647	6,239	14.05%	1.25%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	2,540	5.40%	1.25%
Nye	43,946	48,472	4,526	10.30%	1.25%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	8,551	55.98%	0.50%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	551	3.33%	0.50%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	377	2.32%	0.50%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	796	7.94%	0.50%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	578	6.72%	0.50%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	182	2.70%	0.50%
Lander	5,775	6,109	334	5.78%	0.50%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	(81)	-1.52%	0.50%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	(42)	-0.88%	0.50%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	59	1.34%	0.50%
Storey	4,010	4,258	248	6.18%	0.50%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	(32)	-1.61%	0.25%
Esmeralda	783	982	199	25.42%	0.25%
Nevada Counties	2,700,551	3,112,935	412,384	15.27%	

https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population Statistics and Reports/

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

Ranking		Base		Tiered	Population	Reductions	# of Jurisdictions	
1 - 9	Scenario	Percentage	Base Distribution	Allocation	Allocation	Total	Impacted	Jurisdictions Impacted
	5	0.50%	Counties only	N/A	yes	(\$122,735)	10	Carson, Fallon, Mesquite, Douglas, W. Wendover, Lincoln, Mineral, Storey, Washoe, White Pine
	6	1.00%	Counties only	N/A	yes	(\$91,978)	6	Carson, Fallon, Mesquite, Douglas, W. Wendover, Washoe
	7	0.75%	Counties & Cities	N/A	yes	(\$49,739)	7	Carson, Fallon, Douglas, W. Wendover, Lincoln, Mineral, Washoe
	10	0.75%	Counties & Cities	Clark/Washoe	yes	(\$47,476)	6	Carson, Fallon, Douglas, W. Wendover, Lincoln, Mineral
	13	0.75%	Counties only	N/A	yes	(\$101,063)	8	Carson, Fallon, Mesquite, Douglas, W. Wendover, Lincoln, Mineral, Washoe
	15	0.75%	Counties only	ALL	yes	(\$56,987)	5	Carson, Fallon, Las Vegas, Mesquite, W. Wendover
	17	0.40%	Counties & Cities	ALL	yes	(\$14,641)	5	Carson, Fallon, Las Vegas, W. Wendover, Lincoln
	18	0.50%	Counties & Cities	ALL	yes	(\$19,208)	3	Carson, Fallon, Las Vegas
	19	0.75%	Counties & Cities	ALL	yes	(\$56,215)	3	Carson, Clark, Las Vegas

Please be prepared to rank scenarios from 1 through 9, 1 being the highest choice, and 9 being the lowest choice Scores will be tallied, and inverse ranking applied – Scenarios with the lowest overall total will be higher in rank

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal. Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves.

If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management. The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions. Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC). Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount. Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

Scenario	CarsonCity	Churchill	Fallon Liait	Las Velas	NLASVERAS	Henderson	Mesquite	Douglas	tiko	Westendove	Esmeralda	Fureka	Humboldt	Lander	Lincoln	Lyon	Mineral	NYE	Perstine	storet	Washoe	5Patts	Reno	whitepine	ALLOCATION
5	(\$22,386)	\$7,416	(\$21,820) \$193,969	\$53,629	\$22,699	\$59,367	(\$13,753)	(\$11,861)	\$17,211	(\$21,370)	\$0	\$0	\$6,802	\$0	(\$8,403)	\$0	(\$5,898)	\$2,056	\$3,828	(\$3,304)	(\$12,922)	\$0	\$31,869	(\$1,018)	\$276,111
6	(\$14,343)	\$17,960	(\$22,402) \$139,485	\$12,242	\$6,525	\$39,245	(\$15,262)	(\$3,399)	\$25,602	(\$21,653)	\$0	\$0	\$17,320	\$0	\$2,863	\$0	\$5,402	\$10,585	\$14,988	\$8,026	(\$14,919)	\$0	\$15,705	\$9,895	\$233,865
7	(\$20,875)	\$11,944	(\$5,123) \$120,079	\$21,121	\$20,594	\$52,501	\$1,826	(\$9,845)	\$19,142	(\$4,312)	\$0	\$0	\$11,298	\$0	(\$3,006)	\$0	(\$460)	\$4,153	\$9,098	\$2,170	(\$6,118)	\$0	\$29,776	\$3,954	\$257,919
10	(\$22,549)	\$11,447	(\$5,397) \$135,379	\$1,644	\$12,983	\$43,032	\$1,116	(\$11,322)	\$17,632	(\$4,445)	\$0	\$0	\$10,788	\$0	(\$3,162)	\$0	(\$601)	\$2,708	\$8,892	\$2,043	\$33,881	\$0	\$22,170	\$3,632	\$259,872
13	(\$18,364)	\$12,688	(\$22,111) \$166,727	\$32,936	\$14,612	\$49,306	(\$14,507)	(\$7,630)	\$21,407	(\$21,511)	\$0	\$0	\$12,061	\$0	(\$2,770)	\$0	(\$248)	\$6,321	\$9,408	\$2,361	(\$13,920)	\$0	\$23,787	\$4,438	\$254,988
15	(\$1,710)	\$20,627	(\$12,531) \$30,173	(\$23,705)	\$4,877	\$25,868	(\$8,146)	\$10,478	\$39,271	(\$10,894)	\$0	\$0	\$19,906	\$0	\$7,672	\$0	\$10,311	\$24,663	\$19,483	\$13,024	\$20,090	\$0	\$14,086	\$13,658	\$217,200
17	(\$8,679)	\$12,849	(\$3,063) \$43,434	(\$1,036)	\$19,389	\$41,657	\$1,622	\$3,374	\$32,189	(\$1,523)	\$0	\$0	\$12,136	\$0	(\$340)	\$0	\$2,289	\$17,537	\$11,506	\$4,992	\$25,648	\$0	\$28,595	\$5,760	\$248,335
18	(\$7,406)	\$14,859	(\$914) \$26,317	(\$10,888)	\$16,952	\$38,059	\$3,498	\$4,771	\$33,565	\$713	\$0	\$0	\$14,138	\$0	\$1,882	\$0	\$4,520	\$18,953	\$13,696	\$7,232	\$26,289	\$0	\$26,161	\$7,878	\$240,277
19	(\$4,221)	\$19,883	\$4,458 (\$16,474)	(\$35,520)	\$10,859	\$29,063	\$8,188	\$8,263	\$37,006	\$6,305	\$0	\$0	\$19,142	\$0	\$7,437	\$0	\$10,100	\$22,495	\$19,173	\$12,834	\$27,892	\$0	\$20,076	\$13,174	\$220,131

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population	1	Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%

FFY19 Award Total		\$ 4	4,551,655.00	100.00%
State Allocation		Ś	2.427.721.12	53.34%
		Ş	1/1,257.00	3.70%
Tribal Total		ć	171 257 00	3 76%
Coordinating Council		Ś	67.040.00	1.47%
Nevada Tribal Emergency				
Colony	 	\$	19,000.00	0.42%
Reno-Sparks Indian				
Pyramid Lake Paiute		\$	20,613.00	0.45%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone		\$	27,185.00	0.60%
Duck Water Shoshone	 	Ş	37,419.00	0.82%

