



Steve Sisolak
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

**GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF
SCIENCE, INNOVATION &
TECHNOLOGY**

100 North Stewart Street, Suite 220
Carson City, Nevada 89701
775-687-0987 Fax: 775-687-0990



Brian L. Mitchell
Director

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Name of Organization: Graduate Medical Education (GME) Task Force
Date and Time of Meeting: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 @ 9:00 A.M.
Place of Meeting: Nevada State Library and Archives (NSLA) Building
Governor's Office of Science, Innovation & Technology
100 North Stewart Street, Suite 220
Carson City, NV 89701

If you are unable to join the meeting in person, please use the following numbers:

Northern: 775-687-0999 or
Southern: 702-486-5260
Access code: 70987 then push #

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Brian Mitchell

The Graduate Medical Education (GME) Task Force was called to order by Chair Brian Mitchell at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, May 29, 2019, by telephone conference and located at the Nevada State Library and Archives, Governor's Office of Science, Innovation & Technology, Suite 220, 100 North Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701.

Members Present:

Barbara Atkinson, MD
Bill Welch
Brian L. Mitchell
Chris Bosse
Sam Kaufman
Susanne Bierman
Thomas Schwenk, MD
Wolfgang Gilliar, DO

Members Absent:

Gillian Barclay, DDS, DrPH
Mark Penn, MD, MBA
Ramu Komanduri, MD

Guests Present:

Alison Netski, MD – Chair, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health, Associate Professor, UNLV School of Medicine

Gregory Brown, MD – Professor, Department of Psychiatry, UNLV School of Medicine

Kate Martin, MD – Associate Dean for GME Education & Designated Institutional Official, UNLV School of Medicine

Leon Ravin, MD – Psychiatric Medical Director, NV Division of Public and Behavioral Health

Ferenc Puskas, MD, PhD, MBA – Anesthesiology Program Director, HCA Healthcare

Robert L. Turner, M.Ed. ID, B.S.HIM, Simulation Manager/Grant Administration, Graduate Medical Education, HCA Healthcare

Cortland Lohff, MD - Public Health & General Preventive Medicine Specialist, Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD)

Joseph Iser, MD – Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD)

Staff Present:

Debra Petrelli, OSIT

Tracey Gaffney, OSIT

- 2. Public Comment** (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.)

There was no public comment.

- 3. Welcoming Remarks and Announcements**

Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell thanked everyone for participating in the meeting today. There were no announcements.

- 4. Approval of the Minutes from the May 6, 2019 GME Meeting** (For possible action)

Brian Mitchell

Chair Mitchell asked if there were any changes or corrections to the May 6, 2019 Minutes. There were none. Dr. Atkinson made a motion to approve the Minutes of May 6, 2019. Mr. Kaufman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- 5. Discussion and Possible Vote on Funding Recommendations to the Governor Regarding Applications Received for the GME New and Expanded Program Grants Round 6** (For possible action)

Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell said three applications were received for the GME New and Expanded Program Round 6 funding. He said the remaining amount of funding this fiscal year totals \$1,675,480, and the three applications total \$2,424,226.50, adding there is a funding deficit of approximately \$750,000. He said the three applicants are Mountain View Hospital (MVH) with a Radiology Residency Program requesting \$1,145,685.50; Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) with a Public Health and General Preventative Medicine Program requesting \$707,240; and University of Nevada, Las Vegas School of Medicine (UNLV) with a Forensic Psychology Fellowship Program requesting \$571,301.

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that MHV has a training capacity each year of 5 residents, SNHD has a training capacity of 2 residents each year, and UNLV also has a training capacity of 2 residents each year. He said the average score of the applications comprised by the GME Task Force for MVH was 78%, the average score for SNHD was 67.64% and the average score for UNLV was 76.11%. He said, as in the past, the task force will proceed with the applicant with the highest average score, proceeding to the lowest average score giving applicant representatives a chance to answer questions from members of the task force, after which the task force will have a discussion on the various applications for recommendation of funding amounts to be presented to the Governor.

Mountain View Hospital
Radiology-Diagnostic Residency Program

Robert L. Turner, M.Ed. ID, B.S.HIM
Ferenc Puskas, MD, PhD, MBA

Mr. Mitchell opened up the meeting for questions from members of the task force for Mountain View Hospital (MVH).

