



Meeting Minutes Resilience Commission

Attendance	DATE	March 12, 2019				
	TIME	9:00 A.M.				
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management State Emergency Operations Center 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701				
	METHOD	Video-Teleconference				
	RECORDER	Karen Hall				
Commission Member Attendance						
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	
Caleb Cage	X	Melissa Friend	X	Connie Morton	X	
John Steinbeck	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Todd Moss	Abs	
Roy Anderson	X	Eric Holt	X	Shaun Rahmeyer	X	
Solome Barton	Abs	David Hunkup	X	Andy Rasor	X	
Bunny Bishop	X	Jeremy Hynds	X	Carlito Rayos	Abs	
Felix Castagnola	X	Kacey KC	Abs	Misty Robinson	X	
Bart Chambers	Abs	Aaron Kenneston	X	Jim Seebock	Abs	
James Chrisley	X	Graham Kent	X	Rachel Skidmore	X	
Cassandra Darrough	Abs	Annette Kerr	Abs	Corey Solferino	X	
Craig dePolo	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Malinda Southard	Abs	
Michael Dietrich	X	Chris Lake	Abs	Mike Wilson	Abs	
Dave Fogerson	X	Bob Leighton	X	Stephanie Woodard	X	
Jeanne Freeman	X	Carolyn Levering	Abs			
Legal Representative			Entity		Present	
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney General			Nevada Attorney General's Office		X	
Analyst/Support Staff			Entity		Present	
Karen Hall			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X	
Meagan Werth-Ranson			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X	
Paul Burke			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X	
Robert Plant			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X	
Kendall Herzer			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - South		X	

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chief Caleb Cage, Division of Emergency Management (DEM), called the meeting to order. Roll call was performed by Meagan Werth-Ranson, DEM. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chief Cage spoke to various competing events with this meeting today including the current legislative session underway and the Basic Academy. Noting those challenges, it is important to retain quorum, and Commissioners are asked to please notify staff should they need to leave for any reason. The floor was opened for further comment with Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, speaking to feedback requested by the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities (NGCDD) on incorporating access and functional needs into training and exercise activities. The NGCDD wishes to be more engaged and informed in the planning process for such activities in keeping with the Whole Community concept. No other public comment was presented in available meeting venues.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Cage called for a motion to approve the draft minutes from the February 19, 2019, Commission meeting. A motion to approve the minutes as presented was provided by Dr. Freeman, with a second provided by Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Presentation on the Nevada State Citizen Corps Program

Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps/Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Coordinator, presented the Commission with an update on statewide Citizen Corps initiatives and activities including CERT program training events, CERT involvement in exercises, events supporting the expansion of the “Be the help until help arrives” initiative, and CERT volunteer developments. Highlights of the presentation included:

CERT updates:

- 2019 Nevada Preparedness Summit - Commendation of the CERT program participation, and new interest from many emergency managers to grow CERT programs within their communities including Washoe County’s interest in innovative preparedness training within the school system to promote resilient skills;
- The continuation of CAST Missions in Reno and Elko; and
- Continuation of volunteers in the field assisting with response efforts to recent weather-related events.

Recent program highlights:

- Carson City CERT: Survey and mapping of shelter locations, emergency operation center preparation and set-up training, outreach efforts to Mexican Dam homeowners and Carson City Community Center, and participation in Point of Time Assessment, Stop the Bleed, and Moulage Training;
- Douglas County CERT: Special assignment with the Douglas County Sheriff’s Office, provision of a Basic CERT class, Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR)/Automatic External Defibrillator (AED) training, AED’s Survey for Pulse Point AED Project, and community outreach and booth events providing emergency preparedness and emergency information;
- Elko CERT: Flu Point of Distribution (POD) assistance, CAST mission volunteers, 2019 Nevada Preparedness Summit activities, community and charter school outreach, Sage STEM Health and Safety Fair, preparation and follow-up for CERT training in new communities, and working on updated social media presence, and a new project, American Sign Language (ASL) CERT Survival Sign;
- Southern Nevada CERT: Expansion of the program area course offerings to Las Vegas metropolitan area, Indian Springs, Laughlin, Mesquite, and Pahrump, continuation of class offerings for Spanish speakers, the addition of a CERT Access and Functional Needs (AFN) class, attendance at the 2019 Nevada Preparedness Summit, and prepping for a second annual Live X exercise. A video pertaining to the Southern Nevada CERT program and activities was presented to the Commission; and
- Washoe County CERT: CAST missions, Rail Auxiliary Team (RAT) Academy teams, 2019 Nevada Preparedness Summit, WebEOC/Subject Matter Expert (SME) Training, CERT Academy and new volunteer orientation, Flu POD assistance, RAT Table Top - Increase Rail Safety, Red Rock Rattlers in action, Big Dig Kick-off, prep for the new Washoe County Website, and the CERT EPIC team is planning their full scale Live X.

CERT in Action Highlights:

- Point in Time Assessment: Unduplicated count, in a single 24-hour period, of people who are experiencing homelessness;

Official Minutes – Approved at the April 9, 2019, RC Meeting

- Providing volunteers in response: Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) CERT Red Rock Rattlers provided sand bag location support and flood monitoring., safety and crowd control for the Big Dig Kick-Off event;
- Special Assignment: Douglas County CERT was included in the special assignment of rehabilitation for the deputies investigating the multiple shootings in Gardnerville in January 2019;
- Flu POD: Assistance in Washoe and Elko counties with greeting, paperwork, and CERT's trained and giving shots in Washoe County;
- AED Point of Pulse Project – Checking locations and equipment; and
- CERT Courses: Emphasizing the work southern Nevada has put forth in developing classes for Spanish speakers in addition to the CERT AFN Classes and all programs facilitated by the Nevada programs. The CERT programs are growing as is utilization of CERT services.