												Proposed for FFY2	2021
					FFY2020 Award	\$ 4	4,639,757.00			\$ 4,639,757.00		Scenario #5	
											-	Reductions Total	
(0.50%	1		Pop	ulation Allocation		Base +Pop					(122.735)	
Cou	inty Base	Tiered	Tiered Base					% of Total	Allocation		% of Total	Allocation Change	
Al	location	Base %	Allocation	\$	2,122,689	\$	2,319,879	Allocation	Adjustment	Final Allocation	Allocation	Reduction/Increase	% Change
\$	11,599	1.25%		\$	38,289	\$	49,888	1.08%		\$ 49,888	1.08%	(22,386)	-30.97%
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	11,352	\$	22,952	0.49%		\$ 22,952	0.49%	7,416	47.73%
		0.50%		\$	6,263	\$	6,263	0.13%		\$ 6,263	0.13%	(21,820)	-77.70%
\$	11,599	4.00%		\$	711,369	\$	722,969	15.58%		\$ 722,969	15.58%	193,969	36.67%
		3.75%		\$	445,515	\$	445,515	9.60%		\$ 445,515	9.60%	53,629	13.68%
		2.00%		\$	174,106	\$	174,106	3.75%		\$ 174,106	3.75%	22,699	14.99%
		2.00%		\$	216,610	\$	216,610	4.67%		\$ 216,610	4.67%	59,367	37.76%
		0.50%		\$	16,247	\$	16,247	0.35%		\$ 16,247	0.35%	(13,753)	-45.84%
\$	11,599	1.25%		\$	33,779	\$	45,378	0.98%		\$ 45,378	0.98%	(11,861)	-20.72%
\$	11,599	1.25%		\$	34,536	\$	46,135	0.99%		\$ 46,135	0.99%	17,211	59.51%
		0.50%		\$	3,047	\$	3,047	0.07%		\$ 3,047	0.07%	(21,370)	-87.52%
\$	11,599	0.25%		\$	670	\$	12,269	0.26%	\$ (12,269)	\$-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
\$	11,599	0.25%		\$	1,333	\$	12,932	0.28%	\$ (12,932)	\$-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	11,646	\$	23,245	0.50%		\$ 23,245	0.50%	6,802	41.37%
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	4,166	\$	15,765	0.34%	\$ (15,765)	\$ -	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	3,589	\$	15,189	0.33%		\$ 15,189	0.33%	(8,403)	-35.62%
\$	11,599	1.25%		\$	38,525	\$	50,124	1.08%	\$ (50,124)	\$-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	3,225	\$	14,825	0.32%		\$ 14,825	0.32%	(5,898)	-28.46%
\$	11,599	1.25%		\$	33,053	\$	44,652	0.96%		\$ 44,652	0.96%	2,056	4.83%
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	4,729	\$	16,328	0.35%		\$ 16,328	0.35%	3,828	30.63%
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	2,904	\$	14,503	0.31%		\$ 14,503	0.31%	(3,304)	-18.56%
\$	11,599	1.75%		\$	76,432	\$	88,031	1.90%	\$ 69,923	\$ 157,955	3.40%	(12,922)	-7.56%
		1.75%		\$	69,923	\$	69,923	1.51%	\$ (69,923)	\$-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
		2.00%		\$	173,999	\$	173,999	3.75%		\$ 173,999	3.75%	31,869	22.42%
\$	11,599	0.50%		\$	7,382	\$	18,982	0.41%		\$ 18,982	0.41%	(1,018)	-5.09%
\$	197,190		\$ -	\$	2,122,689	\$	2,319,879	50.00%	\$ (91,091)	\$ 2,228,788	48.04%	\$ 276,111	14.14%
					-	-	-						
						\$	38,143	0.82%		\$ 38,143	0.82%	724	1.94%
						\$	27,711	0.60%		\$ 27,711	0.60%	526	1.94%
						\$	21,012	0.45%		\$ 21,012	0.45%	399	1.94%
						\$	19,368	0.42%		\$ 19,368	0.42%	368	1.94%

-	-									
	\$ 38,143	0.82%			\$	38,143	0.82%		724	1.94%
	\$ 27,711	0.60%			\$	27,711	0.60%		526	1.94%
	\$ 21,012	0.45%			\$	21,012	0.45%		399	1.94%
	\$ 19,368	0.42%			\$	19,368	0.42%		368	1.94%
	\$ 68,338	1.47%			\$	68,338	1.47%		1,298	1.94%
	\$ 174,572	3.76%		\$ -	\$	174,572	3.76%	\$	3,315	1.94%
	\$ 2,145,307	46.24%		\$ 91,091	\$	2,236,398	48.20%		(191,324)	-7.88%
FY2020 Award	\$ 4,639,757.00	100.00%	Ĩ	\$ -	\$4	1,639,757.00	100.00%	\$	88,102.00	1.94%
e from Last FFY	1.93560%									

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

```
The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions.
Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).
```

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

% Chang

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population		Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				ć	27 185 00	0.60%

Local Total	2,100,001	0,112,000	100.0076	· • ·	1,932,070.00	42.50/6
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$	27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$	20,613.00	0.45%
Reno-Sparks Indian						
Colony				\$	19,000.00	0.42%
Nevada Tribal Emergency						
Coordinating Council				\$	67,040.00	1.47%
Tribal Total				\$	171,257.00	3.76%
State Allocation				\$ 3	2,427,721.12	53.34%
FFY19 Award Total				\$ 4	4,551,655.00	100.00%

												Prop	oosed for FFY2	2021
			FFY2020 Awa	rd \$	4,639,757.00				\$ 4	4,639,757.00		Scer	nario #6	
			-									Redu	ictions Total	
.00%			Population Allocation		Base +Pop								(91.978)	
nty Base	Tiered	Tiered Base				% of Total	Г	Allocation			% of Total	Alloc	ation Change	
ocation	Base %	Allocation	\$ 1,925,49	9 \$	2,319,879	Allocation		Adjustment	Fir	al Allocation	Allocation	Redu	ction/Increase	% Change
23,199	1.25%		\$ 34,73	2 \$	57,931	1.25%			\$	57,931	1.25%		(14,343)	-19.85%
23,199	0.50%		\$ 10,29	8 \$	33,496	0.72%			\$	33,496	0.72%		17,960	115.60%
	0.50%		\$ 5,68	1\$	5,681	0.12%			\$	5,681	0.12%		(22,402)	-79.77%
23,199	4.00%		\$ 645,28	6\$	668,485	14.41%			\$	668,485	14.41%		139,485	26.37%
	3.75%		\$ 404,12	8 \$	404,128	8.71%			\$	404,128	8.71%		12,242	3.12%
	2.00%		\$ 157,93	2 \$	157,932	3.40%			\$	157,932	3.40%		6,525	4.31%
	2.00%		\$ 196,48	8 \$	196,488	4.23%			\$	196,488	4.23%		39,245	24.96%
	0.50%		\$ 14,73	8 \$	14,738	0.32%			\$	14,738	0.32%		(15,262)	-50.87%
23,199	1.25%		\$ 30,64	1\$	53,840	1.16%			\$	53,840	1.16%		(3,399)	-5.94%
23,199	1.25%		\$ 31,32	8 \$	54,526	1.18%			\$	54,526	1.18%		25,602	88.52%
	0.50%		\$ 2,76	4 \$	2,764	0.06%			\$	2,764	0.06%		(21,653)	-88.68%
23,199	0.25%		\$ 60	7 \$	23,806	0.51%		\$ (23,806)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
23,199	0.25%		\$ 1,20	9 \$	24,408	0.53%		\$ (24,408)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
23,199	0.50%		\$ 10,56	4 \$	33,763	0.73%			\$	33,763	0.73%		17,320	105.33%
23,199	0.50%		\$ 3,77	9 \$	26,977	0.58%		\$ (26,977)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
23,199	0.50%		\$ 3,25	6 \$	26,455	0.57%			\$	26,455	0.57%		2,863	12.13%
23,199	1.25%		\$ 34,94	6 \$	58,145	1.25%		\$ (58,145)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
23,199	0.50%		\$ 2,92	6 \$	26,125	0.56%			\$	26,125	0.56%		5,402	26.07%
23,199	1.25%		\$ 29,98	2 \$	53,181	1.15%			\$	53,181	1.15%		10,585	24.85%
23,199	0.50%		\$ 4,29	0\$	27,488	0.59%			\$	27,488	0.59%		14,988	119.91%
23,199	0.50%		\$ 2,63	4 \$	25,833	0.56%			\$	25,833	0.56%		8,026	45.07%
23,199	1.75%		\$ 69,33	2 Ş	92,531	1.99%		\$ 63,428	Ş	155,958	3.36%		(14,919)	-8.73%
	1.75%		\$ 63,42	8 \$	63,428	1.37%	-	\$ (63,428)	Ş	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
	2.00%		\$ 157,83	5 Ş	157,835	3.40%			Ş	157,835	3.40%		15,705	11.05%
23,199	0.50%		Ş 6,69	6 Ş	29,895	0.64%	-		Ş	29,895	0.64%		9,895	49.48%
394,379		ş -	\$ 1,925,49	9 Ş	2,319,879	50.00%	1	Ş (133,337)	Ş	2,186,542	47.13%	Ş	233,865	11.98%
				-	-	0.000/	Г				0.000/			
				Ş	38,143	0.82%			Ş	38,143	0.82%		724	1.94%
				\$	27,711	0.60%			\$	27,711	0.60%		526	1.94%
				\$	21,012	0.45%			\$	21,012	0.45%		399	1.94%
				\$	19,368	0.42%			\$	19,368	0.42%		368	1.94%
				\$	68,338	1.47%			\$	68,338	1.47%		1,298	1.94%
				\$	174,572	3.76%		\$-	\$	174,572	3.76%	\$	3,315	1.94%
				_			_							
				\$	2,145,307	46.24%		\$ 133,337	\$	2,278,643	49.11%		(149,078)	-6.14%
			FFY2020 Awa	rd \$	4,639,757.00	100.00%		\$-	\$4	4,639,757.00	100.00%	\$	88,102.00	1.94%
			% Change from Last F	FY	1.93560%		-							

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

1.00% County Base Allocation 23,199

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions. Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).