Dr. Atkinson asked how MVH plans to fill the 5 radiology slots. Dr. Puskas explained they see many secondary applicants, and feels their residency program is very popular. He pointed out they plan on regular meetings and communications with their academic affiliate University of Nevada Reno School of Medicine (UNR) and will also reach out to University of Nevada Las Vegas School of Medicine (UNLV) and Touro Osteopathic School of Medicine regarding the program training opportunities with Sunrise Health GME. He added that GME websites have been created announcing the approval and recruitment for residency programs and believes they can fill the slots one hundred percent. Dr. Schwenk added that UNR has had some student interest, but certainly not enough to fill all 5 slots from UNR. He noted that radiology is in demand nationally however interest has fallen somewhat with more interest shifting towards interventional radiology which requires subsequent fellowship training. Dr. Atkinson remarked that 5 radiology slots seems like a high number and asked for an update on the approval process of the application by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME). Dr. Puskas replied the program recruitment is being finalized and are hopeful for a final phone call this week with a timeline launch for July 2020. Dr. Atkinson commented this is a very tight timeline without yet having a program director and asked whether it is known which faculty members will be involved with the program. Dr. Puskas replied they do know by contract through the consortium, which includes Mountain View Hospital, Sunrise Hospital, Sunrise Children's Hospital and Southern Hills Hospital, and have had discussions for over a year on recruitment. He added it is very difficult to recruit in radiology in Nevada, but they continue to have the experience and support of their application for the program to finalize it.

Dr. Atkinson said it appears that funding for construction had already been committed by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and asked whether any construction had started or whether MVH had received some of the funding for construction. Dr. Turner replied the limited construction in their proposal is for the educational site for radiology which includes a dedicated PACS reading room and offices, and said he is not aware of any other funding received for this purpose. Dr. Turner replied the construction referred to in

this proposal is still an empty space and has not been constructed per plans to build out for radiology.

Dr. Schwenk reinforced Dr. Atkinson's comment and concern about accreditation. He said he has serious concerns about approving total funding or even substantial funding for programs that clearly have a long way to go in the accreditation process. He pointed out it would be very difficult for the task force to defend their decisions to the Governor or to the legislature if substantial support is provided for a program that was not accredited or in some delayed process. He said he does have enthusiasm for these programs in general and their general need, and believes grants and partial grants to keep the process moving would be good, however the task force needs to be very careful in funding programs that are not accredited by the ACGME. Dr. Puskas said he feels the purpose of this grant is to startup GME programs, and this program is exactly the purpose of starting up a GME program. He discussed MVH's track record with other programs launched prior to being accredited, which ultimately were accredited, and believes this should add some assurance that this program will be accredited as well.

Dr. Schwenk said the problem is this initiative got started with programs that were expanding programs and programs already in the queue with a lot of upfront activity, not funded in previous rounds. He said now we are seeing programs that potentially have a long way to go. He said Dr. Atkinson is exactly right in terms of the timeframe and he feels past performance is no prediction for the future in GME.

Dr. Gilliar said regarding further outreach, with the shift of diagnostic radiology and competition with radiology services provided in Nevada, more physician coverage is needed and asked how this residency will be able to create the outreach, such as telemedicine or similar, that focuses on the population in Nevada. He said his concern is whether MVH feels prepared to deliver this program helping to transform some of the needs for radiology and deliver radiologic services via telemedicine where others are not. Dr. Puskas replied that as part of their curriculum, focus and support in communities throughout Nevada significantly increases after residency in radiology. He added that MVH, through follow up surveys, inquires whether residents would like to live in Nevada and/or stay in the local region, and typically the response is to stay in Nevada, which is very positive for retention.

Mr. Mitchell asked for clarification on the number of residents budgeted for 20 hours per week per team. Dr. Puskas confirmed 5 residents. Mr. Mitchell asked how funding for residency salaries would be paid. Dr. Puskas responded the salaries are still within MVH's spending cap period for allocating those funds in GME until 2021. Mr. Mitchell said for clarification and according to MVH's proposed timeline, salaries will be paid via MVH's budget spending cap for the residents coming on board. Dr. Puskas replied that was correct.