Upcoming Events:

- Continued trainings for volunteers, presenters, and the community;
- Douglas County CERT will be in the field helping to facilitate the CASPER Assessment in May of 2019, and Elko County is looking into a similar assessment later in summer or early fall;
- Carson City will be assisting and facilitating with the Pulse of Point AED Project;
- Updates to CERT operation manuals in many of the programs;
- All CERT programs will be at participating in many booth and community preparedness events. (Spring and Summer tradition, Wild Fire Picnics, Earth Day celebrations, and National Night Out;
- Table-top exercises and live exercises: Southern Nevada will host its 2nd annual full scale exercise, Elko will be involved in the Great Basin College multi-agency drill, and Washoe's EPIC team is planning their full scale exercise for June 1, 2019; and
- Elko special project to address access functional needs: ASL is the third most commonly used language in the U.S., and is also used in Canada. It is reported that from 9 to 22 people in a group of 1,000 have a severe hearing impairment or are deaf and in need of ASL support. That number increases each year as many autistic individuals rely on non-verbal communication.
 - ASL-CERT Survival Sign is a new program that can help facilitate this function during exercises and during required assistance at the local level.

Ms. Laffoon thanked Stephanie Parker, DEM, for her help in putting together the information for this presentation, and either Ms. Laffoon or Ms. Parker will be available to help with any CERT or Citizen Corps questions.

Dr. Freeman spoke to the importance of CERT involvement in preparedness efforts and the challenges with planning, training, and exercise activities involved in sheltering. Currently, there are not enough personnel to staff a shelter past 48 hours without the help of CERT or the American Red Cross. Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, praised the "neighbor helping neighbor" approach Ms. Laffoon presented. Deputy Chief John Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, spoke to similar personnel challenges in Clark County regarding shelter staffing, and will follow up with Dr. Freeman after this meeting to see if they can help one another on this important issue. Additional discussion was presented on studies for shelter capacity involving supplies, special needs, and space availability. Chief Steinbeck inquired on whether CERT members are credentialed or are required to undergo background checks. Dr. Freeman indicated that all Citizen Corps volunteers she works with are background checked, and that the Medical Reserve Corps is used in addition to the Access and Functional Needs Support Team. There are additional agreements in place for other services such as durable medical equipment. Misty Robinson also indicated she could be of assistance with this effort. Ms. Laffoon added that many CERT volunteers are background checked in addition to receiving Criminal Justice Information System training. Chief Cage thanked Ms. Laffoon and Ms. Parker for the information given to the Commission.

5. Presentation on the Southern Nevada Incident Management Team

Assistant Fire Chief Larry Haydu, Clark County Fire Department, presented the Commission with an informational overview of the Incident Management Team (IMT) developed in southern Nevada in recent years, its capabilities, its recent deployments, and the team's availability for mutual aid requests. Highlights of the presentation included:

- IMT types and makeup ranging from Type 1 through Type 5 IMTs;
- History of the Southern Nevada IMT to include its creation in 2013, associated bylaws, operating procedures, and the strategic 3-year plan which includes the team being a deployable asset by 2015;
- IMT membership comprised of 60 individuals with a range of certifications to include Incident Commanders, Operations, Logistics, and Planning Section Chiefs, Safety Officers, Public Information Officers, and specialty certifications in training, communications, and Medical Unit Leader;
- IMT deployments including the 2013 Carpenter Fire, 2014 Moapa Valley Flood Event, and the 2017 Route 91 event;
- IMT equipment purchased through grant funding to include laptop computers, printers, plotters, charts, equipment cases, radio equipment, deployable bags, and an equipment trailer; and
- IMT challenges to include operational budget funding via grants, inter-local agreements to pay team members and define liability and injury procedures, training coordination costs, equipment management, and program management;

Dr. Kenneston spoke to similar hesitation in requesting a Type 3 team and the massive infrastructure that comes with that type of team; however local governments do not have this type of resource readily available. In 2017, the flooding in Washoe County changed the approach used, and the use of a Type 3 team proved very beneficial. Another large sheltering project was addressed last year, and now shelter trailers are in place. The issue now is about sustaining that capability and how to solve that problem. Dr. Kenneston inquired if more shelter trailers should be purchased with grant funding, and who would check on the consumables, expiration dates, and replacement parts. Chief Steinbeck noted his appreciation for the discussion put forth and his support of a statewide deployable IMT team especially following the October 2017 Route 91 event. The goal is to have a statewide IMT resource. The very best scenario is to have a portable asset available to someone in the thick of response or recovery. Chief Haydu spoke to the availability of funding and tools to make this a bit easier as the primary challenges.

Dr. Graham Kent, University of Nevada Reno, spoke to the challenges of ongoing funding shortages and what is needed to stand up these teams properly in addition to what the state's role may be in that process. From the standpoint of the IMT, it's a matter of prioritization and funding. There has to be more of a concerted effort for sustainment locally for this resource using available funding sources regionally or statewide. Training costs and equipment costs are not excessive. A specific need currently is for a training and equipment manager as a salaried position for two people either statewide or regionally. Keeping the current level of part-time personnel keeps the IMT performance at a "C" level. Dr. Kenneston indicated that it may take between \$200,000-\$400,000 including salaries and equipment to build out this resource effectively. Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson, Douglas County, spoke to Sierra Front managing a Type 3 team, and the purchases necessary for replacement equipment. The struggle to manage that size of a team is difficult to do properly. Chief Cage agreed that the IMT resource does need to be built out, and spoke to the current Assembly Bill addressing this capability. Through multiple discussions, it was determined that the fiscal cost would be between \$175,000 and \$200,000. This cost was not approved in the ongoing budget discussions; however Senate Bill 15 does address policy authority to establish and use this resource as momentum to continue to build this structure in the state. It is important not to stop this effort and to look at available funding mechanisms. Chief Cage spoke to wanting the ability to support this type of team through DEM in the future. Dr. Kenneston indicated that the Nevada Division of Forestry utilizes insurance policy premiums

obtained from other fire agencies as a funding source for their program, and the possibility of something similar may be possible to help fund this issue.