Scenario #7 **Reductions Total**

Allocation Change

Reduction/Increase

\$ 4,639,757.00

Final Allocation

Ś

Ś

\$

Ś

\$

\$

Ś

51,399

27,480

22,960

649,079

413,007

172,001

209,744

109,283 \$ 2,254,590 48.59%

- \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

% of Total

Allocation

1.11%

0.59%

0.49%

13.99%

8.90%

3.71%

4.52%

Proposed for FFY2021

(49,73

(20.875)

11,944

(5.123

120,079

21,121

20,594

52,501

% Change

-28.88%

76.88%

-18.24%

22.70%

5.39%

13.60%

33.39%

6.09%

(173,131) -7.13%

88,102.00 1.94%

Ś

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population		Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$	27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$	20,613.00	0.45%
Reno-Sparks Indian						
Colony				Ś	19 000 00	0.42%

0.50%		\$ 14,427	7 \$	31,826	0.69%			\$	31,826	0.69%		1,826	6.09%
1.25%		\$ 29,995	5\$	47,394	1.02%			\$	47,394	1.02%		(9,845)	-17.20%
1.25%		\$ 30,667	7 \$	48,066	1.04%			\$	48,066	1.04%	1 [19,142	66.18%
0.50%		\$ 2,706	5 \$	20,105	0.43%			\$	20,105	0.43%		(4,312)	-17.66%
0.25%		\$ 595	5 \$	17,994	0.39%	\$	(17,994)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
0.25%		\$ 1,184	1\$	18,583	0.40%	\$	(18,583)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
0.50%		\$ 10,343	L \$	27,741	0.60%			\$	27,741	0.60%		11,298	68.71%
0.50%		\$ 3,699	\$	21,098	0.45%	\$	(21,098)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
0.50%		\$ 3,187	7 \$	20,586	0.44%			\$	20,586	0.44%		(3,006)	-12.74%
1.25%		\$ 34,209	\$	51,608	1.11%	\$	(51,608)	\$	-	0.00%	1 [0	#DIV/0!
0.50%		\$ 2,864	1\$	20,263	0.44%			\$	20,263	0.44%		(460)	-2.22%
1.25%		\$ 29,350) \$	46,749	1.01%			\$	46,749	1.01%		4,153	9.75%
0.50%		\$ 4,199	\$	21,598	0.47%			\$	21,598	0.47%		9,098	72.79%
0.50%		\$ 2,578	3 \$	19,977	0.43%			\$	19,977	0.43%		2,170	12.19%
1.75%		\$ 67,870) \$	85,269	1.84%	\$	79,490	\$	164,759	3.55%		(6,118)	-3.58%
1.75%		\$ 62,090) \$	79,490	1.71%	\$	(79,490)	\$	-	0.00%	1 [0	#DIV/0!
2.00%		\$ 154,507	7 \$	171,906	3.71%			\$	171,906	3.71%		29,776	20.95%
0.50%		\$ 6,555	5 \$	23,954	0.52%			\$	23,954	0.52%		3,954	19.77%
	\$-	\$ 1,884,901	ι\$	2,319,879	50.00%	\$	(109,283)	\$	2,210,595	47.64%		\$ 257,919	13.21%
				-									
			\$	38,143	0.82%			\$	38,143	0.82%		724	1.94%
			Ş	27,711	0.60%			Ş	27,711	0.60%		526	1.94%
			Ş	21,012	0.45%			Ş	21,012	0.45%		399	1.94%
			\$	19,368	0.42%			\$	19,368	0.42%		368	1.94%
			\$	68,338	1.47%			\$	68,338	1.47%		1,298	1.94%
			Ś	174 572	3.76%	\$	-	Ś	174 572	3.76%	1 [\$ 3,315	1.94%
			Ŷ	1, 1,0, 1		Ŷ		Ŷ	1, 1,07 -	017070		φ 0)010	10170

Ś

Vhite Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$ 20,000.00	0.44%
ocal Total	2,700,551	3,112,935	100.00%	\$ 1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$ 37,419.00	0.82%
allon Paiute -Shoshone				\$ 27,185.00	0.60%
yramid Lake Paiute				\$ 20,613.00	0.45%
teno-Sparks Indian					
Colony				\$ 19,000.00	0.42%
Vevada Tribal Emergency					
Coordinating Council				\$ 67,040.00	1.47%
ribal Total				\$ 171,257.00	3.76%
tate Allocation				\$ 2,427,721.12	53.34%
FY19 Award Total				\$ 4,551,655.00	100.00%

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal. Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

```
The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions.
Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).
```

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00

Base +Pop

2,319,879

51,399

27,480

22,960

649,079

413,007

172,001

209,744

\$ 2,145,307 46.24%

1.93560%

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

% of Total

Allocation

1.11%

0.59%

0.49%

13.99%

8.90%

3.71%

4.52%

Allocation

Adjustment

Population Allocation

1,884,901

34,000 \$

10,080 \$

5,561 \$

631.680 **\$**

395,607 \$

154,602 \$

192,345

0.75%

All Base

Allocation

17,399

17,399

17,399

17 399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

434,977

Tiered

Base %

1.25%

0.50%

0.50%

4.00%

3.75%

2.00%

2 00%

0.50%

Tiered Base

Allocation

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

% Change from Last FFY

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

Scenario #10

\$ 4,639,757.00

Proposed for FFY2021

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population		Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
Durl Weise Oberhaus				<u>_</u>	27.440.00	0.020/

FFY19 Award Total	\$ 4,551,655.00	100.00%
	· · · ·	
State Allocation	\$ 2,427,721.12	53.34%
Tribal Total	\$ 171,257.00	3.76%
Coordinating Council	\$ 67,040.00	1.47%
Nevada Tribal Emergency		
Colony	\$ 19,000.00	0.42%
Reno-Sparks Indian		
Pyramid Lake Paiute	\$ 20,613.00	0.45%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone	\$ 27,185.00	0.60%
Duck Water Shoshone	\$ 37,419.00	0.82%