Mr. Mitchell commented on the line item request for \$125,000 for computers, high-resolution monitors and software under the training and "curriculum expense," however under "facility expense" another \$44,000 is requested for desktop personal computers, scanners, printers, etc., for the program director and coordinator. He pointed out it appears to be a lot of money for computers and asked for clarification. Dr. Turner replied the equipment listed under "Curriculum and Training" is specific PACS reading room equipment which is rather expensive and several vendors were looked at, all with the same competitive pricing. He said MVH is attempting to match what is currently in the facility

reading room, which is a dedicated educational space specifically for radiology. He said the other equipment is for the director's office and the radiology suite in order to start up the program. Mr. Mitchell said if there are four staff, a director, core faculty, subspecialty faculty, a program coordinator and five residents, \$44,000 appears to be a high amount for personal computers, scanner and printers. Dr. Turner replied it is five residents per class in a four-year program, with other core faculty in addition teaching those residents. Mr. Mitchell said if this grant is funded, the task force would need to see more specifics on these items and have this broken out to better understand the costs in this area.

Mr. Mitchell said he has a concern regarding recruitment and pointed out the application states that MVH intends to have conversations regarding recruitment with the University of Nevada Reno (UNR), University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) and Touro University. He asked whether those conversations had taken place since the application was submitted. Dr. Puskas replied that MVH has constant conversations with these schools, but have not had any other specific conversations on this topic at this time.

Mr. Mitchell, referring to accreditation, said it appears the application to the ACGME is expected to be submitted in late summer 2019, and asked for clarification on "late summer." Dr. Puskas replied in order to get on the January agenda, the application needs to be submitted approximately three months prior, making the deadline the end of September 2019.

Dr. Schwenk commented on the timetable, pointing out with the uncertainty of recruiting a Program Director, at the very best, puts the program very late into the match-process. Dr. Puskas replied they have a large residency transition and commented on being able to fill residency programs from Emergency Medicine to Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation (PM&R), all with January approval dates, similar to this application. He said he is confident based on past experience, this timeline will work. Mr. Mitchell asked if the accreditation is not approved in January 2020, what the timeline would be for the next accreditation. Dr. Puskas replied typically meetings are twice a year. Mr. Mitchell said in that case the first residents would be accepted in 2021 rather than in 2020. Dr. Puskas replied that is correct. Mr. Mitchell asked what funding is currently needed to become accredited in January 2020, and if this program is not funded, whether MVH would still submit their application as planned in September 2019 for accreditation and what activities are needed to be done in order to become accredited. Dr. Puskas replied the facility expense and training of core faculty is critical. Mr. Mitchell asked whether the operating expense category could be looked at in the future if accreditation is achieved. Dr. Puskas replied it could.

Mr. Kaufman suggested, after consideration of the last statement made, that MVH forego the requested operation expenses at this time. Mr. Mitchell commented that for only training, curriculum and facility expenses the funding request totals \$915,685.

There were no further questions for Mountain View Hospital.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas School of Medicine
Forensic Psychiatry Fellowship Program

Alison Netski, MD

Kate Martin, MD

Gregory Brown, MD

Leon Ravin, MD

Mr. Mitchell opened up the meeting for questions from members of the task force for University of Nevada Las Vegas School of Medicine (UNLV).

Mr. Mitchell commented on the lengthy timeline with fellows not starting until July 2021, and asked why funding is being requested now. Dr. Netski pointed out that in forensic psychiatry a fellow can go outside of the match, which is typically in place well before their fourth year of training. She said UNLV believes fellows could be secured for next year given the fact the program would not be accredited in the fall of 2019, which is when the bulk of recruitment occurs. She said she does not feel they would be successful in recruiting a fellow for the summer of 2020. Dr. Schwenk asked what the purpose is to hire faculty so far in advance. Dr. Netski replied that with experience from other programs it would enable them to write the curriculum, build the education structure, and build the site which currently does not exist. She added that with the complexity in the curriculum involved in starting a new program and being able to carve out the hours of someone's time to build this curriculum will be important to the success of the program. Dr. Schwenk asked whether a program director would be needed this year to do most of that work. Dr. Martin said the amount of time dedicated by core faculty requires a key group committed and invested in this program from day-one, which would be along-side the program director. She said that amount of time is commensurate with the upstart of a program.

