



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE	Tuesday, October 7, 2025		
	TIME	10:00 AM		
	METHOD	Zoom		
	RECORDER	Loren Borst		
Appointed Voting Member Attendance				
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name
Brett Compston –Chair	X	Joe Colacurcio	ABS	Matthew Petersen
Brian O'Neal – Vice Chair	X	COL. Kyle Cerfoglio	ABS	Ken Quiner
Andy Ancho	X	Tim Galluzzi	X	Misty Robinson
Jayson Andrus	ABS	Kelly Echeverria	X	Bill Savran
Roy Anderson	X	Andrea Esp	X	Cary Underwood
Solome Barton	X	Jessica Brenner	X	Donielle (DT) Allen
Taylor Allison	X	Timothy Hill	X	Adam Miller
Jon Bakkedahl	X	Eric Holt	X	Diana Clarkson
Noah Boyer	X	Chris Lake	X	Corey Ross
Lee Cabaniss	X	Carolyn Levering	ABS	Scott Means
James Chrisley	ABS	Greg Prestipino	X	
Ana Chavez	X	Tennille Pereira	X	
Appointed Non-Voting Member Attendance				
Sarah Fichtner	X	Melissa Friend	X	
Heather Lafferty	X	Selby Marks	X	
Legal/Administrative Support Attendance				
Representative	Entity	Present		
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy Attorney General	Office of the Nevada Attorney General	X		
Loren Borst – Administrative Assistant	Nevada Office of Emergency Management	X		

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Brett Compston, State Administrative Agent (SAA) Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (OEM/HS), called the meeting to order. Loren Borst, OEM/HS performed the roll call. A quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chair Compston opened the first period of public comment.

Phil O'Neill was called to make public comment. No audio was ever heard from Mr. O'Neill.
Chair Compston closed the first period of public comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chair Compston, OEM/HS provided edits to the July 29, 2025 meeting minutes then asked for motions to accept the minutes with the corrections. Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County Emergency Manager, made a motion to approve the minutes. Tim Hill, NV Energy, seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved.

Chair Compston, OEM/HS presented provided edits to the August 6, 2025 meeting minutes then asked for motions to accept the minutes with the corrections. Tim Galluzi, State Chief Technology Officer, made a motion to accept the minutes. Andrea Esp, Washoe County Public Health Preparedness seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved.

4. Homeland Security Grant Program Definitions

Chief Compston opened discussion around New, Maintain, and Enhanced. He indicated he wanted to discuss the terms, how to apply them, and bring them back to the next meeting for a vote. He outlined the current definitions and applications of New, Maintain, and Enhance and the challenges in applying these current definitions. He noted Maintain doesn't have a clear definition as far as what constitutes the dollar amount but is defined as projects that were prior approved with no limitation on dollars. Enhanced has no set definition and while UASI uses 10% monetary increase but there's nothing defined by the NRAC. He also asked if the definition for New should be specified to include anything over 10% or if everything should be ranked every year.

Chief Brian O'Neal, Chief Clark County Fire Department, discussed that 10% should be the limit for previously funded maintain projects, as well as time limited for the maintained status, so projects aren't funded into perpetuity.

Noah Boyer, discussed maintain in the aspect of are you maintaining the capability of a piece of a equipment or the piece of equipment itself, justifying extending the life of pieces of equipment.

Taylor Allison, Lyon County Emergency Manager, continued discussion on maintaining capability of equipment versus the equipment itself. At what point does 10% mean maintaining the capability versus the equipment, would it be a maintain ask or a new equipment ask?

Chief O'Neal discussed the three-year window of maintain versus new ask. At what point does the 10% maintain become a new ask, further scrutinizing that each instance may need to be looked at very specifically and individually.

Ana Chavez, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, discussed how maintaining and replacing equipment now is significantly more expensive than it was 10, 5, or even 3 years ago. Some costs have gone up over 20% in recent years, which is something that needs to be taken into account when considering maintain versus replace.

Diana Clarkson, City of Henderson Emergency Manager discussed the difference between an enhancement to a system versus maintaining a capability, and how inflation can greatly increase the cost of maintaining a capability versus just replacing it. She further emphasized that the rise in inflation percentages should really be more closely looked at when considering voting factors.