													Reductions Total	
0.75%			Popul	ation Allocation		Base +Pop							(47,476)	
All Base	Tiered	Tiered Base					% of Total		Allocation			% of Total	Allocation Change	
Allocation	Base %	Allocation	\$	1,792,106	\$	2,319,879	Allocation		Adjustment	1	Final Allocation	Allocation	Reduction/Increase	% Change
17,399			\$	32,326	\$	49,725	1.07%			Ş	\$ 49,725	1.07%	(22,549)	-31.20%
17,399			\$	9,584	\$	26,983	0.58%			Ş	26,983	0.58%	11,447	73.68%
17,399			\$	5,287	\$	22,686	0.49%			Ś	22,686	0.49%	(5,397)	-19.22%
17,399	2.00%	\$ 46,398	\$	600,582	\$	664,379	14.32%			Ş	664,379	14.32%	135,379	25.59%
17,399			\$	376,131	\$	393,530	8.48%			Ş	393,530	8.48%	1,644	0.42%
17,399			\$	146,991	\$	164,390	3.54%			Ş	5 164,390	3.54%	12,983	8.57%
17,399			\$	182,876	\$	200,275	4.32%			Ş	200,275	4.32%	43,032	27.37%
17,399			\$	13,717	\$	31,116	0.67%			Ş	31,116	0.67%	1,116	3.72%
17,399			\$	28,518	\$	45,917	0.99%			Ś	\$ 45,917	0.99%	(11,322)	-19.78%
17,399			\$	29,157	\$	46,556	1.00%			Ş	46,556	1.00%	17,632	60.96%
17,399			\$	2,573	\$	19,972	0.43%			Ş	5 19,972	0.43%	(4,445)	-18.21%
17,399			\$	565	\$	17,964	0.39%		\$ (17,964	l) \$; -	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
17,399			\$	1,125	\$	18,525	0.40%		\$ (18,525) \$; -	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
17,399			\$	9,832	\$	27,231	0.59%			Ş	27,231	0.59%	10,788	65.61%
17,399			\$	3,517	\$	20,916	0.45%		\$ (20,916	j) \$	\$-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
17,399			\$	3,030	\$	20,430	0.44%			Ś	20,430	0.44%	(3,162)	-13.40%
17,399			\$	32,525	\$	49,924	1.08%		\$ (49,924	l) \$; -	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
17,399			\$	2,723	\$	20,122	0.43%			Ş	20,122	0.43%	(601)	-2.90%
17,399			\$	27,905	\$	45,304	0.98%			Ş	\$ 45,304	0.98%	2,708	6.36%
17,399			\$	3,992	\$	21,392	0.46%			Ş	\$ 21,392	0.46%	8,892	71.13%
17,399			\$	2,451	\$	19,850	0.43%			Ş	\$ 19,850	0.43%	2,043	11.48%
17,399	2.00%	\$ 46,398	\$	64,529	\$	128,325	2.77%		\$ 76,433	\$	204,758	4.41%	33,881	19.83%
17,399			\$	59,034	\$	76,433	1.65%		\$ (76,433) \$; -	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
17,399			\$	146,901	\$	164,300	3.54%			Ş	5 164,300	3.54%	22,170	15.60%
17,399			\$	6,232	\$	23,632	0.51%			Ş	23,632	0.51%	3,632	18.16%
434,977		\$ 92,795	\$	1,792,106	\$	2,319,879	50.00%		\$ (107,329) \$	2,212,549	47.69%	\$ 259,872	13.31%
				-		-								
					\$	38,143	0.82%			Ş	38,143	0.82%	724	1.94%
					\$	27,711	0.60%			Ş	\$ 27,711	0.60%	526	1.94%
					\$	21,012	0.45%			Ş	\$ 21,012	0.45%	399	1.94%
					\$	19,368	0.42%			Ş	\$ 19,368	0.42%	368	1.94%
					1									
					Ι.									
					\$	68,338	1.47%			\$	68,338	1.47%	1,298	1.94%
					\$	174,572	3.76%		\$.	•	\$ 174,572	3.76%	\$ 3,315	1.94%
					_									
					\$	2,145,307	46.24%	1	\$ 107,329		\$ 2,252,636	48.55%	(175,085)	-7.21%

\$

- \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

\$

88,102.00 1.94%

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

1.93560%

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

% Change from Last FFY

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions. Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).

Proposed for FFY2021

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base
Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total		
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population		Allocation	Allocation		
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%		
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%		
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%		
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%		
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%		
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%		
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%		
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%		
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%		
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%		
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%		
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%		
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%		
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%		
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%		
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%		
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%		
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%		
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%		
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%		
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%		
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%		
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%		
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%		
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%		
Local Total	2,700,551	3,112,935	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%		
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%		
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				Ś	27.185.00	0.60%		

	\$	37,419.00	0.82%
	\$	27,185.00	0.60%
	\$	20,613.00	0.45%
	\$	19,000.00	0.42%
	\$	67,040.00	1.47%
	\$	171,257.00	3.76%
	\$ 3	2,427,721.12	53.34%
	\$ 4	4,551,655.00	100.00%
			\$ 37,419.00 \$ 27,185.00 \$ 20,613.00 \$ 19,000.00 \$ 19,000.00 \$ 171,257.00 \$ 2,427,721.12 \$ 4,551,655.00

			FFV2020 A	¢ 4 COO 757 00				¢ 4 COO 757	1	Comorio #12	
			FFY2020 Award	\$ 4,039,757.00				\$ 4,039,757.		Scenario #15	1
										Reductions Total	
.75%	T ¹	T ¹	Population Allocation	Base +Pop	0/ . (T .) .]	_			0(- (T - 1 - 1	(101,063)	<u> </u>
nty Base	Tiered	Tiered Base	¢	÷	% of Total	A	llocation		% of Total	Allocation Change	0/ 01 · · · · ·
ocation	Base %	Allocation	\$ 2,024,094	\$ 2,319,879	Allocation	A	djustment	Final Allocati	on Allocation	Reduction/Increase	% Change
17,399	1.25%		\$ 36,511	\$ 53,910	1.16%			\$ 53,9	.0 1.16%	(18,364)	-25.41%
17,399	0.50%		\$ 10,825	\$ 28,224	0.61%			\$ 28,22	4 0.61%	12,688	81.67%
47.000	0.50%		\$ 5,972	\$ 5,972	0.13%			\$ 5,9	Z 0.13%	(22,111)	-78.74%
17,399	4.00%		\$ 678,328	\$ 695,727	14.99%			\$ 695,7	14.99%	166,727	31.52%
	3.75%		\$ 424,822	\$ 424,822	9.16%			\$ 424,8	2 9.10%	32,930	8.40%
	2.00%		\$ 166,019	\$ 166,019	3.58%	-		\$ 166,0	9 3.58%	14,612	9.65%
	2.00%		\$ 206,549	\$ 206,549	4.45%	-		\$ 206,54	9 4.45%	49,306	31.36%
17 200	0.50%		\$ 15,493 \$ 22,210	\$ 15,493	0.33%	-		\$ 15,4	0 1.07%	(14,507)	-48.36%
17,599	1.25%		\$ 52,210 ¢ 32,022	\$ 49,009	1.07%			\$ 49,00	1 1.07%	(7,030)	-13.33%
17,599	0.50%		\$ 52,952 \$ 2,006	\$ 30,331	1.08%			3 30,33 ¢ 30,3	c 0.06%	(21,407	74.01%
17 200	0.30%		\$ 2,906	\$ 19,000	0.00%	¢	(19 020)	÷ 2,9	0.00%	(21,511)	+DIV/01
17,399	0.25%		¢ 1.271	\$ 19,038	0.39%	ç	(10,038)	¢	- 0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
17,399	0.23%		\$ 1,2/1 \$ 11.10E	\$ 10,070	0.40%	\$	(10,070)	\$ 205	0.00%	12.061	72 25%
17,399	0.50%		\$ 11,103 ¢ 2,072	<u>\$ 26,304</u>	0.01%	¢	(21 271)	3 20,50 ¢	0.00%	12,001	75.55% #DIV/01
17,399	0.50%		\$ 3,972 \$ 2,022	<u>\$ 21,371</u> \$ 20,822	0.46%	2	(21,371)	\$ \$ 20.8	- 0.00%	(2 770)	-11 74%
17,333	1.25%		\$ 3,423 \$ 26,726	\$ 54 125	1 17%	¢	(54 125)	\$ 20,62 ¢	- 0.00%	(2,770)	+DIV/01
17 399	0.50%		\$ 3,076	\$ 20.475	0.44%	-	(34,133)	\$ 20.4	5 0.44%	(248)	-1 20%
17,333	1 25%		\$ 31,517	\$ 48 917	1.05%			\$ 48.9	7 1.05%	6 321	14 84%
17 399	0.50%		\$ 4509	\$ 21 908	0.47%			\$ 21.9	8 0.47%	9.408	75.27%
17 399	0.50%		\$ 2,769	\$ 20,168	0.43%	-		\$ 20.1	8 0.43%	2,361	13.26%
17 399	1 75%		\$ 72.882	\$ 90,281	1.95%	Ś	66 676	\$ 156.9	7 3 38%	(13,920)	-8 15%
	1.75%		\$ 66.676	\$ 66,676	1.44%	Ś	(66,676)	\$	- 0.00%	0	#DIV/01
	2.00%		\$ 165,917	\$ 165,917	3.58%		(,,	\$ 165.9	7 3.58%	23,787	16.74%
17.399	0.50%		\$ 7.039	\$ 24,438	0.53%			\$ 24.4	8 0.53%	4,438	22.19%
295,785		\$ -	\$ 2.024.094	\$ 2,319,879	50.00%	\$	(112,214)	\$ 2,207.6	5 47.58%	\$ 254,988	13.06%
		•	-	-			. , ,	, , , , , ,			
				\$ 38,143	0.82%			\$ 38,14	3 0.82%	724	1.94%
				\$ 27,711	0.60%			\$ 27,72	.1 0.60%	526	1.94%
				\$ 21,012	0.45%			\$ 21,0	.2 0.45%	399	1.94%
				\$ 19,368	0.42%			\$ 19,30	8 0.42%	368	1.94%
				\$ 68,338	1.47%			\$ 68,3	8 1.47%	1,298	1.94%
				\$ 174,572	3.76%	\$	-	\$ 174,5	2 3.76%	\$ 3,315	1.94%
										·	,
			l	Ş 2,145,307	46.24%	Ş	112,214	\$ 2,257,52	48.66%	(170,201)	-7.01%
			FFV2020 4	¢ 4 COO 757 CO	100.000/	ć		¢ 4 COO 757 4	100.000/	ć 00.102.00	1.04%
			Change from Lost 55V	\$ 4,639,757.00	100.00%	Ş	-	\$ 4,639,757.0	100.00%	\$ 88,102.00	1.94%
			70 CHAILER ITOTTI LAST FFY	1.93360%							

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

0.75% County Base Allocation

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions. Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).