Dr. Schwenk asked about the updated status of proposed funding from Stein Hospital Forensic Unit/ Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (SNAMHS). Dr. Ravin said this funding is allocated by the legislature and in the past the legislature has supported all extensions of the psychiatry residency training program for the State of Nevada. He said he cannot speak on behalf of the Governor's budget, but can say SNAMHS has provided training grounds for residents for many years and presently provides training grounds for senior residents in forensic psychiatry. He further discussed how residents receive training in their respective disciplines at this training site. Dr. Schwenk said because this is not going to be reimbursed by CMS, inquired about the sustainability of the program. Dr. Ravin said that funding is allocated by legislature with funds dedicated to GME training, but he cannot speak to the total amount of dollars, specifically for the forensic fellowship training program. He further discussed the opportunity of presenting the program again in two years at the next legislative session as this program goes forward. Dr. Schwenk said he knows the dilemmas of funding for training, faculty selection and resident support, and as much as he supports this program would appreciate a more concise plan for sustainability.

Dr. Ravin replied that UNLV already funds senior residents who have done forensic rotations at the training facility. He said the state is already supporting those rotations, offering more than just competency training in forensics. He added that UNLV is supportive of that part of the training as it is and believes that any minor adjustments could be discussed as part of the Governor's state budget. Dr. Netski pointed out that SNAMHS is

not the only partner supporting UNLV fellows programs, and they do have an additional partner in the community who holds the contract for the detention center.

Mr. Mitchell commented on the letter of commitment from Dr. Jonathan Wirjo from Focus Mental Health Solutions (FMHS), stating it appears FMHS is committed to funding one FTE fellow's salary and benefits, as well as \$5,000 per year in funding for fellows and program directors to attend required educational conferences. He asked what the specific amount of money is expected to be received from Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), necessary to be built into a future budget. Dr. Netski said the cost for a PGY-5, fellow salary with benefits at that particular year, will be looked at. She said in addition they will be doing contracting which supports the clinical faculty that will be working hand-in-hand with the fellows at the that facility. Dr. Gilliar asked what the anticipated salary is for a PGY5. Dr. Netski replied the salary will be approximately \$65,000 plus benefits per year. Dr. Gilliar commented, in coming from New York, salaries are closer to \$100,000, and feels this makes Nevada less competitive. Mr. Mitchell said it sounds like the cost coming to DPBH in the future would be approximately \$65,000 in salary, and possibly another \$15,000 to \$20,000 in fringe benefits, and one-half of a faculty FTE approximately \$100,000, making a grand total of approximately \$200,000. He asked whether that is a reasonable amount of money to absorb into the existing budget or to ask for additional funding in the next fiscal years' Governor's budget. Dr. Raven replied he cannot speak on behalf of the Governor or the legislature's intent in two years from now, but based on recent experience, every budget cycle has been able to expand GME funding and currently arrangements with core medical faculty has been made to provide services at SNAMHS, supporting faculty salaries. He said currently they have senior residents rotating at SNAMHS doing forensic training, amounting to one-half FTE PGY4, which is not much different than a PGY5 salary for a psychiatry fellow. He said if this program is implemented, additional funds every year to expand GME training in the State of Nevada could be requested. He added that currently there is no forensic fellowship training program in the state, leading to every year more and more residents going out of state to pursue careers in forensic psychiatry. He pointed out that three years in a row residents have left the state to pursue forensic psychiatry training elsewhere, and emphasized the importance of retaining residents who pursue careers in the State of Nevada. He said he hopes to change that course. Dr. Schwenk said he would endorse that comment as well and agreed it is very much needed. Dr. Brown commented that in UNLV's experience with the state, SNAMHS has been their core foundational support member since the program started in 2004 and has been a major partner and training site for both in-patient and out-patient services, and UNLV continues to look forward to working with them in the indefinite future.

