



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE		February 19, 2020		
	TIME		9:00 A.M.		
	LOCATIONS		Legislative Counsel Bureau Legislative Building – Room 1214 401 S. Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701		
			Legislative Counsel Bureau Grant Sawyer Building – Room 4412 555 E. Washington Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89101		
	METHOD		Video-Teleconference		
RECORDER		Karen Hall			
Advisory Committee Voting Member Attendance					
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Justin Luna	X	Jeanne Freeman	X	Todd Moss	X
John Steinbeck	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Tennille Pereira	X
Roy Anderson	X	Jill Hemenway	ABS	Shaun Rahmeyer	ABS
Travis Anderson	X	Eric Holt	X	Misty Robinson	X
Elizabeth Breeden	X	Dave Hunkup	X	Rachel Skidmore	X
James Chrisley	X	Jeremy Hynds	ABS	Corey Solferino	X
Darci Davis	X	Graham Kent	ABS	Malinda Southard	ABS
Cassandra Darrough	ABS	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Chris Tomaino	ABS
Robert Dehnhardt	X	Chris Lake	X	Mike Wilson	X
Craig dePolo	ABS	Bob Leighton	X		
Kelly Echeverria	X	Carolyn Levering	X		
Dave Fogerson	X	Ryan Miller	X		
Advisory Committee Non-Voting Member Attendance					
Bunny Bishop	ABS	Melissa Friend	ABS	Catherine Nielson	X
Rebecca Bodnar	ABS	Kacey KC	ABS		
Felix Castagnola	X	Aaron Kenneston	X		
Legal Representative			Entity		Present
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney General			Nevada Attorney General's Office		X
Analyst/Support Staff			Entity		Present
Meagan Werth-Ranson			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X
Kendall Herzer			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - South		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 highlighted changes in membership on the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (Committee): Dr. Darcy Davis, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services has taken over as a voting member for Dr. Stephanie Woodard, and Deputy Fire Chief Travis Anderson, City of North Las Vegas, replaces voting member Solome Barton.

2. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. In Carson City, Colonel Tony Machabee, United States Air Force, expressed concerns on behalf of the Wing Commander at the Nellis Airforce Base regarding the Area 51 event. Numerous articles have come forth concerning the continuation of this event. Another event like this, held at the classified entrances of the base, causes a great deal of disruption to the staff located at the base. Colonel Machabee noted that if the state cannot provide adequate security to the outside of the gate there can be greater consequences. The Wing Commander is responsible for securing the inside perimeter. The outside perimeter is a different situation that should be considered from the state's perspective. No other comment was provided in the Carson City venue, the Las Vegas venue, or from the phone.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Luna called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes from the January 22, 2020, Committee meeting. Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County, spoke to her name needing to be corrected throughout the document. The correct spelling is Echeverria. A motion to approve the minutes as amended was provided by Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson, East Lake Fire Protection District, and a second was provided by Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Briefing on the Statewide Preparedness Efforts for the Coronavirus

Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District, began this agenda item by stating that Clark County is currently monitoring more than 100 travelers from China that are asymptomatic and are maintaining 14-day quarantine. The Incident Command System (ICS) has been activated on a rather small scale, but that is expected to grow as the virus spreads. There are no persons under investigation at this time. Ms. Robinson spoke to the current development of an application for phones for easier symptom reporting. Clark County is also participating in calls with the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) three times a week. Ms. Robinson noted that test kits were received from the CDC for the Southern Nevada Public Health Lab, since then, the test kits have been recalled. The replacement shipment of test kits should be received by next week. Local testing should be able to be completed a few days after the kits are received. Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, provided an update for northern Nevada. Local health authorities are also monitoring travelers returning from China and are participating in the same CDC calls three times a week. In addition to statewide calls that are beginning tomorrow with Public Health Preparedness, there are also Quad County Multi-Agency Coordination Center (MACC) group calls and Quad County Healthcare Coalition calls taking place every Friday. Additionally, information is being updated on the website, and information is continuing to be pushed out to community partners, Emergency Medical Services (EMS) partners, and other healthcare facilities. Information is currently being gathered from the Healthcare Coalition members regarding the potential supply shortages on personal protective equipment (PPE). Currently N95 masks are on a six-month backorder. There is also difficulty in acquiring gowns and gloves and work is being done in conjunction with the Nevada Hospital Association. This is a national issue. Carson City Health and Human Services will be going live with an incident action plan (IAP) to be published on a weekly basis addressing current approaches to the Coronavirus. Ms. Robinson spoke to the National Bio-surveillance Integration Center (NBIC) report that is sent out to the Fusion Centers and if these reports need to be pushed out to the north that can be done if requested.

5. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Programmatic Update

Chief Luna spoke to the document provided in the member packets. This agenda item is meant to be an informational item only. This report is as of the period ending December 31, 2019.

6. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Financial Update

Chief Luna spoke to the document provided in the member packets. This agenda item is also meant to be an information item only regarding the financial update for the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) for the award years that are open currently. The documents are divided by the Urban Area projects and State Homeland Security grant projects. Also, included in the member packets is the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 list of projects that were approved. This was included as reference material for this year's grant process. Dr. Davis inquired on the timeframe for the grant deadline and asked for clarification regarding some of the projects showing to be 100% complete, and some are showing 0% complete. Chief Luna spoke to these projects being previously approved, and the level of completion depends on the year and the type of projects. Equipment only projects can sometimes be completed quicker than other projects. Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, noted that the FFY2016 grant expired on December 30, 2019, the FFY2017 grant expires on September 30, 2020, the FFY2018 grant expires on September 30, 2021, and the FFY2019 grant expires on September 30, 2022. Any funding remaining for FFY2016 is in the process of being wrapped up and any remaining funding goes to a deobligated status and is being reverted to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). There are numerous reasons the project money can go unspent. Ms. Anderson noted there are still large balances for FFY2017 and can be attributed to contract payoffs that occur at the end of a project.

7. Next Steps in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Process

Chief Luna spoke to this agenda item being meant to provide the Committee with a timeline of the next steps in the HSGP grant process. DHS released the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for FFY2020 as of last Friday, February 14, 2020, now DEM/HS can talk with more certainty about the timeline of the process. The FFY2020 NOFO is included as a handout in the member packets for this agenda item. Page 8 of the NOFO shows the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) amount for Nevada at \$4,287,500.00 which is a \$210,000.00 increase over last year's award. The overall Federal investment was unchanged from the previous year at \$415,000,000.00. Page 10 of the NOFO shows the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) range for Nevada at \$4,200,000.00 to \$5,250,000.00, which overlaps the \$5,000,000.00 allocation from last year's award. The overall federal investment for UASI increased by \$25 million over last year for an overall Federal investment of \$615,000,000.00. The range amount for the UASI allocation is a new structure for this year's award, and final award amounts will be based on DHS/Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) evaluation of the effectiveness of proposed investments and projects. Within the NOFO, it states that applicants are strongly encouraged to apply for funding at least 15% over the high end of their target allocation range as ineffective applications will not be funded. This is a new requirement for this year. This additional 15% is available for both the SHSP and the UASI amounts. The Committee will consider that option into consideration when ranking the projects. The DHS/FEMA effectiveness evaluation will primarily be based on our application's inclusion of projects related to the new national priorities introduced in this year's NOFO. For FFY2020, the HSGP includes the following four national priority areas: enhancing cybersecurity (including election security), enhancing the protection of soft targets/crowded places (including election security), enhancing information and intelligence sharing and cooperation with federal agencies, including DHS, and addressing emerging threats (e.g., transnational criminal organizations, weapons of mass destruction [WMDs], unmanned aerial systems [UASs], etc.). Each of the four priority-aligned investment justifications (IJs) must equal or exceed 5% of the applicable target allocation.