Scenario #15 **Reductions Total**

Allocation Change

Reduction/Increase

\$ 4,639,757.00

Final Allocation

Ś

Ś

\$

Ś

Ś

\$

Ś

Ś

ć

Ś

\$

\$

(23,6 \$

(31 6 ć

(24

70,564

36,163

15,552

559 173

368,181

156,284

183,111

21,854

67,717

68,195

13,523

36,349

31,264

% of Total

Allocation

1.52%

0.78%

0.34%

12 05%

7.94%

3.37%

3.95%

0.47%

1.46%

1.47%

0.29%

0.00%

0.00%

0.78%

0.00%

0.67%

Proposed for FFY2021

(56,987

(1.710)

20,627

(12.531)

30,173

4,877

25,868

(8.14

10,478

39,271

(10, 894)

19,906

7,672

10.311

24,663

19,483

13,024

20,090 0 #DIV/0!

14,086

13,658

217,200 724 1.94%

526

399

368

1,298

3,315

(132,413)

Ś

88,102.00 1.94%

0 #DIV/0!

0 #DIV/0!

0 #DIV/0!

0 #DIV/0!

(23,70

% Change

-2.37%

132.77%

-44.62%

5.70%

-6.05%

3.22%

16.45%

-27.15%

18.31%

135.77%

-44.62%

121.06%

32.52%

49.76%

57.90%

155.87%

73.14% 11.76%

9.91%

68.29%

11.12%

1.94%

1.94%

1.94%

1.94%

1.94%

-5.45%

Draft County & City Allocation by	Population & Base
Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year	(FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population		Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
				_		
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				Ś	27.185.00	0.60%

17,399	1.25%	\$ 28,998	\$ 24,315	\$	70,712	1.52%	\$		(70,712)	\$	-	0.00%
17,399	0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 2,036	\$	31,034	0.67%				\$	31,034	0.67%
17,399	1.25%	\$ 28,998	\$ 20,861	\$	67,259	1.45%				\$	67,259	1.45%
17,399	0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 2,985	\$	31,983	0.69%				\$	31,983	0.69%
17,399	0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 1,833	\$	30,831	0.66%				\$	30,831	0.66%
17,399	1.75%	\$ 40,598	\$ 48,240	\$	106,237	2.29%	\$		84,730	\$	190,967	4.12%
	1.75%	\$ 40,598	\$ 44,132	\$	84,730	1.83%	\$		(84,730)	\$	-	0.00%
	2.00%	\$ 46,398	\$ 109,819	\$	156,216	3.37%				\$	156,216	3.37%
17,399	0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 4,659	\$	33,658	0.73%				\$	33,658	0.73%
295,785		\$ 684,364	\$ 1,339,730	\$	2,319,879	50.00%	\$		(150,002)	\$	2,169,877	46.77%
			-		-							
				\$	38,143	0.82%				\$	38,143	0.82%
				\$	27,711	0.60%				\$	27,711	0.60%
				\$	21,012	0.45%				\$	21,012	0.45%
				\$	19,368	0.42%				\$	19,368	0.42%
				\$	68,338	1.47%				\$	68,338	1.47%
				\$	174,572	3.76%	-	\$	-	\$	174,572	3.76%
				\$	2,145,307	46.24%	ç	;	150,002	\$	2,295,308	49.47%
			FFY2020 Award	\$ 4	1,639,757.00	100.00%	\$	5	-	\$4	1,639,757.00	100.00%

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00

Base +Pop

2,319,879

70,564

36,163

15,552

559,173

368,181

156,284

183.111

21,854

67,717

68,195

13,523

23,621

24,040

36,349

31,628

31,264

% of Total

Allocation

1.52%

0.78%

0.34%

12 05%

7.94%

3.37%

3.95%

0.47%

1.46%

1.47%

0.29%

0.51%

0.52%

0.78%

0.68%

0.67%

Allocation

Adjustment

Population Allocation

1,339,730

24,166 \$

7,165

3,953 \$

448,979 **\$**

281,186 \$

109,886

10,255

21,319

21,797

1,923

841

2.629

2,265 \$

7,350

423 \$

136.713

0.75%

County Base

Allocation

17,399

17,399

17.399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

Ś

20,613.00

19,000.00

67,040.00

\$ 4,551,655.00 100.00%

\$ 171,257.00

\$ 2,427,721.12

ć

0.45%

0.42%

1.47%

3.76%

53.34%

Tiered

Base %

1.25%

0.50%

0.50%

4 00%

3.75%

2.00%

2 00%

0.50%

1.25%

1.25%

0.50%

0.25%

0.25%

0.50%

0.50%

0.50%

Tiered Base

Allocation

28,998

11,599

11.599

92,795

86,995

46,398

46.398

11,599

28,998

28,998

11,599

5,800

5,800

11,599

11,599

11,599

% Change from Last FFY 1.93560%

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions. Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population Statistics and Reports/

Pyramid Lake Paiute

Reno-Sparks Indian

Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council

Colony

Tribal Total

State Allocation

FFY19 Award Total

Scenario #17 **Reductions Total**

Allocation Change

Reduction/Increase

Proposed for FFY2021

(14,641

(8,679)

12,849

(3,063)

43,434

(1,036

19,389

41,657

1,622

3,374

32,189

(1,523)

12,136

(340)

2,289

17,537

11,506

4,992

25,648

28,595 5,760

0 #DIV/0! 20.12%

248,335 12.72%

0 #DIV/0!

0 #DIV/0!

0 #DIV/0!

0 #DIV/0!

% Change

-12.01%

82.70%

-10.91%

8.21%

-0.26%

12.81% 26.49%

5.41%

5.89%

111.29%

-6.24%

73.81%

-1.44%

11.04%

41.17%

92.05%

28.03%

15.01%

28.80%

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19	Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population	Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$ 72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$ 15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$ 28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$ 529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$ 391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$ 151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$ 157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$ 30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$ 57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$ 28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$ 24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$ -	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$ -	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$ 16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$ -	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$ 23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$ -	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$ 20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$ 42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$ 12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$ 17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$ 170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$ -	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$ 142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$ 20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$ 1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$ 37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$ 27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$ 20,613.00	0.45%

FFY19 Award Total	\$ 4,551,655.00	100.00%
State Allocation	\$ 2,427,721.12	53.34%
Tribal Total	\$ 171,257.00	3.76%
Coordinating Council	\$ 67,040.00	1.47%
Nevada Tribal Emergency		
Colony	\$ 19,000.00	0.42%
Reno-Sparks Indian		
Pyramid Lake Paiute	\$ 20,613.00	0.45%
Failon Palute -Shoshone	\$ 27,165.00	0.00%