Ms. Bosse asked, given the significant need for forensic psychiatry, why only 2 fellows are being considered for the program as it appears a fixed cost is being spent and only 2 residents per year graduate, and also asked whether that number might increase. Dr. Brown replied currently there are almost no forensic psychology programs across the United States that take more than 2 fellows per year. He said going beyond 2 fellows would be more than the largest and most prestigious programs in the United States and added that 2 fellows per year fall in line with national standards but possibly with the growth of GME, Nevada could expand in the future. Dr. Netski commented on existing psychiatry programs in Southern and Northern Nevada and said with 2 new programs starting up the number of graduates will greatly increase, allowing UNLV to consider expanding in the future. Dr. Martin said

UNLV definitely wants to demonstrate success and would be open to expansion in the future if it looks feasible.

Mr. Mitchell inquired about the requested \$10,000 for training for GME infrastructure support and asked for additional details on that line item. Dr. Martin replied that from the GME standpoint, they are bringing in new programs online requiring specialized training for staff on the specifics of that program and the need to get the program in place by meeting all of the requirements. Mr. Mitchell asked whether this would be extra-duty pay. Dr. Martin said yes, it includes hours and/or people to support the startup of the program.

There were no further questions for UNLV.

Southern Nevada Health District
Public Health and General Preventive Medicine Residency Program

Cortland Lohff, MD
Joseph Iser, MD

Mr. Mitchell opened up the meeting for questions from members of the task force for Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD).

Dr. Schwenk said the key issue with this application is sustainability and asked for an update from SNHD. Dr. Lohff replied that last November 2018, the task force also had sustainability high on the list of concerns on SNHD's application. He said the current plan for ongoing funding for the program is outlined with several possibilities for sustainability in the application. He said the largest source of funding continues to be The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) preventive medicine residency training program through competitive grants. He said HRSA has set up a special program to fund preventive medicine and residency programs across the country and because these programs are not hospital-based, there is no Medicare or Medicaid funding that supports them. He said currently HRSA has a grant that is funding a number of residency programs around the country. He added that HRSA's next competitive grant will be available in 2023, which SNHD will apply for and anticipating it to provide funding of the program for a five year period. He added that if additional funding becomes available between now and 2023, SNHD will certainly apply for that funding as well. He said the second major funding source is applied directly to the health district through fees, grants, and property taxes. He said it had been anticipated the Public Health Improvement Fund, which was a bill introduced during this current legislative session, would be funded and SNHD could use it as another source of funding, however it did not pass legislation. He commented on another source of funding being considered involving discussions with a number of other institutions in the Las Vegas area, including the Southern Nevada Veteran's Administration (VA), other hospital systems, non-profits, as well as UNLV to identify potential rotation sites for SNHD residents. He said if agreements are worked out with these other institutions a portion of the resident's salaries consistent with the time spent at each institution will be supported. He said a number of residency programs across the county are affiliated or have some affiliation with VA hospitals who do fund these types of residency programs. He said Dr. Ramu Komanduri, Nevada Veteran's Administration Chief of Staff, has indicated in the past, of his interest in working with SNHD to create a partnership having residents do rotations at the VA.

Dr. Schwenk commented he is disappointed in the above discussed plans, which are currently only possibilities. He added he is very supportive of this program, but feels sustainability is even worse than the accreditation issue. He said there is no clear plan for sustainability funding, not with the HRSA plan being four years out, and stated he feels the state legislature, nor the Clark County Commission are funding sources to depend on.

Dr. Iser commented that when the whole process was started with the Public Health Improvement fund at the legislature, the plan was to get increased taxes through vaping products via SB 263 (a Nevada State Senate Bill that taxes vaping products). He pointed out the taxation committee did not want to obligate those funds to any one purpose. He said the Governor's office is still interested in looking at funding the Public Health Improvement Fund, but rather via an increase in the Governor's budget.

He said depending on what is received from SB 263 taxes, SNHD was promised some of that funding. He said at the Clark County property tax level, SNHD had received additional funding over the originally budgeted amount, and pointed out with construction and increased building, SNHD will see approximately \$400,000 in additional property tax. He said he feels an increase in property tax contributions to this program can be promised. Dr. Schwenk thanked him for his comments but maintained he still needs to see a solid budget as well as resolved accreditation issues, as in previous discussions.