Chief Matt Peterson, Elko County Fire Chief, spoke of how the state's bomb squads manage themselves and observe a rotation-type schedule of how to propose maintain asks for maintain versus new to NRAC. He proposed memorializing such an outline for all asks of the NRAC, moving forward. He clarified that if such a structure is exercised, then an ask, whether it be maintain or new, doesn't have to be created every time the NRAC is approached. He also clarified that there should be clear categories for maintain and ask, i.e., if new equipment is adding capability, then it should be new.

Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County Emergency Manager, asked for more clarity on what was considered new or maintain, giving an example of adding coops – is this a new or maintain ask? She also stated that adding the 10% limit was important for a maintain ask.

Chief Peterson In discussion with Ms. Echeverria, he agreed that adding the 10% limit for maintain should be a required add for a maintain ask, following up with an agreement on the coop example given by Ms. Echeverria concerning programs.

Chair Compston then gave an example comparing a possible maintain versus a new ask. Chief Petersen responded with narrative about equipment lifespan and maintaining the equipment versus replacing it, as the cost of replacing large-ticket items could be well above maintaining equipment over the life span of said equipment.

Mr. Boyer then spoke about how the bomb squads have learned to work together to maintain and/or share equipment as the cost of everything goes up. The squads coordinate, support, and assist each other, doing all they can to seek alternate sources of funding for new equipment before coming to NRAC for an ask for a big-ticket item. He spoke about how robots are a big ticket item that have a very steep, up-front cost to acquire, but over the long run are significantly cheaper to maintain. In an economy where it is extremely difficult to save funds for such big items like this, being eaten up by items like Celebrite subscriptions, alternate funding sources and maintain, share, and support programs are the paths that bomb has found helpful.

Tim Galluzzi, State Chief Technology Officer, spoke about how software subscription programs are becoming more and more expensive and eat up the funding for all programs, particularly for rural

programs. It is really becoming a significant problem – going nowhere but upwards in cost. He suggested that programs should seek funding elsewhere for maintain programs, not only because of the rising cost of such things, but because funding from government grants can dry up easily and quickly, as evidenced by recent events. He suggested government grants should be seed funding to start or expand and that alternate funding sources should be sought for maintenance efforts.

Chair Compston stated that the current recompete methodology is every three years. He asked for thoughts on changing that to every year or every two years for a re-competition.

Chris Lake, Executive Director Community Resilience NV Hospital Association, agreed with Mr. Galuzzi, but also felt that the programs are only evaluated as they come up, stating they should be evaluated more often, and more in depth as a whole. He also stated that giving a flat, 10% rate to everything is kind of flawed, as each program and piece of equipment has a different life span, so each one should be evaluated individually, not just with a flat rate of 10%. He, again, reiterated that programs need to be evaluated on an annual or bi-annual basis, looking at more than just a 10%, as the cost of everything is going up exponentially and programs and equipment need to be looked at in more depth.

Jon Bakkedahl, Carson City Emergency Manager, spoke about how the original intent of the grant writers was to fund big-ticket, upfront items, and that maintenance was left to the budget. He also stated how consolidation may be an approach as well, applying a regional mindset for big-ticket items, like ramming devices used over a region, rather than each program having one. He then spoke about how this approach could be applied in a greater way, as when programs are evaluated more often and more in depth, evaluators could look at each program and what it uses and how said practices and equipment could be used in other programs or applications, resulting in further cost savings.

Mr. Boyer spoke about doing more in depth, more frequent evaluations also brings back a level of accountability for programs. It forces leaders to not only come with the initial ask, but also have a constant, maintenance plan in place, at all times, i.e., if you're going to have a program in place, you're going to have the up-front cost, but you are also going to have a maintenance program, so show us how you are going to fund that.

Ms. Echeverria spoke about planning workshops they often have to identify gaps within their programs. These workshops also pay attention to priorities by state and jurisdictions in an attempt to take into account all requirements at all levels.

Ms. Allison indicated her agreement with everything that had been said, but also stated how it is difficult for a new entity to enter into a field of those that have been applying for these grants for a long time, i.e., a new ask is hard to be rewarded against long-standing maintain asks. She then stated that the committee should be looking more at what programs do they really, truly want to fund and where the maintain funding is really justified versus funding a new ask, factoring in inflation, the 10%, time frames, age of programs, application, regionality, etc. She also gave some narrative about using the NRAC as a source of occasional funding and that alternate sources of funding should be sought first.