	All Base	Tiered	Ti	iered Base			% of Total	Al	location		
Α	llocation	Base %	4	Allocation	\$ 1,403,526	\$ 2,319,879	Allocation	Ad	justment	Fin	al Allocation
\$	9,280	1.25%	\$	28,998	\$ 25,317	\$ 63,595	1.37%			\$	63,595
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 7,506	\$ 28,385	0.61%			\$	28,385
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 4,141	\$ 25,020	0.54%			\$	25,020
\$	9,280	4.00%	\$	92,795	\$ 470,359	\$ 572,434	12.34%			\$	572,434
\$	9,280	3.75%	\$	86,995	\$ 294,575	\$ 390,850	8.42%			\$	390,850
\$	9,280	2.00%	\$	46,398	\$ 115,119	\$ 170,796	3.68%			\$	170,796
\$	9,280	2.00%	\$	46,398	\$ 143,223	\$ 198,900	4.29%			\$	198,900
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 10,743	\$ 31,622	0.68%			\$	31,622
\$	9,280	1.25%	\$	28,998	\$ 22,335	\$ 60,613	1.31%			\$	60,613
\$	9,280	1.25%	\$	28,998	\$ 22,835	\$ 61,113	1.32%			\$	61,113
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 2,015	\$ 22,894	0.49%			\$	22,894
\$	9,280	0.25%	\$	5,800	\$ 443	\$ 15,522	0.33%	\$	(15,522)	\$	-
\$	9,280	0.25%	\$	5,800	\$ 881	\$ 15,961	0.34%	\$	(15,961)	\$	-
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 7,700	\$ 28,579	0.62%			\$	28,579
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 2,754	\$ 23,633	0.51%	\$	(23,633)	\$	-
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 2,373	\$ 23,252	0.50%			\$	23,252
\$	9,280	1.25%	\$	28,998	\$ 25,473	\$ 63,751	1.37%	\$	(63,751)	\$	-
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 2,133	\$ 23,012	0.50%			\$	23,012
\$	9,280	1.25%	\$	28,998	\$ 21,855	\$ 60,133	1.30%			\$	60,133
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 3,127	\$ 24,006	0.52%			\$	24,006
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 1,920	\$ 22,799	0.49%			\$	22,799
\$	9,280	1.75%	\$	40,598	\$ 50,537	\$ 100,414	2.16%	\$	96,111	\$	196,525
\$	9,280	1.75%	\$	40,598	\$ 46,233	\$ 96,111	2.07%	\$	(96,111)	\$	-
\$	9,280	2.00%	\$	46,398	\$ 115,048	\$ 170,725	3.68%			\$	170,725
\$	9,280	0.50%	\$	11,599	\$ 4,881	\$ 25,760	0.56%			\$	25,760
\$	231,988		\$	684,364	\$ 1,403,526	\$ 2,319,879	50.00%	\$	(118,867)	\$	2,201,012

Population Allocation

0.40%

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00

Base +Pop

-		-								
	\$	38,143	0.82%	1		\$ 38,143	0.82%		724	1.94%
	\$	27,711	0.60%			\$ 27,711	0.60%		526	1.94%
	\$	21,012	0.45%			\$ 21,012	0.45%		399	1.94%
	\$	19,368	0.42%			\$ 19,368	0.42%		368	1.94%
	\$	68,338	1.47%			\$ 68,338	1.47%	1	1,298	1.94%
	\$	174,572	3.76%		\$	\$ 174,572	3.76%	\$	3,315	1.94%
	\$	2,145,307	46.24%		\$ 118,867	\$ 2,264,173	48.80%		(163,548)	-6.74%
				-						
FY2020 Award	\$ 4	1,639,757.00	100.00%	Ī	\$ -	\$ 4,639,757.00	100.00%	\$	88,102.00	1.94%
from Last FFY		1.93560%								

\$ 4,639,757.00

22,894

% of Total

Allocation

1.37%

0.61%

0.54%

12.34%

8.42%

3.68%

4.29%

0.68%

1.31%

1.32%

0.49%

0.00%

0.00%

0.62%

0.00%

0.50%

0.00%

0.50%

1.30%

0.52%

0.49%

4.24%

0.00%

3.68%

0.56% 2,201,012 47.44%

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

```
The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions.
Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).
```

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

Scenario #18 Reductions Total

Allocation Change

Reduction/Increase

\$ 4,639,757.00

Final Allocation

Ś

\$

Ś

\$

\$

Ś

Ś

ć

Ś

64,868

30,395

27,168

555,317

380,998

168,359

195,302

33,498

62,010

62,489

- \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

% of Total

Allocation

1.40%

0.66%

0.59%

11.97%

8.21%

3.63%

4.21%

0.72%

1.34%

1.35%

Proposed for FFY2021

(19,20

(7.406)

14,859

1011

26,317

(10,888

16,952

38,059

3,498

4,771

33,565

88,102.00 1.94%

\$

% Change

-10.25%

95.64%

-3.26%

4.97%

-2.78%

11.20%

24.20%

11.66%

8.33%

116.05%

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19	Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population	Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$ 72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$ 15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$ 28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$ 529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$ 391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$ 151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$ 157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$ 30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$ 57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$ 28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$ 24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$ -	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$ -	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$ 16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$ -	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$ 23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$ -	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$ 20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$ 42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$ 12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$ 17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$ 170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$ -	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$ 142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$ 20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$ 1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$ 37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$ 27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$ 20,613.00	0.45%
Reno-Sparks Indian					
	1				

11,599	\$ 1,932	\$	25,130	0.54%			\$	25,130	0.54%		713	2.92%
5,800	\$ 424	\$	17,824	0.38%		\$ (17,824)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
5,800	\$ 845	\$	18,244	0.39%		\$ (18,244)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
11,599	\$ 7,382	\$	30,581	0.66%			\$	30,581	0.66%		14,138	85.98%
11,599	\$ 2,641	\$	25,839	0.56%		\$ (25,839)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
11,599	\$ 2,275	\$	25,474	0.55%			\$	25,474	0.55%		1,882	7.98%
28,998	\$ 24,420	\$	65,018	1.40%		\$ (65,018)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
11,599	\$ 2,044	\$	25,243	0.54%			\$	25,243	0.54%		4,520	21.81%
28,998	\$ 20,951	\$	61,549	1.33%			\$	61,549	1.33%		18,953	44.50%
11,599	\$ 2,998	\$	26,196	0.56%			\$	26,196	0.56%		13,696	109.57%
11,599	\$ 1,840	\$	25,039	0.54%			\$	25,039	0.54%		7,232	40.61%
40,598	\$ 48,449	\$	100,646	2.17%		\$ 96,520	\$	197,166	4.25%		26,289	15.38%
40,598	\$ 44,323	\$	96,520	2.08%		\$ (96,520)	\$	-	0.00%		0	#DIV/0!
46,398	\$ 110,294	\$	168,291	3.63%			\$	168,291	3.63%		26,161	18.41%
	4 4 6 7 9	<u>^</u>	37.070	0.60%			ć	27 979	0.60%		7 979	30 30%
11,599	\$ 4,679	Ş	27,878	0.00%			Ş	21,010	0.0078		7,676	33.3370
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530	\$ \$	2,319,879	50.00%		\$ (126,925)	\$	2,192,953	47.26%	\$	240,277	12.30%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530	\$ \$	2,319,879	50.00%		\$ (126,925)	\$	2,192,953	47.26%	\$	240,277	12.30%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530	\$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - 38,143	0.80% 50.00%	1	\$ (126,925)	\$	2,192,953 38,143	0.82%	\$	240,277	12.30%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530	\$ \$	2,319,879 2,319,879 - 38,143	0.80% 50.00%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$	2,192,953 38,143	47.26%	\$	240,277	12.30%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530	\$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - 38,143 27,711	0.80%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$	27,878 2,192,953 38,143 27,711	0.82% 0.60%	\$	240,277 724 526	1.94%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530 -	\$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - - 38,143 27,711 21,012	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012	0.60% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45%	\$	7,878 240,277 724 526 399	12.30% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,679 \$ 1,345,530	\$ \$ \$ \$	2,319,879 - 38,143 27,711 21,012	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$	2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012	0.60% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45%	\$	240,277 724 526 399	1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,6/9 \$ 1,345,530 -	\$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368	0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42%	\$	7,878 240,277 724 526 399 368	1.94% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	\$ 4,6/9 \$ 1,345,530 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368	0.60% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45%	\$	7,878 240,277 724 526 399 368	1.94% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	5 4,6/9 \$ 1,345,530 -	\$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368	0.80% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42%	\$	7,078 240,277 724 526 399 368	12.30% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	5 4,6/9 \$ 1,345,530 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,973 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368 68,338	0.80% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42%	\$	7,078 240,277 724 526 399 368 1,298	1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	5 4,6/9 \$ 1,345,530 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47% 3.76%		\$ (126,925)	> \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,973 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368 68,338 174,572	0.80% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47% 3.76%	\$	1,078 240,277 724 526 399 368 1,298 3,315	1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	<u>\$ 4,6/9</u> <u>\$ 1,345,530</u> -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368 68,338 174,572	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47% 3.76%		\$ - (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,873 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368 68,338 174,572	0.80% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47% 3.76%	\$	1,078 240,277 724 526 399 368 1,298 3,315	1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94%
11,599 684,364	<u>\$ 4,6/9</u> <u>\$ 1,345,530</u> -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	27,878 2,319,879 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368 68,338 174,572 2,145,307	0.80% 50.00% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47% 3.76%		\$ (126,925)	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	2,192,953 2,192,953 38,143 27,711 21,012 19,368 68,338 174,572 2,272,232	0.80% 47.26% 0.82% 0.60% 0.45% 0.45% 0.42% 1.47% 3.76% 48.97%	\$	1,078 240,277 724 526 399 368 1,298 3,315 (155,489)	12.30% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94% 1.94%

