



# Meeting Minutes Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

<b>Attendance</b>	<b>DATE</b>	September 21, 2020			
	<b>TIME</b>	2:00 p.m.			
	<b>METHOD</b>	Teleconference			
	<b>RECORDER</b>	Karen Hall			
<b>Appointed Voting Member Attendance</b>					
<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Present</b>
Justin Luna – Chair	X	Dave Fogerson	X	Todd Moss	X
Billy Samuels – Vice Chair	X	Jeanne Freeman	X	Tenielle Pereira	X
Andy Ancho	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Matthew Peterson	Abs
Roy Anderson	X	Jill Hemenway	X	Shaun Rahmeyer	Abs
Travis Anderson	X	Eric Holt	X	Misty Robinson	X
Elizabeth Breeden	X	David Hunkup	Abs	Rachel Skidmore	Abs
James Chrisley	X	Jeremy Hynds	X	Corey Solferino	X
Cassandra Darrough	Abs	Graham Kent	Abs	Malinda Southard	X
Darcy Davis	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Chris Tomaino	X
Craig dePolo	Abs	Chris Lake	X	Mike Wilson	X
Bob Dehnhardt	X	Carolyn Levering	X		
Kelly Echeverria	X	Ryan Miller	X		
<b>Appointed Non-Voting Member Attendance</b>					
Bunny Bishop	X	Melissa Friend	X	Kacey KC	Abs
Rebecca Bodnar	X	Sheryl Gonzales	X	Aaron Kenneston	X
Kate Callaghan	Abs	Mojra Hauenstein	Abs	Catherine Nielson	Abs
Felix Castagnola	X	Patricia Herzog	X		
<b>Legal/Administrative Support Attendance</b>					
<b>Representative</b>		<b>Entity</b>			<b>Present</b>
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy Attorney General		Office of the Nevada Attorney General			X
Karen Hall – Management Analyst/Support		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. Chief Luna welcomed Matthew Peterson, Elko County Emergency Manager, as a new member of the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC).

## 2. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened discussion for the first period of public comment. Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corp/Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Coordinator spoke to September as being Preparedness Month and emphasized being strong and resilient while being prepared for all hazards. It is time to assess preparedness levels at home, work, and in everyone’s vehicles. CERT week is this week, and Ms. Laffoon thanked CERT volunteers for all that they do for the state. Assistant Chief Todd Moss, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, announced his retirement effective October 30, 2020, and that he will simultaneously resign from the NRAC at that time. Assistant Chief Moss thanked the NRAC for what it has done for the bomb squad capability throughout the state. Chief Luna thanked Assistant Chief Moss for his service.

### 3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Luna called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes of the August 17, 2020, NRAC meeting. Dr. Chris Lake, Nevada Hospital Association, motioned to approve the minutes with one correction. Dr. Lake asked for a spelling correction in the attendance table on the first page of the minutes, specifically the header stating, “Appointed Non-Voting Member Attandance”. The word “attendance” should be corrected, and the header should now read “Appointed Non-Voting Member Attendance”. A second was provided by Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson, East Fork Fire Protection District. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. Review and Ranking of Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG)

Chief Luna opened discussion on the evaluation and ranking of nine scenarios presented for future EMPG allocations. Highlights from this agenda item are as follows:

- Chief Luna referred to the funding scenarios provided to all NRAC members and emphasized Handout #4a - Certified Population Estimates of Nevada's Counties, Cities and Towns 2000 to 2019 as the most recent demographer identification. Handout #4b – EMPG Allocations 2016-2019 as it has been presented in the past. This handout continues to have the first page denoting the historical allocations, and the second page being the population information showing any changes. The third page includes how the tiered base percentages were distributed and some of the scenarios under consideration. Also included are two summary pages before the detailed scenarios. The summary pages were included to provide an overview of highlighted criteria, and to provide members with a space to record rankings.
- Chief Luna went over each of the nine scenarios provided for review. The scenarios chosen to be considered were cut from a list of 18 to nine, including scenarios 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, and 19. All scenarios are formula-based.

#### Scenario 5

- Base percentage allocation of .50% which is only distributed to counties.
- The tiered allocation is not used for this scenario
- Next level of distribution is population allocation.
- The reduction total of approximately \$122,000 encompasses all jurisdictions that take reductions only. It does not take into consideration the amount of increase to a specific jurisdiction.
- There are ten jurisdictions that have a reduction.

#### Scenario 6

- Base percentage allocation of 1% which is only distributed to counties.
- The tiered allocation is not used for this scenario.
- The next level of distribution is population allocation.
- Reductions total approximately \$91,000 impacting six jurisdictions.

#### Scenario 7

- Base percentage allocation of .75% which is distributed to cities and counties
- The tiered allocation is not used for this scenario.
- The next level of distribution is population allocation.
- Reductions total approximately \$49,000 impacting seven jurisdictions.