*** Meeting break at 10:12 a.m.; Resumed at 10:22 a.m. with quorum***

6. Overview of Nevada Preparedness Efforts

Jim Walker, DEM, provided the Commission with an overview of current preparedness efforts in Nevada. Highlights of the presentation are as follows:

- An overview of the State Preparedness Report (SPR) and how it is used to identify current capabilities and gaps;
- An overview of the Consequence Analysis process and final report as the overarching analytical tool derived from the THIRA, State of Nevada Enhanced Mitigation Plan, and the SPR;
- Alignment of training and exercise activities based on information sent to the Commission.

Mr. Walker spoke to multiple ongoing conversations between valued stakeholders urging the state to address gaps identified in the process, and this is a start to enable that moving forward. The goal is to drive where Nevada is going when looking at funding sources and developing appropriate training and exercise programs to support that activity. At the last meeting, additional information was provided to the Commission for feedback. One of the best values the Commission brings is feedback from a broad range of expertise.

Dave Hunkup, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, inquired on how the tribes are involved in the SPR and suggested that the newly created NTECC be a vehicle by which the process can be socialized to the tribes. Mr. Walker spoke to interviews undertaken for both the THIRA and SPR process, and the specific effort to include invitations to tribal governments within each county. That approach can be amended if necessary. Dr. Kenneston spoke to the SPR being separate from THIRA even if they are often presented as a singular product, and that jurisdictional exercises are funded out of local or Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) funds. For large exercises, Dr. Kenneston would like to see a budgeting process inclusive of a collaborative exercise funding pool. Mr. Walker spoke to the inherent difficulties with grant funding, and is in agreement with efforts to address statewide or regional funding for this process. Chief Cage expressed support for Dr. Kenneston's idea, emphasized the importance of prioritizing funding for those types of actions. The Commission's key role could be to identify these priorities for funding. The identification of key capabilities applied to the strategic plan and the alignment of strategic priorities with the mission, vision and goals will help support this type of initiative.

Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, spoke to hazard mitigation, THIRA, and the SPR driving capabilities, and the inconsistency in hazard profiles throughout the state. Chief Cage agreed that there is an issue with consistency and common language, and asked what mechanisms are available then to accomplish mending that issue including a possible combined threat and hazard assessment the state and the creation of a single assessment. Mr. Hynds spoke to the complexity of identifying jurisdictional hazards and the depth each jurisdiction can take for each hazard. Mr. Walker presented concern on pushing jurisdictions without a specific capability to address issues they may not have the ability to address. Chief Cage spoke to a specific example such as infectious disease, and jurisdictions could approach this at the level they are capable. Dr. Freeman indicated that the basic training cycle could be beneficial to address employee cycling throughout the state. That rotation would allow consistency of trained skills. When it comes to capabilities, there needs to be some practicality on what is actually achievable on an annual basis. Training is powerful, but if not practiced, it's just training. Cross-jurisdictional sharing of training opportunities would be very beneficial. Mr. Walker indicated that this is exactly the desired goal as jurisdictional perspective is valuable. Dr. Freeman praised DEM for its responsiveness to training requests and consistency in that effort. Discussion included the possibility of publishing an annual training schedule and Commission initiative calendar to allow predictability for local and tribal partners in building their programs.

7. Overview of Nevada Recovery Efforts

Kelli Anderson, DEM, and Suz Coyote, DEM, provided an overview of current recovery efforts undertaken by the State, emphasizing work applied towards the Nevada Disaster Recovery Framework. They have met with and appointed specific Recovery Support Function (RSF) leads, and continue to review the roles, responsibilities, and expertise of those leads. Current activities include the review and development of annexes, moving this function into full scale exercises, and standing up the NDRF and RSF functions in preparation for the next disaster. Preparations are also underway for training in specific support areas, emergency operation center function, and transition to recovery processes. As the transition center has not been set up before, the hope is to reach out to local jurisdictions that want this specific training. Discussion included break-out sessions at the Nevada Preparedness Summit to address recovery efforts and input for the Preliminary Disaster Assessment (PDA) tool. The State is now working with GIS experts to develop smart forms and procure licensing for locals to implement the same process, and a survey will be sent out for input. There will be PDA training in May or June 2019 for northern and southern stakeholders.

Additional discussion was provided for federal disasters 4303 and 4307 indicating number of grants awarded, amount awarded, paid to date, balance, and pending reports for each disaster. Emphasis was placed on this report not being where it needs to be, and that reimbursements are behind due to pending report submissions and backlog of report processing. Progress will be made within the next several months for larger stakeholders due to increased meeting schedules to close the gap on submissions and reimbursements. Chief Cage spoke to providing these updates moving forward, and is optimistic on building preparedness for recovery.

8. Update on Current Efforts toward the Emergency Management Strategic Plan based on the Current Resilience Goal and Objectives

Chief Cage provided the Commission with an update of the Emergency Management Strategic Plan noting changes discussed in the plan from previous feedback received. Work has been done on the current definition of resilience, the current State Resilience Goal, and associated objectives to move the plan from being DEM-centric to resilience-centric. The discussion involved changes to the plan including updated vision, mission, and values statements inclusive of resilience. The next steps will be further development by the DEM leadership team and staff to provide an updated version of this plan to the Commission at the next meeting. The challenges of the Commission will be to shepherd this process moving forward.

