



Meeting Minutes Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

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

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.
- Section IV – Officers and Duties [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.”.
- Signature Section [Page 3]: 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 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.

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the September 21, 2020, NRAC Meeting

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;

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved 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 in addition to identifying what is important such as population as an example. Chief Luna spoke to 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

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved 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.