Dr. Davis spoke to working on the Statewide Emergency Disaster and Behavioral Health Plan and if there were any components spelled out regarding behavioral health and if not, how does the Committee go about making sure that is included. Chief Luna advised this is national guidance that is pushed down to all the states from the Federal level; therefore, Nevada has no control over certain requirements for what is included in project submissions. Communication can be conducted through delegations and elected officials to try to raise behavioral health to a national priority. Projects outside of these national priorities can be included as well. This will be discussed further at next month's meeting when project submissions are reviewed. Dr. Davis expressed the need for behavioral health to be included moving forward. Carolyn Levering spoke to the 5% allocation requirement, there is no reference to the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) being a requirement for this year's guidance and inquired if that has officially been removed from this year's guidance. The LETPP used to be a dedicated funding stream for law enforcement activities and has been rolled into the larger SHSP and UASI funding stream. Up until now, there has always been a 25% requirement that the total allocation of funding had to be applied to LETPP activities. Ms. Levering expressed concern with meeting some of the allocation requirements, specifically election security. Kelli Anderson advised the LETPP is still included in the guidance as part of the Price Act of Homeland Security and would still be required by law. The applications that have been received to date still reflect a portion of funds going to law enforcement above the 25%. Ms. Levering asked for clarification on the 25% still going to law enforcement and if there is an additional 20% being allocated to these four categories. Rachel Skidmore, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, noted that some of the allocations can overlap and does not believe that there will be an additional 20% on top of the 25%. LETPP will cover anything relating to law enforcement terrorism prevention activities but if talking about soft targets or anything the Fusion Center does, those can be met with the same allocation categories. Ms. Anderson advised there are dual functions but the difficulty is in increasing the number of IJs as there are only ten on each for SHSP and UASI, but there has to be separate IJs for the four new priorities. This is currently an enhancement to what is already being done. There needs to be collaboration to create inclusive enhancements. There is a project that has been submitted and has been funded for the past few years with the State Election Secretary of State's Office (SOS) regarding election security. However, there has never been funding for an election security project specifically from UASI funding. There are also questions about the priority one and priority two listed in the grant guidance affecting election security. Ms. Anderson is verifying both of these priority investments and expects this to be an error but will be working closely with DHS.

Misty Robinson noted that the NOFO was provided to a few members of the State, Local, Tribal, Territorial Government Coordination Council (SLTTGCC), and they were asked to provide feedback. Unfortunately, the state and locals did not have a good opportunity to review this document before it was put out through DHS. Ms. Levering expressed concern with the new target allocation range element. Historically, Nevada has not fared well in the national competitive process and could result in less of an allocation. There is nothing in this document as to how the federal government will determine the effectiveness of an application other than meeting the categorical allocations. When the funding used to be more competitive in the past, it was a strongly subjective process and that subjectivity could potentially hurt the state and the UASI. Ms. Anderson spoke to how DHS may judge the applications. It was noted on the national call last week that the urban area will receive the UASI plus the high amount of \$5.25 million if submissions include the additional criteria for the 5% for each of those priority areas that Chief Luna read into the record. The plus 15% is then competitive. The low amount and the high amount of the urban area are not competitive as long as the 5% investments are completed. If the 5% investments are not met, the urban area may receive a lower amount. Ms. Anderson is confident that the UASI high amount will be received as long as there is compliance. Ms. Levering also inquired about the Management and Administration (M&A) costs set aside for the state to process these grants and without knowing the exact of funding to anticipate, what is the thought regarding the M&A set aside for UASI and SHSP funding. Ms. Anderson advised it was not anticipated there would be five additional set aside allocation potentials. This makes this application process more challenging. For strategy purposes for each funding stream, for UASI the total plus the high is what should be requested. If lower funding is received,

the management cost will be adjusted and projects will be adjusted, as needed. This could lead to future meetings to evaluate additional projects.