9. Briefing on Current Legislative Efforts Affecting the Statewide Resilience Strategy

Chief Cage briefed the Commission on current legislative efforts related to the Statewide Resilience Strategy. All of the Senate Bills (SB) noted were heard last Monday in the Senate Government Affairs Committee with no challenges, opposition, or significant fiscal note attachments for six of the seven bills put forth. SB 69 had several fiscal notes, but they were modest and addressable. In addition, there was some concern on the neutrality of the bill. Chief Cage spoke to his meeting with the Chair of the Committee, Senator David Parks, and developed a list of amendments based on Resilience Commission input received previously. The Chief looks forward to seeing the updated bill drafts. Additional discussion was presented on Assembly Bill 71 and 206 which will be heard on Friday at 8:00 a.m., and the same process will ensue. Updates on legislative efforts will continue, as each time a bill is heard, the window closes. If there are any concerns or questions, the Chief asked the Commission to communicate that information to him as soon as possible.

10. Overview of Current Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Allocations

Chief Cage opened discussion on the overview of the current EMPG allocations and the historical challenges of the funding formula. This is complex on every level and a significant funding source for operations. Changes affect programs, and over the next six months, the Commission will deliberate on this issue, and if

necessary, establish a subcommittee to drill down into this issue. Kelli Anderson, DEM, provided an overview of the current EMPG program with the following highlights:

- The EMPG provides approximately \$4.4 Million dollars annually to support preparedness;
- An EMPG overview to include purpose and support of comprehensive all-hazard emergency preparedness;
- Program focus on planning, operations, equipment acquisitions, training, exercises, construction, and renovation to enhance and sustain the all-hazards core capabilities of state, local, tribal and territorial governments;
- Cost match and the split of funding applied to support DEM staff and operations in addition to local and tribal emergency management programs;
- Specific EMPG grant requirements to include emergency operation plan updates, annual participation in the THIRA, completion of specific training requirements, and completion of annual exercises for all EMPG funded personnel. Additional requirements include a FEMA approved hazard mitigation plan for all subgrantees, availability for cost share or match, compliance with federal and state assurances including on-time quarterly reporting, and compliance with FEMA mission areas.

Kelli Anderson spoke to the heavy lift related to the hazard mitigation plan requirement, and that many local and tribal jurisdictions have partnered with county plans to ensure they are eligible for disaster funding. Dave Hunkup asked for clarification on the FEMA requirement in 2018 for participation in three exercises annually. Ms. Anderson indicated that exercises are funded via multiple funding sources, and that there is a need to ensure funding diversification is applied to training. That is why the requirement is kept by DEM. This discussion refers to FFY 2020 funding moving forward as of October 2019. The requirement to continue with the three exercises is up for discussion by the Resilience Commission and the SAA. Chief Steinbeck spoke to the strategy and legislative efforts applied to this very effort looking to transfer more funding to the local jurisdictions. EMPG is responsible for the majority of staff funding within the Deputy Chief's organization, and that funding has been stagnant with no salary increases. There will most likely not be any large federal windfall to address this issue. If Clark County gets increased funding, another jurisdiction gets less funding. Ms. Anderson spoke to the receipt of EMPG funding annually, and the success in that program funding supporting emergency managers. Currently, 52% of the funding is passed through, and 48% stays at state level to cover salaries. The formula needs to be fair and equitable, and it has not changed since 2010. An attempt to change the formula in 2013 was unsuccessful. Whether the formula is THIRA-based or population driven, a decision needs to be made. There are about six months to review this issue and provide the SAA with a new formula. Jeremy Hynds inquired on getting the current funding allocation as it currently is, with Ms. Anderson indicating she can provide whatever documents necessary to the Commission for that purpose. Dr. Freeman spoke to the variety of funding models throughout the state, and maybe looking at those formulas to help to enhance this conversation. Chief Cage spoke to the grant requirements and looking at the specific codifications in review. Perhaps there should be an overview of the legislative effort supporting the plan, and what efforts will allow changes moving forward. Chief Cage also spoke to a recent Certified Public Manager (CPM) review performed at DEM on this issue, and having that group report to the Commission if warranted.

Dave Hunkup presented concern about tribes meeting certain thresholds and wants to make sure funding allocations are inclusive of tribal needs. He suggested that a presentation be made to the NTECC in order to keep them updated on this issue. Dr. Graham Kent agreed that the focus should be on risk-based perspectives, and presented concern with wildfire noting a recent summit in northern California addressing that hazard. Dr. Kent inquired if similar mechanisms can be used to move from a steady-state of readiness to a more proactive approach. Kelli Anderson spoke to the programmatic side of EMPG, noting that there is about an 80-90% pass through for personnel. There isn't a lot of funding to move toward additional initiatives, but perhaps the people could be used for resources to address Dr. Kent's concern. HSGP and other funding streams can support plans such as mass-evacuation that could address the issue of fire. The second

avenue is mitigation grants addressing fire, though these types of grants have a more difficult application process. Leveraging of funding streams is crucial to putting together well thought-out applications. Dr. Kent agreed with the complexity of this issue and offered his assistance.