\$

Local Total	2,700,551	3,112,935	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$	27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$	20,613.00	0.45%
Reno-Sparks Indian						
Colony				\$	19,000.00	0.42%
Nevada Tribal Emergency						
Coordinating Council				\$	67,040.00	1.47%
Tribal Total				\$	171,257.00	3.76%
State Allocation				\$	2,427,721.12	53.34%
FFY19 Award Total				\$	4,551,655.00	100.00%
				_		

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves. If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county. If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management. The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions. Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

1.93560%

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00

Base +Pop

2,319,879

64,868

30,395

27,168

555,317

380,998

168,359

195,302

33,498

62,010

62,489

% of Total

Allocation

1.40%

0.66%

0.59%

11 97%

8.21%

3.63%

4.21%

0.72%

1.34%

1.35%

Allocation

Adjustment

Population Allocation

1,345,530

24,271 \$

7,196

3,970 \$

450.923 **\$**

282,403 \$

110,362 \$

137.305

10,299

21,412

21,892 \$

0.50%

All Base

Allocation

11,599

11,599

11,599

11 599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11.599

11,599

11,599

11,599

11,599 289,985 Tiered

Base %

1.25%

0.50%

0.50%

4 00%

3.75%

2.00%

2 00%

0.50%

1.25%

1.25%

0.50%

0.25%

0.25%

0.50%

0.50%

0.50% \$

1.25%

0.50%

1.25%

0.50%

0.50%

1.75%

1.75% \$

2.00% \$

0.50%

Ś

Tiered Base

Allocation

28,998

11,599

11.599

92,795

86,995

46,398

46.398

11,599

28,998

28,998

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

% Change from Last FFY

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

Scenario #19 **Reductions Total**

Allocation Change

Reduction/Increase

\$ 4,639,757.00

Final Allocation

147,071 \$ 2,292,378 49.41%

- \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

Ś

Ś

\$

Ś

68,053

35,419

32,540

512,526

% of Total

Allocation

1.47%

0.76%

0.70%

11.05%

Proposed for FFY2021

(56,215

(4.221)

19,883

4,458

(135,343) -5.57%

88,102.00 1.94%

\$

(16,474

% Change

-5.84%

127.98%

15.87%

-3.11%

Draft County & City Allocation by Population & Base Proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 effective October 1, 2020

	2010 Census	7/1/19	% of 7/1/19		Standard	% of Total
Local Governments	Population	Population	Population		Allocation	Allocation
Carson City	55,274	56,151	1.80%	\$	72,274.00	1.59%
Churchill	16,271	16,648	0.53%	\$	15,536.00	0.34%
Fallon	8,606	9,184	0.30%	\$	28,082.85	0.62%
Clark	877,547	1,043,227	33.51%	\$	529,000.00	11.62%
Las Vegas	583,756	653,350	20.99%	\$	391,886.00	8.61%
N Las Vegas	216,961	255,327	8.20%	\$	151,407.00	3.33%
Henderson	257,729	317,660	10.20%	\$	157,243.03	3.45%
Mesquite	15,276	23,827	0.77%	\$	30,000.00	0.66%
Douglas	46,997	49,537	1.59%	\$	57,239.00	1.26%
Elko	44,408	50,647	1.63%	\$	28,924.00	0.64%
West Wendover	4,410	4,469	0.14%	\$	24,417.00	0.54%
Esmeralda	783	982	0.03%	\$	-	0.00%
Eureka	1,987	1,955	0.06%	\$	-	0.00%
Humboldt	16,528	17,079	0.55%	\$	16,443.00	0.36%
Lander	5,775	6,109	0.20%	\$	-	0.00%
Lincoln	5,345	5,264	0.17%	\$	23,592.00	0.52%
Lyon	51,980	56,497	1.81%	\$	-	0.00%
Mineral	4,772	4,730	0.15%	\$	20,723.00	0.46%
Nye	43,946	48,472	1.56%	\$	42,596.00	0.94%
Pershing	6,753	6,935	0.22%	\$	12,500.00	0.27%
Storey	4,010	4,258	0.14%	\$	17,807.00	0.39%
Washoe	105,922	112,088	3.60%	\$	170,877.00	3.75%
Sparks	90,264	102,543	3.29%	\$	-	0.00%
Reno	225,221	255,170	8.20%	\$	142,130.00	3.12%
White Pine	10,030	10,826	0.35%	\$	20,000.00	0.44%
Local Total	2,700,551	3,112,935	100.00%	\$	1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$	37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$	27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$	20,613.00	0.45%
Reno-Sparks Indian						
Colony				ć	19 000 00	0.42%

3.75%	\$ 86,995	\$ 251,972	\$ 356,366	7.68%		\$	356,366	7.68%	(35,520)	-9.06%
2.00%	\$ 46,398	\$ 98,470	\$ 162,266	3.50%		\$	162,266	3.50%	10,859	7.17%
2.00%	\$ 46,398	\$ 122,509	\$ 186,306	4.02%		\$	186,306	4.02%	29,063	18.48%
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 9,189	\$ 38,188	0.82%		\$	38,188	0.82%	8,188	27.29%
1.25%	\$ 28,998	\$ 19,104	\$ 65,502	1.41%		\$	65,502	1.41%	8,263	14.44%
1.25%	\$ 28,998	\$ 19,533	\$ 65,930	1.42%		\$	65,930	1.42%	37,006	127.94%
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 1,724	\$ 30,722	0.66%		\$	30,722	0.66%	6,305	25.82%
0.25%	\$ 5,800	\$ 379	\$ 23,578	0.51%	\$ (23,578) \$	-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
0.25%	\$ 5,800	\$ 754	\$ 23,953	0.52%	\$ (23,953) \$	-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 6,587	\$ 35,585	0.77%		\$	35,585	0.77%	19,142	116.42%
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 2,356	\$ 31,354	0.68%	\$ (31,354	\$	-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 2,030	\$ 31,029	0.67%		\$	31,029	0.67%	7,437	31.52%
1.25%	\$ 28,998	\$ 21,789	\$ 68,186	1.47%	\$ (68,186)\$	-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 1,824	\$ 30,823	0.66%		\$	30,823	0.66%	10,100	48.74%
1.25%	\$ 28,998	\$ 18,694	\$ 65,091	1.40%		\$	65,091	1.40%	22,495	52.81%
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 2,675	\$ 31,673	0.68%		\$	31,673	0.68%	19,173	153.38%
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 1,642	\$ 30,641	0.66%		\$	30,641	0.66%	12,834	72.07%
1.75%	\$ 40,598	\$ 43,228	\$ 101,225	2.18%	\$ 97,544	\$	198,769	4.28%	27,892	16.32%
1.75%	\$ 40,598	\$ 39,547	\$ 97,544	2.10%	\$ (97,544)\$	-	0.00%	0	#DIV/0!
2.00%	\$ 46,398	\$ 98,409	\$ 162,206	3.50%		\$	162,206	3.50%	20,076	14.12%
0.50%	\$ 11,599	\$ 4,175	\$ 33,174	0.71%		\$	33,174	0.71%	13,174	65.87%
	\$ 684,364	\$ 1,200,537	\$ 2,319,879	50.00%	\$ (147,071)\$	2,172,808	46.83%	\$ 220,131	11.27%
		-	-							
			\$ 38,143	0.82%		\$	38,143	0.82%	724	1.94%
			\$ 27,711	0.60%		\$	27,711	0.60%	526	1.94%
			\$ 21,012	0.45%		\$	21,012	0.45%	399	1.94%
			\$ 19,368	0.42%		\$	19,368	0.42%	 368	1.94%
			\$ 68,338	1.47%		\$	68,338	1.47%	1,298	1.94%
			\$ 174,572	3.76%	\$ 	\$	174,572	3.76%	\$ 3,315	1.94%

Ś

Local Total	2,700,551	<u>3,112,935</u>	100.00%	\$ 1,952,676.88	42.90%
Duck Water Shoshone				\$ 37,419.00	0.82%
Fallon Paiute -Shoshone				\$ 27,185.00	0.60%
Pyramid Lake Paiute				\$ 20,613.00	0.45%
Reno-Sparks Indian					
Colony				\$ 19,000.00	0.42%
Nevada Tribal Emergency					
Coordinating Council				\$ 67,040.00	1.47%
Tribal Total				\$ 171,257.00	3.76%
State Allocation				\$ 2,427,721.12	53.34%
FFY19 Award Total				\$ 4,551,655.00	100.00%

Any increases or decreases to future grant awards will be shared equally between the two halves.