Dr. Schwenk commented on his concerns on the accreditation timelines, which are the same as with the radiology program at MVH. He said his concern is providing funding in advance of the accreditation and feels it is risky. Dr. Lohff responded that since November, SNHD has made significant progress in terms of the accreditation piece. He said they developed and submitted their application, sent it to ACGME in early March 2019, had a site visit in late April 2019, and the ACGME Preventive Medicine Review Committee (RFC) will be meeting in two weeks and making a decision on SNHD's accreditation status at that time. He commented the site visit went very well with positive feedback and very few citations. He said there were minimal requests for additional documentation and information in advance of the site visit as well as at the site visit itself. He noted with any citations identified that prevent SNHD from being accredited in June 2019, those citations can be addressed in advance of the next meeting of the RFC which will be in November 2019. Dr. Schwenk asked Dr. Lohff if the task force were to approve some sort of continued planning support, whether it will be known before the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2019) what the decision is from the RFC and whether that information could be provided to the task force before final disbursement of GME funding. Dr. Lohff said the next meeting of the RFC is June 14, 2019 and SNHD would be provided with the RFC's decision that same day or day after.

Dr. Atkinson commented on SNHD's progress since the last round of funding. She said she liked the comments on stakeholders and believes it is going to be very important for this to be a standard as a community asset. Referring to the application fringe benefit rate, she pointed out the increase to 42.25% from 38%, noting that fringe benefits seem high, and asked for clarification. Dr. Lohff said, as he understands, the fringe benefit rate was set by SNHD, and pointed out last fiscal year that rate was 38.65% and has increased this fiscal year to 42.25%. Dr. Iser agreed and said this is correct. He commented that SNHD has the same benefits as any other governmental agency. He said this benefit rate is the same as all SNHD employees receive who contribute to PERS. He said there is a lower benefit rate that

applies to others because they do not contribute to PERS. He further commented on ongoing discussions with UNLV for reduced tuition. He said one of the concerns during GME Task Force's last round of funding was the high tuition and fees for residents attending classes at UNLV. He added UNLV has recently proposed that SNHD consider residents being graduate resident assistants at UNLV, which would mean their tuition could be at a rate of in-state tuition as opposed to out-of-state tuition. He added further discussions are required on this topic with UNLV's Office of Human Resources to reduce the overall cost to the program and identify some solutions.

Mr. Mitchell asked for clarification of the timeline to recruit a person in December 2019, since a potential person interested in the program is already lined up, and if approved, could start on July 1, 2019, with the overall goal of 2 PM1's and 2 PM2's, but if a person is recruited in December 2019 as a PM2, how easy will it be or how will the program be right-sized to have residents coming in and leaving in July of every year. Dr. Lohff said the goal here is to demonstrate SNHD's commitment in putting this program together by getting residents hired as quickly as possible based on availability, funding, etc. He clarified they do have one person, who is an intern, interested in joining the program on July 1, 2019, who is previously board certified in internal medicine and has also received his MPH and is able to complete the program in one year (July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020). He said the issue is they would be limited to only 2 PM1's and 2 PM2's per each year. He said they have tried to come up with a schedule that will optimize the number of residents in the program at one time, but at the same time making sure to allow at least 2 PM1's and 2 PM2's at any given time. He pointed out it is in the budget to hire a PM1 that will start in January 2020 with hopes to recruit this resident between now and next year. He said after that time the residents would start on the July 1st cycle. He added with that the hope is to increase the number of residents.