11. Update on the FFY 2016-2018 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Grant Balances

Kelli Anderson, DEM, presented the current status of the HSGP balances referring to line item detail provided in meeting handouts including project names, recipients of funding, funding awarded, funding deobligated, and available funding. Balances are not reflective of all activity as reporting may not have come in to DEM reflecting all project activity. This information is a snapshot in time only. Ms. Anderson will be putting together narratives on both the programmatic and financial aspects of the HSGP that will be shared with the Commission during ongoing meetings. Dr. Kenneston thanked Ms. Anderson for this information as a reminder to the Commission on historical background for existing projects.

*** Lunch Break – Meeting resumed at 12:40 p.m. with quorum ***

12. Review of Current Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Reobligation Guidelines

Chief Cage opened discussion on the current Reobligation Guidelines provided to the Commission for review. Kelli Anderson indicated receiving limited feedback on the existing guidelines, and that it is not the intent to change the document as it is an approved NCHS document requiring Finance Committee and NCHS approval for any changes. Feedback was received on the performance period of the HSGP. Typically, DEM has allowed extensions when warranted as some deliverables and Requests for Proposal (RFP) take longer than expected. Chief Cage acknowledged this request in considering softening the 24-month requirement, but there are challenges with doing so. On Item #2, input was received that included making sure line-item detailed budgets for project change requests are provided in addition to exactly what documents are required for that process. Dr. Kenneston spoke to original discussions and concerns that many of the Commissioners were used to a process where a justification was presented, and then have a vote to level funds. The first time the reobligation and deobligation process was presented to the Commission, it may have been the expectation that the same process would be followed. It is important to understand how the process will work moving forward.

Chief Cage spoke to the current guidelines working with this new process, and there are marginal changes based on feedback received. A process could be provided to the Commission to start the discussion. What is necessary is predictability for stakeholders. Dr. Kenneston asked if there should be a mechanism in place for occasional requestors to present their project case. Currently, Ms. Anderson is looking for input on how the Commission wants to see that information. The guidelines are used by DEM to bring to the table what is necessary or not necessary. Of specific significance is the time-sensitive clause giving the UAA and SAA the ability to push out money in a time sensitive manner in order not to lose federal funding. If funding is received back at the end of a performance period, the turn-around time requires that authority. Dr. Craig dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, spoke to the mitigation process and entire-day reviews of projects, and wonders if a subcommittee of this Commission is necessary to address that issue. Chief Cage indicated supporting such a request with a termed subcommittee if absolutely necessary. Chief Cage moved to affirm the reobligation guidelines as presented with expectation that at the next meeting, DEM will come back with a conceptual process for deobligations and reobligations at the next meeting including consideration of a subcommittee. Dr. Kenneston seconded the motion. Chief Steinbeck supports the motion, but inquired if this will refer to every project change request that comes through the system or just reobligation or deobligation requests. Ms. Anderson indicated that the guidelines cover all three types of requests, and that anything over \$100,000 would need to be moved to this Commission for approval in the new process in addition to scope change requests, but smaller changes have historically been done internally with existing processes. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

Chief Steinbeck spoke to grant recipient desires of having visibility on where projects sit within the process when it comes to changes in the projects. Perhaps it is through a grants management system. There needs to be an effective solution to enhance real-time activity. Dr. Kenneston spoke to the use of historical dashboards used based on manual input, and the need of a technology platform in lieu of DEM staff trying to manually feed a system would be beneficial. Chief Cage also presented concern on what the long-term funding solution would be for such an initiative, but would like to incorporate this into the discussion moving forward as a possible monthly agenda item.

13. Discussion on Establishing Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Objectives and Priorities for Communications-Based Project Investments

Chief Cage opened discussion on this agenda item noting changes in the HSGP process, and the advisory functions of both the Nevada Public Safety Communications Committee (NPSCC) and the Cyber Security Committee (CSC) absorbed into the Resilience Commission. As a result of that change, those functions will now be handled by the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) and information technology representatives from the Nevada Department of Administration and the Office of Cyber Defense Coordination respectively.

Melissa Friend, DEM, spoke to the changes in the priorities and objectives that will be used to review communications-related project investments. Highlights of that discussion are as follows:

- Current SAFECOM guidance for 2018 including:
 - Governance and leadership;
 - Statewide planning and procedures for emergency communications
 - Identify, review, establish, and improve SOPs in coordination with response agencies at all levels of government;
 - Emergency communications training and exercise;
 - Activities enhancing operational coordination; and
 - Standards-based technology and equipment.

Ms. Friend indicated that the 2019 SAFECOM guidance is not yet available, and that the SCIP is in the process of being updated. Dr. Kenneston inquired if Ms. Friend's activities are tied into the interoperable issue related to the communications towers, with Ms. Friend indicating that her staff is involved in that process in addition to having the resources to access in order to address ongoing issues. Chief Cage indicated that this agenda item is an action item referring to Slide #46 provided, and if there are any suggested changes necessary at this time. The compliance requirement with State or Federal grant guidance addresses changing grant guidance through the Notice of Funding Opportunity. David Hunkup inquired how the SAFECOM guidance is implemented with the tribes of Nevada. Chief Cage referred back to Slide #44 expectations and the process of including the NTECC. As NIMS capability is built, capability will be notified to tribal jurisdictions throughout the state including general NIMS training. The key coordination piece is the NTECC. Mr. Hunkup spoke to the disaster boxes currently in place, annual communication drills inclusive of the tribes, and updating equipment and policies. Ms. Friend indicated that the SCIP will include communication to the tribes. Chief Cage read into record the existing 2018 priorities and objectives noting two items requiring amendment based on this discussion to include compliance with NCHS direction in addition to review and ranking for regional, tribal, or statewide impact.