#### Scenario 10

- There is a tiered allocation only for Clark and Washoe counties.
- Reductions total approximately \$47,000 impacting six jurisdictions.

#### Scenario 13

- Base allocation of .75% to counties only.
- The tiered allocation is not used for this scenario.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the November 30, 2020, NRAC Meeting**

- Reductions total approximately \$101,000 impacting eight jurisdictions.
- Chief Luna indicated that scenarios 15 through 19 all have varying levels of base percentage allocations and include tiered allocations.

Scenario 15

- Base allocation to counties only.
- Reductions total approximately \$56,000 impacting five jurisdictions.

Scenario 17

- Base allocation to counties and cities.
- Reductions total approximately \$14,000 impacting five jurisdictions.

Scenario 18

- Base allocation to counties and cities.
- Reductions total approximately \$19,000 impacting three jurisdictions.

Scenario 19

- Base allocation to counties and cities.
- Reductions total approximately \$56,000 impacting three jurisdictions.

- Chief Luna instructed the NRAC members to go back into the detailed pages for each scenario to see where the numbers are being pulled from. Reduction totals are in the upper right corner, and the second page of the Summary page lists scenarios along with all the adjustments, increases, or reductions for each city and county. In all scenarios, the tribal allocations increase at the same rate, and the total awards are divided with 50% applied to cities and counties, and the remaining 50% applied to the State and Tribal jurisdictions.
- Chief Luna spoke to the ranking process that will be used to identify the new allocation formula. Non-voting members can submit rankings for consideration but may not vote on final ranking. A roll call with each member stating their rankings on record to be tallied by NRAC administrative staff. All members will read in-order rankings of scenarios 5 through 19, with 1 being the highest ranking, and 9 being the lowest ranking. In an inverse ranking process, the scenario with the lowest number will be the highest ranked.
- Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, asked if the NRAC membership could have a few minutes to review the scenarios prior to ranking, with Chief Luna indicating his intention to break for ten minutes while members rank scenarios, do a quorum call to ensure a quorum of members is present, and then proceed with the roll call rankings. Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, inquired if the members are to just read the agendaized order of scenarios and then rank those scenarios in that order, with Chief Luna indicating that is the case.
- Kelli Echeverria, Washoe County Emergency Management, urged that the NRAC look at the least amount of impact to the programs, and asked the NRAC to keep in mind the percentage of change as noted.
- Samantha Ladich, Nevada Office of the Attorney General, referred to the meeting packet inclusion of a ranking page on handout #4b. Chief Luna explained the ranking sheet and how to use the tool when prompted. Once the rankings are complete, the ranking spreadsheet will be sent to all the NRAC members and listserv subscribers for review.

**\*\* Meeting Break taken at 2:30 p.m. – Meeting resumed at 2:40 with a quorum \*\***

- Mike Heidemann, Churchill County, asked for clarification on whether the rankings were associated with each member's vote. Chief Luna spoke to the ranking process discussed previously. Mr. Heidemann presented concern that the non-voting member's input could affect the outcome of the rankings. Chief Luna spoke to this process being used in the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security and the NRAC in previous meetings. Voting members then could vote on the suggested rankings. Samantha Ladich

**OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the November 30, 2020, NRAC Meeting**

indicated that the rankings are just a place to start, and the voting membership can choose to not accept the rankings presented. Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas, indicated not recalling an non-voting members being part of the ranking process in the past, and presented concern that the amount of non-voting members in attendance that could significantly affect the outcome of rankings, and in her opinion, the NRAC should consider carefully including non-voting members in this process. Ms. Ladich indicated that although not her place to have an opinion, that in her experience, this process has been used the past ten years in the ranking process, and if the group wants to change that, that is up to the NRAC. Ms. Levering thanked Ms. Ladich and indicated that Ms. Ladich's opinion should not weigh in on this issue from her point of view. Ms. Levering inquired if Ms. Ladich could provide a percentage weight that a non-voting ranking has cast in the past, and statistically this time, it could be significant. Ms. Ladich indicated she could not provide the previous ten years of weighted non-voting affect, and she would leave this up to a policy discussion for the NRAC, and she has been asked about this issue in the past and was sharing that information with the NRAC.