If a county does not have an eligible program, that county's amount gets re-allocated to the state. Per NRS 414.090, each county shall establish a local organization for emergency management.

If a city does not have an eligible program, that city's amount gets re-allocated to the county.

The award will be allocated 50% to counties/cities and 50% to state/tribal.

The State Administrative Agent may consider re-allocations outside of the formula amounts based on agreements between jurisdictions.

Tribal allocations will be managed from the state portion through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).

Based on the formula, allocations may change annually if there is a change in the overall award amount.

% Change from Last FFY

Population will be updated when Census numbers are released and five years after the Census based on State Demographer estimates. https://tax.nv.gov/Publications/Population_Statistics_and_Reports/

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00

Base +Pop

2,319,879

68,053

35,419

32,540

512,526

\$ 2,145,307 46.24%

1.93560%

FFY2020 Award \$ 4,639,757.00 100.00%

% of Total

Allocation

1.47%

0.76%

0.70%

11.05%

Allocation

Adjustment

Population Allocation

1,200,537

21,655 \$

6,420

3.542 **\$**

402,332 \$

0.75%

All Base

Allocation

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399 17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399 17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399

17,399 17,399

434,977

Tiered

Base %

1.25%

0.50%

0.50%

4.00%

Tiered Base

Allocation

28,998

11,599

11.599

92,795

AGENDA ITEM #5a

FFY 2023	L NEVADA HOMELAND SECURITY G	RANT PROGRAM	
	TENTATIVE DELIVERABLES AND ME	ETING TIMELINE	
		Meeting or	
Meeting or Deliverable	Description of Mosting (Delivorable	Deliverable	Meeting Time or
Completion of the 2020 THIRA/SPR	THIRA/SPR data is captured and used to identify gap changes in capability statewide - Used by the NCHS to establish HSGP priorities for the following year.	12/31/2020	TBD
FFY 2021 HSGP NOFO Released	Release of the FFY 2021 HSGP NOFO indicates allotment of funding applied to SHSP and UASI funding streams - This is the money Nevada projects will compete for.	Potentially February 2021	TBD
Release of FFY21 HSGP Project Proposal requirements for Nevada's Grant application.	FFY21 HSGP Project Proposal submission into Online Grants Portal	Potentially February 2021	TBD
Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) Meeting #1	FFY21 HSGP project submission overview	Potentially February 2021	TBD
Urban Area Working Group (UAWG) Meeting #1	FFY21 HSGP project review for UASI and UASI/SHSP split projects – UASI only and UASI/SHSP split project presenters MUST attend.	Potentially February 2021	TBD
Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) Meeting #1	FFY21 Discussion of HSGP timeline and overview	Potentially March 2021	TBD
Urban Area Working Group (UAWG) Meeting #2	FFY21 UASI Project Prioritizing	Potentially March 2021	TBD
Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) Meeting #2	FFY21 HSGP project review for SHSP or SHSP/UASI projects - Project presenter(s) for SHSP-only and SHSP/UASI split project submissions MUST attend.	Potentially March 2021	TBD
Nevada Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (OCDC) Review	Review of FFY21 cybersecurity-specific project submissions, prioritization, and recommendation to the Co-Chairs of the NRAC	Potentially March 2021	TBD
Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) Review	Review of FFY21 communications-specific project submissions, prioritization, and recommendation to the Co-Chairs of the NRAC	Potentially March 2021	TBD
Urban Area Working Group (UASI) Meeting #3	UAWG meeting tentative (if necessary, to revise any FFY21 UASI project requests/strategies, etc.)	Potentially March 2021	TBD
Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) – Finance Committee Meeting	Review of FFY21 NRAC recommendations for SHSP-only and SHSP/UASI split funded HSGP projects and to hear informational only UAWG recommendations for UASI-only HSGP funding; Project presenter(s) with projects recommended for funding should attend.	Potentially April 2021	TBD
Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) Meeting	Monthly Scheduled Meeting – In the event anything needs to be addressed with the FFY21 HSGP process, it will be added to this meeting agenda.	Potentially April 2021	TBD
Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) Meeting #2	Review and Approval of FFY21 NRAC and UAWG recommendations; Project presenter(s) with projects recommended for funding should attend.	Potentially April 2021	TBD
Final State Application due to FEMA DHS	Submission by DEM/HS of the final 2021 HSGP Grant application to DHS for consideration of project funding	Potentially April 2021	To DHS by required time

Strategic Capacities to be Maintained in FFY 2020

Approved by the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security on October 21, 2019

Background

During 2018, the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) voted to approve changes to the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP). Previously, the NCHS members would vote to establish the five priority Core Capabilities from the Department of Homeland Security's list of 32. These five priority Core Capabilities would drive the grant process for both grant streams under HSGP, the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSP) and the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI).

Current Process

Following the 2018 vote of the NCHS, the current process requires the State Administrative Agent and the Urban Area Administrator to develop a list of strategic capacities to be maintained in order to recommend priorities for funding in the upcoming cycle. These strategic capacities were developed with input from the NCHS Finance Committee and the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) in anticipation of the FFY 2020 HSGP process.

Strategic Capacities Defined

A strategic capacity is a defined as the outcome of a program or system developed by a Nevada jurisdiction that would have a significant negative effect on Nevada's safety and stability if lost.

Strategic Capacities to be Maintained

The following nine strategic capacities are recommended to be maintained by the NCHS in FFY 2020. They are not provided in order of priority.

	FUSION CENTERS
Strategic Capacity:	 Programs: Southern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center Nevada Threat Analysis Center Core Capabilities: Intelligence and Information Sharing Planning Interdiction and Disruption Screening, Search, and Detection
	CITIZENS CORPS
Strategic Capacity:	Program(s): • City of Las Vegas • Douglas County • Carson City • Washoe County • Elko County • Statewide Tribal
	Core Capabilities: Public Information and Warning Mass Care Search and Rescue Operational Communication Health and Social Services Housing

	NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Strategic Capacity:	 Program(s): State of Nevada DEM Tribal NIMS Core Capabilities: Operational Coordination Situational Assessment

Strategic Capacity:	CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, NUCLEAR, AND EXPLOSIVE (CBRNE)
	 Program(s): Tahoe-Douglas Bomb Squad Elko Bomb Squad Consolidated Bomb Squad (Washoe, Reno, and Sparks) Las Vegas Bomb Squad Las Vegas ARMOR
	 Core Capabilities: Forensics and Attribution Interdiction and Disruption Public Health, Healthcare, and Emergency Medical Services Urban Area Hazardous Materials Program (UASI)

	OPERATIONAL COMMUNICATION
Strategic Capacity:	 Program(s): Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) Core Capabilities: Operational Communication

	PUBLIC INFORMATION AND WARNING
Strategic Capacity:	 Program(s): Emergency Alert System Core Capabilities: Planning Operational Communication

	RECOVERY
	 Program(s): Nevada Disaster Recovery Framework
	Core Capabilities:
	Community Resilience
	Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction
	 Public Information and Warning
	Operational Coordination
	Infrastructure Systems
01	Critical Transportation
Strategic Capacity:	 Environmental Response/Health and Safety
	Fatality Management
	Fire Management and Suppression
	 Logistics and Supply Chain Management
	Mass Care Services
	 Mass Search and Rescue Operations
	 On-Scene Security, Protection, and Law Enforcement
	Operational Communication
	Public Health, Healthcare, and Emergency Medical Services
	Situational Assessment
	Planning
	- Flamming

	CYBER SECURITY
Strategic Capacity:	 Program(s): Incident Response Plan Education and Awareness Threat Identification Core Capabilities: Intelligence and Information Sharing Forensics and Attribution Planning Access Control and Identity Verification Physical Protective Measures Supply Chain Integrity and Security Risk and Disaster Resilience Assessment Infrastructure Systems Operational Communications Training

	PLANNING
Strategic Capacity:	 Program(s): Continuity of Operations Mass Fatality Community Resilience Metropolitan Medical Response System (UASI) Core Capabilities: Planning