Chief Steinbeck inquired if the SWIC will replace the NPSCC and NPSCC Grants Subcommittee functions, with Chief Cage and Ms. Friend indicating that is the case; however, it will not be a unilateral process by the state. The process will include working with statewide partners on reviewing and ranking with visibility by the Commission. Chief Cage motioned to amend the 2018 objectives and priorities to create 2019 objectives with the changes noted. Dr. Freeman seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously. Ms. Friend will update the objectives and priorities for use in the FFY19 HSGP process.

14. Discussion on Establishing Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Objectives and Priorities for Cybersecurity-Based Project Investments

Administrator Shaun Rahmeyer, Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (OCDC) and Michael Dietrich, Chief Information Officer, Nevada Department of Administration, presented the Commission with information on the establishment of FFY19 HSGP objectives and priorities that will be applied to cybersecurity-related project investments. Highlights of that discussion are as follows:

- Historical overview of the former Cyber Security Committee established in 2014 under the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security, and the purpose of that body to provide input to the grant process, and expertise on cybersecurity-related matters;
- Previous funding recommendations and project proposal criteria used to review cybersecurity-related project investments;
- The creation of the OCDC, and the streamlining of the cyber-review process for the HSGP; and
- Updated recommendations that will now be applied to cybersecurity project investments to better align with more commonly accepted practices. This topic generated considerable discussion on the choices of eliminating several of the objectives or priorities and compliance. That discussion included:
 - Misty Robinson inquired if the NIST Risk Management Framework utilization was more effective in this new model in addition to having concern over the elimination of the review and ranking of cyber investments for regional or statewide impact. Jeremy Hynds also presented concern on that elimination. Administrator Rahmeyer indicated the intent to do so removes previous restrictions and a more appropriate allocation of funding, and Mr. Dietrich noted that the goal is to look at codified systems to deliver that same impact;
 - Rachel Skidmore, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, spoke to one of the most successful cyber projects coming out of the City of Henderson resulting in published reports and creation of valuable working groups. Ms. Skidmore indicated the desire to capture that regional benefit, and agrees on the decision to eliminate the alignment requirements associated with Presidential Executive Order 13636 and Presidential Policy Directive 41. Ms. Skidmore also inquired on what the OCDC performance matrix was exactly. Administrator Rahmeyer indicated that he had no issue with including statewide impact as an objective, and that there was not an internal matrix, but rather the use of OCDC for guidance.

Chief Cage opened up discussion on the final recommendation from the Commission on the objectives and priorities presented. Discussion included interest in maintaining regional, tribal, and statewide capacity building. Misty Robinson motioned to re-include the review and ranking of cyber projects for regional and statewide impact, and to make the last two bullets on Slide #51 match the communication project objectives previously discussed in Agenda Item #13. Chief Cage clarified if Ms. Robinson wished to include tribal impact, with Ms. Robinson agreeing to include that in her original motion. Mr. Hynds seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously. Administrator Rahmeyer will update the recommendations for use moving forward.

15. Discussion on Statewide Homeland Security Capacities that are Recommended to be Maintained with Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 HSGP Funding

Chief Cage spoke to historical process of the NCHS identification of the top 5 core capabilities used to drive the HSGP process annually. Using the approved capabilities from the NCHS, subgrantees would prepare and submit projects aligning with the established capabilities. This presented two distinct problems, 1) core capabilities established by the NCHS may not align with grant guidance, and 2) fitting project submissions neatly into an approved capability. Emphasis was placed on what capacities in recent years require sustainment, and by that, meaning which capacities are critical enough to require maintaining moving forward. The Commission was asked to reference the 2007-2018 HSGP Funding Summary and Top Funded Projects documents for a visual on historically funded projects. Deputy Chief Steinbeck indicated that the

Commission is beginning to address this issue, as there is necessary funding required maintaining critical capability throughout the state. What is necessary is the prioritization of maintaining those critical capabilities in lieu of new projects. Kelli Anderson spoke to the funding summary document and the percentage of funding changes throughout the grant historically in addition to the top funded projects to emphasize how the draft recommendations were derived.

Chief Cage opened up discussion on this topic indicating that what he is looking for is a list of capabilities to maintain. Dr. Kenneston indicated that he felt Intelligence and Information Sharing, Citizen Corps, CBRNE, Bomb Squads, COOP, Mass Fatality, and NIMS/Tribal NIMS are important to maintain. Rachel Skidmore emphasized that several projects that have changed core capabilities historically, and that important to her to maintain are Intelligence and Information Sharing, Bomb Squads, Henderson HazMat, and LMVR ARMOR. Both Henderson and ARMOR do not perform the explosives function in CBRNE. Per Ms. Anderson, if CBRNE is a chosen strategic capacity, then Henderson and ARMOR would be eligible under that category. Ms. Skidmore also presented concern with the lack of equipment upgrades as a function of limited funding, with Lieutenant Corey Solferino, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, indicating agreement with Ms. Skidmore regarding equipment.

Misty Robinson asked that Community Resilience be included in the list of strategic capacities, with Ms. Anderson inquiring on what that would look like, and the concern of project overreach in this category without further definition as to what capacity under Community Resilience is being supported. Dave Hunkup agreed with Dr. Kenneston's suggestions, and would like to add Operational Communications especially with Nevada's shared communication systems. Additionally, Mr. Hunkup supports Citizen Corps as well and the development of that capability within the tribes as current capacity is too reliant on volunteers and community members during response. Chief Steinbeck spoke to concerns about opening up Operational Communications as a maintained capacity due to the fact that requests for radios would flood this process. Ms. Anderson spoke to not having the funding notice yet, and no one knows what FFY19 HSGP guidance will be currently. From past year's guidance, there is a requirement for a Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC), therefore, that capacity is included on the list. NIMS is also a priority and requirement that has to be maintained. Chief Steinbeck spoke to Public Information and Warning and the critical capacity which built statewide emergency alerts as necessary to maintain. Local needs must be addressed, and those needs can compete once overarching capacities are met. Chief Cage indicated that it is his intent for the process to move away from core capabilities and to look at what is strategically critical to maintain on a regional or statewide level. The next steps would be that once the list of strategic capacities is created, then there has to be an understanding on how to fund those capabilities. That does not mean that every project that applies for funding under a strategic capacity is funded, but rather working strategically with statewide partners to come up with a strategy to go after funding over a 5-year period to spread out funding required.

