



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE		Tuesday, January 20, 2026		
	TIME		10:00 AM		
	METHOD		Zoom		
	RECORDER		Loren Borst		
Appointed Voting Member Attendance					
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Brett Compston –Chair	X	Joe Colacurcio	X	Matthew Petersen	ABS
Brian O'Neal – Vice Chair	X	COL. Kyle Cerfoglio	ABS	Ken Quiner	ABS
Andy Ancho	X	Tim Galluzi	X	Misty Robinson	X
Jayson Andrus	ABS	Kelly Echeverria	ABS	Bill Savran	X
Roy Anderson	X	Andrea Esp	X	Cary Underwood	X
Solome Barton	X	Jessica Brenner	ABS	Donielle (DT) Allen	X
Taylor Allison	X	Timothy Hill	X	Adam Miller	ABS
Jon Bakkedahl	X	Eric Holt	X	Diana Clarkson	ABS
Noah Boyer	X	Chris Lake	ABS	Corey Ross	ABS
Lee Cabaniss	X	Carolyn Levering	ABS	Scott Means	X
Doug McMahan	ABS	Greg Prestipino	X		
Ana Chavez	X	Tennille Pereira	ABS		
Appointed Non-Voting Member Attendance					
Sarah Fichtner	X	Melissa Friend	X		
Heather Lafferty	ABS	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. There was no public comment, Chair Compston closed the first period of public comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chair Compston, OEM/HS, presented minutes of October 7, 2025, meeting with discussion for possible action, then asked for motions to accept the minutes.

There was no discussion. Andrea Esp, Northern Nevada Public Health made a motion to approve the minutes from October 7, 2025. Jon Bakkedahl, Carson City Emergency Manager, seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Homeland Security Grant Program Definitions

Chair Compston, OEM/HS, opened discussion for possible action around New, Maintain, and Enhanced definitions for grant programs. He cautioned that due to the turmoil in grants from FEMA in Washington there is a possibility that the notice of funding opportunities (NOFOs) could be one year instead of three as in the past. There could also be an adjustment in the national priority areas or the direction of national spending. There could be more direction to spend in a Homeland Security manner than some fringe areas. Everyone should be prepared to act within a small window when the NOFOs are released.

Chair Compston noted that in the last meeting it was clear that there were a lot of concerns, positions and perspectives about defining maintain and enhance definitions. Concern included: are we talking about maintaining certain dollar amounts, are we talking about enhancements tied to a percentage or a dollar amount, talking about maintaining a capability and how do you define what that capability is and what the cost associated with it is? There are also discussions about 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year reviews. Discussions about competing projects every year, and the level of details of the applications. Chair Compston received a host of input from members over the last two weeks on the subject. He hopes this meeting will get to a consensus recommendation regarding the definitions and statuses moving forward.

Chief Brian O'Neal, Clark County Fire Emergency Manager, stated that in the last NRAC meeting he had made a recommendation to have a 3-year cycle to maintain projects. He now feels that time should be shorter and the maximum amount of time should be 2 years. He thinks that would provide enough time for agencies to build their own agency budget; the cost of accepting grant awards, and be prepared to assume the cost of it over a period of time and to continue to allow more opportunity, and a higher percentage of the funds that could be used for implementation of new projects. He stated some time is needed to be able to evaluate the effectiveness of a project.

Jon Bakkedahl, Carson City Emergency Manager, stated with the definitions being interpreted differently by different people, he would be in favor of making everything competitive every year. There would be no enhance, no new, no maintained categories. You would come with your best projects. Additionally, if the item was bought previously and is a replacement or upgrade, he requested that be disclosed as to when it was purchased as well. That would help the process in defining life cycles of things, and if people are at least attempting to incorporate items into

budgeting in their general fund instead of receiving allocations for the same product year after year. He concluded his comments by recommending simplifying the process to where everything is a competitive grant every year.