Chief Luna advised that once the prioritization of the projects is completed, assuming they are within the rankings for the standard allocations, the 5% requirement is met for the national priorities, any projects submitted toward the 15% have to fall within those national priorities. This would need to be a consideration when ranking the projects. Ms. Anderson advised that this was her understanding and this question has also been pushed up to DHS for clarification. In regards to the 15%, there are other projects that would potentially fit in the plus 15% but if the plus 15% is not received then they cannot be funded. There needs to be a lot of strategies when submitting investments to protect maintaining capacities. Dr. Jeanne Freeman inquired if in regards to projects to be sustained, moving forward with the funding of these projects according to the national priorities, how does this impact the funding moving forward when priorities could continuously be changing. Ms. Anderson noted that Nevada has a solid foundation with the Threat and Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA) and Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR). There needs to be communication with the DHS partners. Dr. Freeman clarified that the plus 15% is to go into the verbiage of enhancing so it does not go into the maintain category that it is being shown as an enhancement to meet the verbiage in the NOFO. Ms. Anderson noted that this creates another set of issues. This potentially means, this will need to be opened for additional projects or expand existing applications. Dr. Freeman clarified that it is possible that the enhancement can be a refinement to a project that is already in place and the funding maintains the level that is there. It does not necessarily mean there is an enhancement in the funding, but there is an enhancement in the project. Chief Luna advised there needs to be clarification on the word enhancement from DHS moving through this process. DEM/HS has developed a transparent process to allocate these funds and that process is separate from the DHS process. There is a lot of overlap and there is a need to be more strategic. Ms. Skidmore asked for clarification on if the urban area potentially received at least \$4.2 million, would the urban area then put forth the sustain IJs less the 5% in M&A the state would maintain and then do separate IJs up to the \$6 million. Ms. Skidmore asked if the baseline less than 5% and then everything less than that would be on separate IJs. Ms. Anderson noted the UASI low amount is \$4.2 million, the UASI high end is \$5.25 million and the UASI high end plus the 15% is estimated at \$6 million. This means a lot of applications that are maintaining capacities do an enhancement justification as well. These projects would be looked at to see where they fall and if enhancing it could potentially be placed in the 5% carve-out for the priority investments. When looking at the three levels, the amount is \$210,000.00 and \$300,000.00 per target priority. This may not be difficult when looking overall. Ms. Skidmore asked for clarification on the 5% overall for priorities was not for additional piece, it was for the overall IJs submitted up to the \$4.2 million would have to include at least 5% for those activities and not for anything that is applied for beyond that. Ms. Anderson advised that the \$4.2 million is the minimum and the 5% allocation is the \$5.25 million. The \$5.25 million will be received if the four priorities investments are met. That is a given if projects are compliant. Additional 15% more could be granted if more money is requested in the four priorities. Ms. Skidmore expressed concern with removing line items out of specific IJs, this could result in the 5% and now it is on the chopping block. Once the final say is received on what the funding will be from DHS, might need to come back to the urban area and determine what that looks like. Ms. Anderson reiterated that the \$4.2 million is the allocation amount that will be received if not compliant with the four priorities. If the priorities are submitted for the 5%, the \$5.25 million will be received. Chief Steinbeck agreed that adjustments are going to be made regarding this process, and it needs to be looked at a little differently than in previous years.

Chief Luna spoke to the overall HSGP process here in Nevada. The determination of the strategic capacities to be maintained lays the foundation of the process. These were reviewed and recommendations were made by this Committee at the meeting back in October 2019. The recommendations from the Resilience Advisory Committee and the Finance Committee of the Commission on Homeland Security were reviewed by the Commission at the meeting in October 2019. Based on those strategic capacities, project submissions will be reviewed and it will be determined which projects should be recommended to maintain status and which will

go into the competitive process. During the last few months of this past year, work was done with stakeholders throughout the state on preparedness assessments, which identifies our current readiness level and also getting input on the THIRA, which identifies the gaps in our capabilities to handle a variety of hazards. These two assessments will guide decisions regarding priorities during the process and were completed in December 2019. Along with the assessments done at the state level, DHS released the national rankings based on the Metropolitan Statistical Analysis (MSA) risk calculations; this process was reviewed at the meeting back in August 2019. These assessments play a significant factor in the level of funding that is received.

DEM/HS released the project proposal application portal to any agencies that were interested in submitting projects for consideration. The project proposals were due at the end of the day on Monday, February 17, 2020. Cybersecurity and communications specific project proposals will receive an extra layer of review coordinated by the State's Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (OCD) and the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC). The project proposals will then be presented to the working groups for review, by the Resilience Committee at next month's meeting, which is scheduled for Wednesday, March 11, 2020. This meeting will be an all-day meeting. A separate working group will be scheduled to review the Urban Area projects. The initial meeting is on February 27, 2020. The working groups will prioritize the projects and make recommendations to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee will review the projects and make recommendations for the Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) for final review and consideration. Those meetings will be scheduled for early April 2020. The final project submission is due back to DHS at the federal level by April 15, 2020. This requires a really quick turn-around and involves a lot of moving parts within the process.