Mr. Mitchell said if the PM1 starts in January 2020 and becomes a PM2 the following January, and SNHD recruits 2 new PM1's the following July, it appears there is a 6 month overlap by having 3 PM1's. Dr. Iser replied that in July of next year they would recruit a PM1 and a PM2. The PM2 would be a resident that has previously concluded his/her other residency program along with an MPH and would be able to complete the program in one year rather than two years. He said the PM1 resident would be someone that would need to complete their residency program in 2 years. Mr. Mitchell said in principal SNHD will be recruiting through the rotations of the other residents from UNLV, as well as advertise on the SNHD website. He asked what the future looks like for recruitment. Dr. Lohff responded that discussions had taken place with others interested in the program, including some that have rotated through the health district and are now elsewhere completing residencies in other programs. He said the plan is to work with professional organizations, including the American College of Preventive Medicine along with other residency programs around the country that collectively work to recruit residents into their respective programs. He said locally recruits are being identified who might have an interest in this program, as well as recruiting residents nationally along with professional partners. Mr. Mitchell said he assumes there are similar programs in other states and asked if those programs are full and are able to match each year. Dr. Lohff replied the biggest hurdle other programs have is the availability of funding to totally fill those positions, but he has no data with him today to speak on actual numbers of programs that fill successfully or their fill rates.

Mr. Mitchell, circling back to sustainability, said his concern is he didn't see any new information or changes from the sustainability plan SNHD submitted in the past. He said in his opinion he believes the HRSA grant is uncertain and even if certain, it leaves a gap in funding because it is not available until 2023. He added he is unclear whether HRSA is a 2023 application with a funding date in 2024. He said he also feels funding from the legislature is an uncertain prospect and understands that most of SB 263 monies will be going to tobacco prevention activities. He asked when SNHD would know how much extra money will be received from property taxes in Clark County. Dr. Iser replied SNHD will receive between \$400,000 and \$500,000 and anticipate additional monies at the end of March. He pointed out when they are given the estimated amount of tax monies to expect, it begins with what was received the previous year. Mr. Mitchell asked how much extra money was received in March 2019. Dr. Iser responded between \$400,000 and \$420,000. Mr. Mitchell asked if this amount is contingent on property values continuing to appreciate. Dr. Iser responded no, and added that most of that increase comes from new construction. Mr. Mitchell commented that most economists are forecasting a recession in 2020, and asked whether Clark County is continuing to forecast robust increases in construction activity through the next two years. Dr. Iser said he believes everyone is being somewhat conservative and recently forecasts are predicting relatively continued strong growth in Southern Nevada. Mr. Mitchell said given the uncertainty of funding sources, it appears the only sure funding source is SNHD's own budget. He added that given sustainability has been a concern each time SNHD submits an application, he asked SNHD if the task force recommends to the Governor and the Governor agrees to fund this application, whether SNHD would commit to funding the \$500,000 to \$550,000 annual program costs out of its own budget moving forward. He said he does not think this specific of a commitment has ever been offered before from the GME Task Force. He said this would mean SNHD is committed to using its own budget resources and future increases through property taxes to fund this program going forward. Dr. Iser replied the answer is yes. He added he is predicting SNHD will likely receive an approximate additional \$420,000 in their base-budget under property taxes for next fiscal year, and likely another \$400,000 to \$420,000. He pointed out that property tax funding is put into all of their programs, including vaccines for children and families, family planning program and/or to fund the Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) program. He pointed out that SNHD has applied to New Start as a funding source in the amount of \$650,000, which would allow freeing up more property tax dollars. He said environmental health fees are being raised in the next couple of months, making environmental health self-sufficient, also freeing up additional property tax dollars. Mr. Mitchell said the task force does not want to fund this program now and then have other demands vacuum up those additional funds leaving no sustainability funds for this program, which is why a firm commitment is needed today despite other good uses of the money. He said SNHD is committing to using its own money long term to fund the program. Dr. Iser agreed to Mr. Mitchell's statement, and further explained funding sources for other programs, ultimately freeing up even more funding for this program and feels sustainability is not an issue, he is sure SNHD can fund this program in the future out of property tax funds and other grant funding.

Dr. Schwenk remarked that the last five minutes of conversation did nothing to reassure him. He believes there are too many uncertainties by depending on unknowns including the state's economy and the legislative process.

There were no further questions for SNHD.

Mr. Mitchell opened the discussion to the GME Task Force for recommendations to the Governor for the allocation of GME Round 6 grant funding totaling \$1,675,480.00.

Dr. Schwenk proposed full funding for UNLV totaling \$571,301.00; \$300,000 for SNHD; and the remaining funding of \$804,179.00 to MVH.