Cary Underwood, Southern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center (SNCTC), stated he understands where everyone is coming from. He discussed the emphasis of these grants was originally to build state and local areas capability to prevent and protect against acts of terrorism. He thinks that the state, and certainly the urban areas have invested a lot over the years and that there is a reasonable discussion to be had to make sure that they sustain those capabilities because they are part and parcel to the current and previous administrations. Previous administrations emphasized grant priorities that needed to occur as well as looking at the proper use of these grants with numerous examples over the years going back to Senate, Congressional, and White House reports and evaluations. He personally has agency heads evaluating grant expenditures regularly. There must be a conversation about making sure that NRAC stays true to the purpose of the grant. Top priority is making sure that there's a sustained investment in those capabilities that the grants were intended to build and ultimately maintain. Everyone must be a good steward, specifically, when they start talking about minimum expenditures in national priority areas, such as the 3% cyber etc. Whatever NRAC decides, the solution must talk about sustaining those capabilities already built that are the true purpose of those grants. As a fusion center, he knows SNCTC is a big ask every single year, as well as those in Carson City. There must be some definition.

Chair Compston asked Mr. Underwood based on his comment versus the prior comments made by Mr. Bakkedahl who wanted to eliminate the terminology and have everything compete every year, how does Mr. Underwood foresee mixing those two together?

Mr. Underwood replied he does see a way of mixing the two together. He went on to say there's probably responsibility, certainly with the state and urban area leader's input. He suggested identifying key areas that are state priority investments, and there should absolutely be, to Chief O'Neal's point, no program or project without an evaluation period including those that are justifying a sustainment. There should be an open assessment about whether or not the sustainment of these priority Homeland Security projects merits priority and what that particular program is doing? Beyond that, the outcome of that assessment should fundamentally decide whether or not future projects or future expenditures should be modified, or moving them into a compete status like what Mr. Bakkedahl was talking about where every project must compete. There might be an opportunity for a compromise there. There should be an evaluation period for projects that are determined to be sustained eligible. Basically, making the argument for staying in a category with reasonable limits and increases for sustainment costs and if there's a need to exceed those costs, they would have to be justified. Previously it was about 10% for things like cost of living and other adjustments. They need to establish a number and anything that is in excess of that, that project lead has to come in and justify. There is room for compromise. In any project they have to justify their sustainment needs and there should be limits to which projects actually qualify for being in a statewide priority sustainment category.

Taylor Allison, Lyon County Emergency Manager, agrees with projects going competitive annually. She has expressed previously the challenges in new projects coming forward, particularly making it equitable for rural counties that haven't had the capacity to participate previously. It is important to sustain critical programs. The question she directed toward Chair

Compston was, if there was a way, under the purview of NRAC, to also make recommendations to the state and political subdivisions for what is considered sustainable projects that should come off of these funding streams in the future and should be included in state and local budgets. She noted the current structure has not been sustainable. It's been very high-risk fluctuating funding for critical programs.

Chair Compston replied to Ms. Allison stating he doesn't have a good answer. The answer is "yes", based on what the federal government requires of these grants and what the state sees as investment justifications that they deem reasonable.

Noah Boyer, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, stated to go along with what Mr. Underwood was saying, there wouldn't be bomb squads in the state of Nevada if it wasn't for the funding source from SHSP & UASI. He wanted to reiterate, as a project manager, that he has no problem coming back year after year and justifying projects. If it doesn't meet the mark, it doesn't meet the mark; and he then is able to be held accountable for the funding received. He noted it is going to be interesting to see, going forward, how these projects develop.

Tim Galluzi, Governor's Technology Office, stated he believes both can be accomplished. Going forward investments can be categorized as either new or ongoing sustainment-type categories but still compete. He stated he is looking towards building a statewide security operations center that is a multi-year long endeavor that is going to be a phased process that funding is absolutely critical to be able to provide those services to the rural communities. If that funding is not available, he stated the only way he would be able to do that is if he charged a rate for it and the rural communities just can't afford that. When looking at the criticality of that program and really the intent of the whole-of-state program and approach of the state and local cyber security grant program being able to rely on that for a multi-year investment is really the intent of that program and to only get it for a year or two and then to have it potentially go away would absolutely be counter-intuitive.

Mr. Bakkedahl stated that he appreciated what Mr. Underwood said and fully understands that it is the top priority to make sure there are fusion centers and information sharing. His previous comment wasn't a knock towards that but a knock towards the process. When they started last year, there was \$24,000 left after all the red line stuff from pre-approved grant life cycles. That doesn't help anybody who is trying to add a one-time capacity which goes back to the original intent of the grant, which was to get that one-time thing and then the local jurisdiction maintains it after that. That's not a local jurisdiction, what SNCTC does, as well as at NTAC which is statewide support for everybody. Same with a bunch of other things that are funded throughout that grant when it comes to continuity in Nevada. To Chair Compston's point, moving towards how are they going to look at it if this grant goes away and people start to look at their capabilities outside of this grant. People need to be looking at that, preparing themselves or their jurisdiction or statewide support to help, look at long-term activities for what your jurisdiction does. More than likely these grants are going to go away or at least come with some sort of large cost share moving forward. It's the only 100% funded grant on paperwork up-front. Everything else has cost shares that we utilize. So, whatever Chair Compston decides would be the best for the state, but we all need to start looking at moving forward and moving off of these grants because they're not going to be here forever. It wasn't supposed to be here by this date. We're at 25 years this year post-9/11.