Chief Cage added that cybersecurity as a critical capacity is worth the discussion, and Administrator Rahmeyer offered that information technology is the cornerstone of modern society and under threat at this time. Cyber-crime represents the largest transfer of wealth in history, with nearly \$6 trillion dollars involved by 2021. This Commission cannot allocate funding for everything, but cybersecurity is a worthy investment. A comprehensive statewide strategy is critical. Misty Robinson agreed that cybersecurity should be on the list. HSGP funding is not sufficient to adequately fund many cyber projects, but it is a place to start. On a national level, the State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Government Coordinating Council is working on a separate funding stream for cybersecurity, but for now, it's HSGP.

Kelli Anderson spoke to recovery as a critical capacity to maintain regardless of the type of disaster. Chief Cage posed the question that there has been some strategic development of recovery capacity, and what would the strategic capacity associated with that development look like. Per Ms. Anderson, the PDA tool must continue, and implementation to the local levels is critical. Ms. Anderson indicated she could put together a 5-year plan with deliverables if necessary. Chief Steinbeck spoke to COOP tools and the recovery

tools as necessary maintenance capacities, for without them, it would be starting at ground zero. The suggestion was made to possibly separate the building of capacity from maintaining existing capacity. Michael Dietrich spoke to new instances of technology terror and the communication and coordination on that front. There are now email vehicle threats, and the cyber world tends to work in a silo. There needs to be a higher level of communication to bridge this gap.

Chief Cage went through the current reiteration of the strategic level capacities based on discussion to include Intelligence and Information Sharing, CERT, CBRNE, Statewide Interoperability (SWIC), NIMS/Tribal NIMS, Public Information and Warning/Emergency Alert System, Continuity of Operations, Recovery, Cybersecurity, Community Resilience, and Mass Fatality. Chief Cage inquired what would be the strategic capacity for Mass Fatality, as there is county capacity within Washoe and Clark counties. Several examples were provided for existing capacities that could fit in this category including Disaster Portable Morgue Units (DPMU) purchased several grant cycles back, and whether the software is still relevant. If so, there is capability loss. Deputy Chief Steinbeck also spoke to needing enhancement in mass fatality as it has not ranked high in the process in previous grant cycles. After October 1, 2017, the Unified Victim Identification System (UVIS) is being replaced as maintenance and training have diminished. Chief Cage spoke to legislative efforts moving forward to address putting a group together, and if the capacity isn't there currently, it should be built. The expectation is the build out and exercising of a plan that is shared during a mass fatality event.

Misty Robinson requested that discussion on finalizing the strategic capacity list be tabled, but Chief Cage indicated that due to the compressed timeline, that is not possible. The Co-Chairs would have to present this to the NCHS. Chief Steinbeck spoke to this being a transitional year, and that the process will develop in the future. Rachel Skidmore inquired on the process of recommendation review, with Chief Cage indicating that this Commission would recommend strategic capacities to the NCHS. The NCHS would then vote on March 26, 2019, to approve that list, and that list would drive the FFY19 HSGP process. As an example, the expectation would then be if looking at Intelligence and Information Sharing as a capacity, the Co-chairs and DEM would work with both fusion centers to come up with a 5-year plan. The same thing could be done with CERT. Programs would define baseline funding, and the Commission would vet that information and suggest necessary changes. Advisory input for both communications and cyber-related projects would also be included in that review. David Hunkup requested that the current list of strategic capacities be read into record, with Chief Cage providing the list, on record, as requested.

Dr. Freeman spoke to Operational Coordination not being included in the strategic capacity list. Kelli Anderson indicated that the Operational Coordination category is an overarching one, and if added, can cover a myriad of projects that both NIMS and CBRNE can also cover. If Operational Coordination is included on the list, it needs to have specific definition, as it would open up the process to many proposals. It is Ms. Anderson's goal to ensure that the Commission has quality projects to review, and that DEM is able to handle the influx of requests. Chief Cage followed up with noting that Operational Coordination is critical and a huge part of the emergency management program and what will drive that is the specific capacity to be maintained.

Rachel Skidmore presented discussion on historical purchases acquired through the operational coordination core capability such as the tactical shields her organization purchased. Ms. Skidmore asked for clarification on the existing strategic capacity list. Chief Cage indicated it is not the intention of this list that requests outside of these capacities go unfunded, but rather before funding anything else, key capacities must be built. If those capacities are lost, it will have a strategic impact on the entire program. Instead of fighting for funding every year for key capacities, the goal is to look at proven capacity and support that capacity, and whatever is left could be used for innovation. Ms. Skidmore would like to continue having Operational Coordination as a key capacity.

Administrator Rahmeyer asked if there is any indication if NCHS will have any changes to priorities moving forward, and if so, the value in taking this list as a draft in the event NCHS priorities change. Chief Cage

indicated that he did not have any indication at this time on how the NCHS will weigh in on this issue, and this list will be advisory only to the NCHS, as they will make the final vote on what is to be used moving forward with the FFY19 HSGP process.