- Dr. Jeanne Freeman asked if the rankings could be separated into voting and non-voting rankings to see what that influence could be. Chief Luna indicated that ranking tally sheet will separate out the non-voting members visually; however, the cumulative ranking will include all ranking input. Chief Billy Samuels, Clark County Fire Department, inquired if the bylaws for the NRAC addressed ranking by non-voting members. Chief Luna indicated that this type of ranking has not been done for the EMPG; however, it has been done for the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security and the NRAC during the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) process. Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, indicated that the bylaws do not address non-voting members ranking capability, and confirmed that the process of having non-voting members included in the rankings has been a part of the HSGP process. Chief Samuels asked again if we can separate out voting from non-voting rankings, that could show if there is any impact. Dr. Freeman indicated it may be beneficial to address this issue in the bylaws in the future. Chief Samuels wants to see a list of voting, non-voting, and total rankings for comparison, with Chief Luna indicating that is the goal currently.
- Mary Ann Laffoon spoke to the Carson City mitigation project and potential losses in all scenarios and inquired on what came of that issue. DEM/HS has discussed this issue with Carson City to identify potential options such as reobligations. The main purpose of today's discussion is to identify a funding allocation based on a formula compliant with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) guidance.
- Jill Hemenway, American Red Cross of Northern Nevada, asked if this ranking is meant to be a final determination or just narrowing down the choices more. Chief Luna indicated that the idea is to use the ranking to develop a recommendation through motion and vote to identify a specific funding allocation that can be used moving forward with EMPG. The goal is to have a decision today based on the timing of the grant. A funding formula needs to be developed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021.
- Chief Luna instructed the NRAC to begin reading into record their rankings. Karen Hall captured ranking as read and compiled the initial results. *Please refer to Attachment A for detailed ranking records developed during this agenda item, and Attachment B for a corrected ranking record that addressed a formula error in the spreadsheet. The error did not change the rankings voted on by the NRAC voting membership.*

**\*\* Meeting Break taken at 2:35 p.m. to get information out to the NRAC membership, support staff, and listserv subscribers – Meeting resumed at 2:45 with a quorum\*\***

To allow for more time to get information out to the NRAC, support staff, and listserv subscribers, Chief Luna moved to Agenda Item #5.

After Agenda Item #5 was presented, Chief Luna came back to Agenda Item #4 to report on the ranking report and instructed NRAC members to double check their individual rankings.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the November 30, 2020, NRAC Meeting**

Rankings as initially presented were as follows and presented in inverse rank order (lowest total equals highest rank). Rankings were read into record for voting members, non-voting members, and the cumulative results. *Please refer to Attachment A for the initial ranking spreadsheet:*

Rank 1:	Scenario #17	Rank 4:	Scenario #7	Rank 7:	Scenario #13
Rank 2:	Scenario #18	Rank 5:	Scenario #15	Rank 8:	Scenario #19
Rank 3:	Scenario #10	Rank 6:	Scenario #6	Rank 9:	Scenario #5

A motion to approve Scenario #17 as the funding formula for the EMPG was presented by Mike Heidemann. Roy Anderson, Washoe County School District, seconded the motion. Chief Luna inquired if any members on the line did not receive the ranking information to check the report. No members indicated not receiving the information. All were not in favor, with Carolyn Levering voting not in favor of the motion. Motion passed. Chief Luna expressed his appreciation for the efforts and input in support of this process.

Upon review of the ranking record provided, an error was confirmed in the “RANK TOTAL FOR VOTING MEMBERS ONLY” column of the ranking spreadsheet after the meeting adjourned. There was a formula error when adding rankings for the voting members. Columns AJ and AK were mistakenly added to the voting member totals. The correction of eliminating this error resulted in no change to rankings, and the NRAC membership, support staff, and listserv subscribers were given this information after the meeting. *Please refer to Attachment B for clarification on this error.*

**5. Overview of the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Process**

Chief Luna provided a brief overview of the HSGP process to include HSGP timelines, release of the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), Metropolitan Statistical Analysis (MSA) rankings, Strategic Capacities to be Maintained, meeting timelines, reporting requirements, and potential deliverables from the State Administrative Agent (SAA), Urban Area Working Group, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee, Finance Committee, and the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. Highlights of this overview included:

- DEM/HS is the SAA for the HSGP process, and the Clark County Office of Emergency Management is the Urban Area Administrator (UAA) of the HSGP process for the Las Vegas Urban Area.
- A review of the 2021 HSGP Timeline and explanation of each step in the process.
- A review of the current Strategic Capacities to be Maintained (SCBTM) was presented, and at a future meeting the NRAC will discuss 2021 SCTBM and present recommendations to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security’s Finance Committee for review, and ultimately the Commission will approve the final SCTBM. The SCTBM provide a strategic framework for the HSGP.
- Chief Luna inquired if Chief Samuels had any additional information on the UAA process for HSGP, and Chief Samuels indicated he had nothing further to add to this discussion.

**6. Public Comment**

Chief Luna opened discussion on the second period of public comment. Kelli Anderson indicated that the EMPG allocations approved at this meeting would begin October 1, 2020, for the FFY21 EMPG program.

**7. Adjourn**

Chief Luna called for a motion to adjourn. A motion was presented by Dr. Freeman, and a second was provided by Robert Dehnhardt, Nevada Department of Administration. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.