Chief O'Neal stated they're trying to maintain capabilities that have been around for a long time and in some cases for 10 or 15 years. They are not providing an evolution to the threat that we're currently seeing and the evolution of terrorism and things that might affect our community. He thinks that ties back to the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) identifying the threats that are most particular for areas and then identifying the capabilities that we need to address those at the time. That's done on a much more frequent cycle than just continuing to maintain projects and programs. He thinks if there's a way to tie-in some of those other planning processes that help to identify year-over-year threats and hazards, that might be a big step in clearing up the timeline that's necessary for projects.

Greg Prestipino, Nevada Threat Analysis Center (NTAC), commented on Mr. Bakkedahl's last comment. He said they have been working with the NTAC Meta Analysis Center to alleviate some of their asks for the last two years by decreasing their ask through the SHSP by about 10% over the last two years. They've also been working with their counterparts down at SNCTC with how they can work together. Throughout the last few years their relationships have been very strong and they've been working towards moving some of their actual software and products off of the actual grant and into their state general fund. They know that's always a difficult ask to do, but these are the things that they're doing so that everyone else within the NRAC can have the ability to compete for whatever is left over through the grant. But they have to make sure that they maintain and stay within the actual objectives within the grant by maintaining the priorities which are to detect, deter, and prevent.

Mr. Underwood said in an effort to get to a consensus, maybe there should be consideration for those that receive recurring grant funds for sustainment, if that's the word they want to look at, maybe part of the discussion needs to be that those programs have to actually submit some type of long-term sustainment plan. To Mr. Bakkedahl's point, he thinks that that's what everybody should be forecasting. He knows they had that conversation a lot in Las Vegas even as a heavy recipient of grant funds, and it's why they have eliminated a lot of things in previous years, but maybe that's part of the discussion. If you're in that sustainment, or you have recurring funds being granted to you like Mr. Boyer's project maybe that's something we have to submit for to determine what they're trying to do, actively, each year to remove certain parts of sustainment long term. Mr. Underwood doesn't think that that's an unreasonable ask. It's more work, obviously, but he thinks that maybe that's not an unreasonable ask either.

After discussion, it was decided that NRAC make a recommendation to Chair Compston, SAA, that the upcoming grant cycle go to annual competitions that include state priorities that will be included in the NOFO in addition to federal priorities for sustainment. Past sustained projects will be required to include a long-term sustainment plan as described by Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Bakkedahl asked about state priorities, and how they would be identified. Does it come from NRAC? Does it come from the NRAC recommendation to Homeland Security Commission, or does it come from the SAA?

Chair Compston responded with a proposal as an addendum to the motion. Recommendation would come from the SAA with concurrence of the Governor. That way, the Governor, as the senior Homeland Security person for the whole state, has a say on what's the most important for the overall enterprise.

Mr. Bakkedahl stated he thought that was appropriate. That's what Governor Sandoval did years ago when he wanted to start implementing very specific statewide priorities.

Eric Holt, Lincoln County Emergency Manager, asked if there would be a timeline on the sustained projects, or if once they're supported, they're supported?

Chair Compston responded with an example of possible Nevada directed capabilities that may be maintained. He used fusion centers and bomb squads as an examples. Those must be included in some way, shape, or form. The SAA would recommend to the Governor state priorities and with concurrence of the Governor on those priorities, they would be listed in the NOFO, much like the federal government lists 35% for law enforcement, or 10% for border, 3% for cyber, so they would have a state addendum to the federal requirements.

Mr. Underwood echoed Mr. Bakkedahl's comments, he appreciates that he brought up going all the way back to Governor Sandoval. Even subsequent administrations and SAAs have provided those types of priority areas in the past, so he believes that what Chair Compston's suggesting is consistent with precedent.

Chief O'Neal asked regarding the State Homeland Security Commission's role. Do applicants present their awarded projects to that Commission for approval?