Adam Miller, Office of Information Security and Cyber Defense within the Governor's Technology Office, voiced his agreement with changing to a three- or two-year maintenance window to renew the application. He also stated that, no matter if you think applying for funding is futile, programs should still do it, no matter what, stating there are always conversations and negotiations that can happen in order to get the funding necessary – there are always options.

Ms. Allison stated that she has noticed in the last few rounds of rankings, scaling back was denied, when she felt it was certainly obvious it could. She voiced that a scalability plan should be required in the application process, so it doesn't have to be addressed in later re-evaluations.

Mr. Miller spoke about how, in these difficult economic times, flexibility, teamwork, collaboration, and negotiation skills need to be exercised in order to get as many programs over that red line and funded. If that means certain other programs need to take a haircut to make that happen, then all programs need to critically look at their programs to make others successful. Additionally, if a program can get 75% funding, then leaders should look to other sources of funding to fill that 25% gap.

Ms. Echeverria spoke about building certain language into the application, up front, that addresses flexibility and scalability, so it doesn't have to be addressed later, it is an approach that could be made. This would also allow for evaluators to know more about each program, up front, cutting down on time during the evaluation process, as well as down the road, when programs are re-evaluated.

Mr. Bakkedahl spoke about one-year performance periods and having annual testimony on every grant. He suggested that if a performance period is for one year, then the grant is for one year. If you have additional asks after that time frame, then be back every year. He also mentioned putting an area in the application that asks if a program has an additional funding source or stream that the evaluators need to know about when evaluating all applications.

Ms. Clarkson also stated her encouragement for all applications. She spoke about guidelines for deobligated funds, and that if someone feels they may not have a chance, they may, in actuality, qualify for deobligated funds that hadn't been thought of. Possible applicants should always apply, as there is always a chance for funds somewhere.

Ms. Echeverria spoke about the definition of 'new' and that it really hadn't been addressed yet in the discussion. Chair Compston agreed. Discussion was held on the 10% factor, what is enhance or new, seen for the first time or just annual, but the definition of 'new' wasn't actually had. Ms. Echeverria stated that, if it hasn't been prior approved, then that would be new. This way, if a prior application had been denied, then their application could be tweaked and they could come back again with a new ask, stating it wouldn't limit re-application.

Mr. Boyer stated that there is a long history of discussion on what is new versus maintain –

what is being maintained, what is the deficit of not having the piece of equipment, etc. He gave examples of applications he has submitted for maintain and new in the same year, citing new equipment versus maintaining a current program with new equipment – definitions have to be clearly defined within each program, each year, and evaluated with clear scrutiny.

Lee Cabaniss, Elko County Emergency Manager, asked for more clarification of what is 'new'. Is it something that is totally new or whether it's new funding? Is it new to NRAC, as it was maintained by a local entity before, but now a new ask from NRAC? What are the exact definition(s) of 'new'? Mr. Compston stated that his understanding was 'new' is something that is new to the committee.

Chief O'Neal stated he felt it was important to clearly define what new means, as the purpose of the grant is to fund projects that are outside of a typical budget process. He stated his view of the purpose of the grant was to fund brand new projects to the committee that are big ticket items for applicants that aren't typically able to be funded with budgeted funds, and that maintain items should be a lower priority than this new category.

Chair Compston stated the committee will present various courses of action to the committee for consideration and/or action before the next NRAC. He is going to coordinate with Chief O'Neal to possibly establish a working group(s) to work through these issues. These actions should have the desire effect of being more prepared for the 2026 round of grants.

5. Grant Status Report

Shea Slone, OEM/HS presented the current grant status report, outlining the current grant program, various grant years, total aware amount, and balance for all state OEM and urban area grants. She stated that the report was for all Fiscal Year (FY) '25 grants, all had been awarded, but everything is on hold. No specific details were available at the time of the presentation, as all FEMA portals are down.

Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County Emergency Manager, asked if the report shows available funds within the grants as she wasn't seeing any. Ms. Slone noted the report does not show available funds only awarded funds.

6. Public Comment

Chair Compston opened the second period of public comment.

There was no public comment.

7. Adjournment

Chair Compston, OEM/HS, called for a motion to adjourn.

Tim Galluzzi, State Chief Information Security Officer, motioned to adjourn. Taylor Allison, Lyon County Emergency Management, seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 10:58 AM.