Mr. Welch commented that MVH had discussed if \$230,000 came out of their budget request it would still be functional. He said if combined with Dr. Schwenk's proposal that would be another \$111,506.50 making the total reduction \$341,506.50 for MVH, and added he wants to be sure they are left in the position to move forward. Mr. Mitchell clarified the question to MVH and asked whether MVH would still be able to stand up their radiology program as proposed in the application with grand funding of \$804,179 as opposed to the original ask of \$1,145,685. Dr. Puskas replied that MVH would be able to go forward with the program.

Mr. Welch said he continues to be disappointed with the SNHD application, even though he is very supportive of the cause, and agrees public health is a major issue in Nevada, but does not feel most of the questions asked of SNHD during the last application round were answered and to some extent are even more compromised today. He asked if SNHD were to receive \$300,000 what can be done with this amount of funding and how would it move this program forward. Dr. Lohff replied that some money is better than no money and a closer look at the budget would be required to decide how they would accommodate those reductions. He added they will continue to work towards reducing tuition costs from out of state tuition to in-state tuition, and may not be able to fill the residency position effective January 2019 but rather wait until July 2020 to fill two residency positions. He added they could certainly work with the recommended \$300,000 and adjust the budget so the program continues to develop and be able to enroll residence both this year and next year. Dr. Schwenk said his intent with this recommendation is to try to maintain momentum until some hard numbers could be put down for sustainability with all the unknowns and uncertainties over the next many months.

Dr. Gilliar agreed. He further recommended that both MVH and SNHD should get the support to get their programs off the ground as quickly as possible and pointed out that taking too much of the margin is not good in his opinion. He further recommended moving \$50,000 from UNLV and split it evenly between SNHD and MVH, giving each an additional \$25,000.

Mr. Kaufman said based on Dean Schwenk's proposal and Dr. Gilliar's revised recommendation, he believes the task force should move forward with these numbers as well as apply the revision of \$50,000 being split evenly from UNLV to MVH and SNHD.

Mr. Mitchell calculated the suggested funding as follows:

Mountain View Hospital: \$829,179
Southern Nevada Health District: \$325,000
UNLV School of Medicine: \$521,301

Mr. Kaufman made a motion to recommend to the Governor, distribution of funds to the applicants in the above amounts totaling \$1,675,480 for GME Round 6 funding. Dr. Gilliar seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion on Possible Changes to the Request for Applications Document to be used in Future Rounds to Solicit Applications for Funding for GME (For possible action)

Brian Mitchell

Dean Schwenk asked, in expanding the charge for the GME Task Force, what the support would be among the task force to explore funds for loan repayment that would draw down a federal match helping physicians in Nevada after training, or possibly funding for health research. Mr. Mitchell commented that loan repayment has been suggested to the legislature but there is no firm answer whether GME funds can be used for loan repayment as of today. He pointed out earlier in the session he understands the answer for loan repayment using these funds was a no. He said he believes the legislature is aware the task force would be in support of loan repayment and if not approved this session, will work on getting it approved next session. He said other discussion on use of these funds could include dividing the funding to include planning grants for applications not very far along in the accreditation process, and a separate grant for programs already accredited and require funding to build up. Dean Schwenk agreed there needs to be two stages of applications. Dr. Atkinson said she supports having two stages of applications as well.

7. Discussion on Next Steps for the GME Task Force Including Timelines for Future Funding Rounds and Future Meetings (For possible action)

Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell said the original \$5 million that has been budgeted to GME the last four years was approved by the Senate Finance and Ways and Means Committee in the Assembly. He said the additional \$2 million Governor Sisolak proposed in his budget to be added for GME was not approved. He added there may be an opportunity to fill that back in the final days of the legislative session, but as of now the task force can plan on continuing with \$5 million per year as in the past. He proposed another round of solicitations of applications in the fall 2019, giving the task force an opportunity to think through what the application looks like and whether there be a two-stage application as discussed and said he would schedule the next GME Task Force meeting in early fall 2019. He said in preparing the application, he will work with task force members who have shown an interest in this topic and will present a revised application at that meeting. The task force unanimously agreed to the timeline.

8. Public Comment (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.)

Brian Mitchell

There was no public comment.

9. Adjournment

Brian Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 10:46 a.m.