Dr. Freeman spoke to this strategic capacity list, with the impression the list applies to regional and statewide capacity, and questioned if the application for funding would require the description of exact capacity. There are regionalized capacities that are available, even if localized, throughout the state through EMAC, mutual aid, etc. Dr. Freeman wants to ensure that if a local community is developing a project, it needs to have statewide impact, and that this information could be shared with applicants to drive the expectation on the evaluation process. Chief Steinbeck spoke to not eliminating local agencies going after remaining funds for a local need. The Commission will still have the ability to look at and rank those projects, and there should be carve outs for those capacities that cannot be lost. This could be a springboard to maintaining projects outside of the grant process.

Kelli Anderson spoke to the HSGP process and the fact that typically the state gets 10 investment justifications categorized by “projects”. There is a general requirement that has appeared in many funding notices to have at least one fusion center or intelligence project as an example. Additionally, any funding applied to HSGP must be deployable, and that is why the SAA has that authority. Should the Department of Homeland Security indicate they cannot fund a project, the Resilience Commission would re-review the project. The mission is to ensure that this process is not open to undefined projects or to waste applicant, staff, or this Commission’s valuable resources on those projects that cannot make it through a compliance review. Dr. dePolo motioned to approve the initial list of strategic capacities provided for the purposes of the HSGP timeline with the ability to review at a later time with the possibility of having a 5-year plan for projects. Chief Cage clarified the list and read it into the record again, noting that Dr. dePolo’s motion would refer to his read out of strategic capacities. Additional discussion was presented by Administrator Rahmeyer on the potential benefit of defining what “strategic” means, with Chief Cage indicating that strategic in this case warrants that should the capacity not be addressed, it would have huge repercussions to homeland security efforts.

Chief Steinbeck inquired if Dr. dePolo wished to amend his motion to allow the SAA to develop specific capacities within the overarching capabilities. Dave Hunkup requested to have a clean copy of the capacities as amended after the meeting. Connie Morton, Southern Nevada VOAD, seconded the motion. Chief Cage re-read into record the strategic capacities. The resultant list will be used to advise the Co-Chairs who will define the strategic capacities for review and approval by the NCHS. Dr. Freeman asked that CERT be changed to Citizen Corps, and that change was accepted by Dr. dePolo and Ms. Morton as amendments to the motion and second provided. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

Kelli Anderson spoke to the existing FFY18 HSGP Project Proposal template used last year, and asked the Commission for any recommendations or suggestion in changing the form. Due to the pending release of the FFY NOFO, time is limited, and an updated version of this form will need to be sent out soon. Also required in the FFY19 process will be the inclusion of a detailed line item budget for each proposal. Dr. Kenneston inquired if core capability reference in the document would be changed to reflect strategic capacities. Mr. Hynds presented concern over Section 12 requirements to provide sub grant award recipients. Per Ms. Anderson, this section is for the proposer to tell DEM where the funding will be applied. Considerable discussion ensued on examples of how the City of Henderson could use this section to identify sub grant awardees and the issues with responsibility on monitoring asset transfers. Ms. Anderson indicated that it is the responsibility of the jurisdiction awarded the funding to monitor how the funding is applied. If that cannot be done, the SAA could grant the funding to the jurisdiction. The other option is for the requesting jurisdiction to tell the state who to award the funding to, because DEM does not allow sub-sub grants. Mr. Hynds spoke of the challenges in continuing to monitor sub grants and the complexity involved with timelines and deliverables. Chief Cage inquired if there was a proposed timeline within the proposal, with Ms. Anderson indicating that Section #16 requires such information. Chief Cage also inquired if there is a way to

acknowledge if the subgrantee intends to pursue a Request for Proposal (RFP), with Ms. Anderson indicating that a possibility may exist for the use of a “good of the state” contract and release it to stakeholders. The only caveat is that Ms. Anderson would have to know in advance what type of equipment is needed.

Dr. Kenneston inquired on the timeline for the FFY19 HSGP process. Per Ms. Anderson, the unofficial timeframe for the NOFO to drop appears to be mid-April, and at that time the funding allocations will be known for the UASI and SHSP. If necessary, in preparation for the process, draft project proposals and budgets could be sent out to stakeholders, but that is up to the SAA and UAA. Dr. Kenneston requested that no draft documents be sent out as that will complicate the process once official documents are ready.

16. Public Comment

Chief Cage opened discussion for public comment. Robert Dehnhardt, Chief Information Security Officer, State of Nevada, expressed his appreciation for efforts of Administrator Rahmeyer and Michael Dietrich in clarifying cyber objectives for the state, specifically, regional versus statewide initiatives, Mr. Dehnhardt spoke to the City of Henderson’s response plan and templates developed as an example of what can happen with relatively small funding requests. Clark County is currently using those tools, and the OCDC has shared them with other statewide agencies, tribal organizations, and executive level government. Emphasis was placed on community effort, and that is what sets this Commission apart from the others. Irene Navis, Navis Strategic Services, LLC, spoke to having been involved with this process since 2006, and the progress established with planning efforts. There is concern that the opportunity has not been taken to look at continuity of operations (COOP), alternate care sites, and impacts to critical infrastructure. Many of the facilities that would be used are not classified as critical infrastructure. It may be beneficial to look at an investment to pull all of these differing plans together under community resilience or other over-arching capacities. The convention centers in southern Nevada are used for multiple events which poses conflict when needed during disaster or emergency. COOP, community resilience, damage assessment, and recovery work together, and efforts can be looked at comprehensively moving forward.

17. Adjourn

Chief Cage called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was presented by Mary Ann Laffoon, and a second was provided by Chief John Steinbeck. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.