Chair Compston responded that there are still legal obligations. Ultimately, the Homeland Security Commission is the approval authority. So, this board makes a recommendation, the ranking of those projects then goes to Homeland Security Finance Committee, who has the authority to make adjustments those recommendations, and after that, it goes to the Nevada Homeland Security Commission for final approval. Whatever Homeland Security Commission approves is what goes forward to FEMA.

Ms. Allison stated she agrees and supports this but requested if they can potentially have a future agenda item on the NRAC where they can support a formal recommendation of sustainability for those programs to the state of Nevada and appropriate political subdivisions.

Chair Compston noted that if we go that route another NRAC meeting would need to take place before the NOFOs drop.

Chair Compston moved for a motion to complete all projects annually with the NOFO and including a list of state investment priorities that must be funded and that the Governor has approved. Any of those priority projects will, in the future years, will have to provide a

detailed sustainment plan for consideration in the next competition.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Grant Status Report

Shea Sloan, OEM/HS, Provided the quarterly grant status report based on the completed transactions from the state accounting system. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) FY21 and Emergency Management Preparedness Grant (EMPG) FY22, periods of performances have ended, and OEM/HS is working towards closing those two grants out. For FY22, HSGP and FY22 EMPG, there are two negative balances for OEM/HS which are due to fiscal processes and a cash management issue due to the FY25 funding not being released. EMPG FY23 has received a time extension, and the period of performance now ends March 30th. Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP) FY22 also received a time extension, and the period of performance now ends February 28, 2026.

There were no questions, and the agenda item was closed.

6. 2025 Grants Updates

Suz Coyote, OEM/HS, provided updates on the current status of the FFY25 EMPG, HSGP, Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP), State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP), and prior years of the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) grant program.

Nevada joined a multi-state lawsuit after FEMA imposed FY25 grant conditions. Federal courts blocked those requirements and restored multi-year performance periods. FEMA is issuing corrected FY25 grant awards, but separate DHS policies continue to affect timelines. The result of legal actions is that FEMA must adhere to the congressional framework.

Some DHS policy impacts include Secretary-level review of contracts and subawards over \$100,000, which could delay award issuance, the removal of holds on awards, and reimbursements to OEM/HS on subrecipient payments. The FY25 federal reissuance timeline, confirmed by the Nevada Attorney General, intends to reissue compliant FY25 awards by January 24, 2026, for HSGP, EMPG, NSGP, and SLCGP. Reissued awards will include restored multi-year periods of performance, removal of blocked terms and conditions and updated standard FEMA terms.

FEMA has not yet supplied timelines for HSGP FY25 application review or removal of holds. FY25 NSGP application review has not been started. Due to lawsuits over the BRIC program FEMA is required to resume mitigation funding, though timelines have yet to be announced.

Chair Compston, OEM/HS, noted that the periods of performance are back to three years, but because of the delay with the grants last year not being processed until August and then the federal shutdown the HSGP Investment Justifications (IJ) will be delayed in processing.

Jon Bakkedahl, Carson City Emergency Manager, inquired about the period of performance start date. Mr. Bakkedahl also asked if it was okay for him to start working on the RFP grant award that OEM/HS approved.

Ms. Coyote stated October 1st is the start date going forward. She advised against doing any work on a grant award that hasn't been properly executed. The terms and conditions are not known so if someone was to proceed with procurement or anything that hasn't been properly documented in a grant award between the state and applicant it is ill-advised.

Mr. Bakkedahl clarified for the record not procurement, but the paperwork leading up to procurement. He indicated his concern about the length of time it takes in paperwork to purchase something within the grant.

Ms. Coyote noted it would be the applicant's choice to begin working on grant applications but still advised caution.

Brantley Hancock, City of Reno, inquired about the Cyber Security Grant and how to receive updates on those grant awards.

Ms. Coyote stated that grant hasn't been issued yet for FY25. FY24's 30% cost share waiver is on hold awaiting approval, but it is still sitting on the secretary's desk for review and possible approval. She noted FEMA contract language can be found in the Zoom grants portal and has remained consistent if applicants need help with verbiage when writing their proposals.

There was no additional discussion, and the agenda item was closed.

7. Public Comment

Chair Compston opened the second period of public comment.

There was no public comment.

8. Adjournment

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

Jon Bakkedahl, Carson City Emergency Manager, made a motion. Lee Cabaniss, Elko County Emergency Management seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.