8. Summary of Project Submissions for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Process

Chief Luna spoke to the document provided in the member packets. This agenda item is meant to be an informational item only with the preliminary summary report for project submissions for the FFY2020 grant award. DEM/HS will be working with the project submitters prior to the Committee meeting on March 11, 2020. Each project submitter will have three minutes to present their projects to the Committee. Chief Luna noted on page 12, it shows a combination of both SHSP and UASI projects. The total combined amount is almost \$14 million in projects. The next few pages show SHSP projects only. The total for SHSP projects only is almost \$6 million. The last few pages show UASI projects only. Page 19 shows the UASI projects total of \$7.8 million. Carolyn Levering spoke to the sustained section subject to error by submitter and if anyone was going back through to correct those that chose sustain when it should have been new. Chief Luna indicated this section will be cross-referenced with past maintain projects with the current list of project submissions for accuracy. Ms. Anderson noted that DEM/HS has the ability to release the application back to the applicant after review and have updates made to reflect accurate information. The only thing that was edited out was the overview column because it did not fit on the spreadsheet. This is a new system and a new process; this was done to garner input. Ms. Levering requested if a project is listed as sustain and was funded last year can a comparison be provided of last year's funding level to compare with this year's request. This will help understand the logic behind the increase. Chief Luna spoke to the document provided for agenda item #6i, referencing the final spreadsheet of the projects approved for FFY2019. This document can be used as a starting point when looking at current project submissions. More documentation will also be provided at the March 11, 2020 meeting.

9. Discussion of Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Allocations

Chief Luna opened this agenda item by discussing the documents that were provided in the member packets for this item. Based on the discussion from last month's meeting, DEM/HS prepared documents for review that reflect different allocation scenarios along with adding in information that shows the entire grant award.

Please note that these scenarios have been updated to reflect the FFY2020 allocation amount for Nevada of \$4.6 million, which is an increase of \$88,000.00 over last year's award. Just for clarification, the EMPG allocation formula that is being considered is not for FFY2020 but for FFY2021. The spreadsheets included in the packets are divided into two sets. The first group of scenarios shows each county and city receiving a base, and the base amounts are shown using different percentage calculations. The next group of scenarios shows only counties getting a base allocation with the remaining amount being distributed by population. This group also shows base amounts using different percentage calculations. Then the next set of allocation scenarios adds in an additional base amount for the two counties whose population is more than 100 thousand just as another alternative. Then the rest of the calculations are similar to the previous scenarios presented but with different outcomes because of the additional base distributions. Dr. Jeanne Freeman noted that looking at the various scenarios there have been multiple requests for Tribal partners to be added to the same formula as others and inquired if this has been investigated further. Chief Luna advised on the scenarios that specific Tribal partners have been separated out that have received certain allocations and have remained stable based on prior allocations. There is a proposed increase in the scenarios of 1.94% which is the same percentage increase as the grant award overall. Chief Luna spoke to the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC) being included in the State allocation half of the overall award. The Tribal allocation based off population is proving to be difficult. This is why it is proposed the Tribal partners remain stable but there is a potential for an increase. Dr. Freeman advised looking at other state agencies and how they determine population if the Committee moves forward with the population allocation and is supportive of the different ways Tribal governments allocate actual population. Dave Hunkup, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC), spoke to the RSIC participating in the 2020 census and the numbers for that community in Reno and Hungry Valley. This information may want to be considered moving forward. Dr. Freeman questioned agenda item #9, document #A2, the allocation formula where it shows counties with over 100,000 in population with at 2% base before the other base allocations. Chief Luna advised this was just a starting point and was not based on any specific criteria. Many options have been discussed over the past six months. Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, spoke to the Tribal allocation. The RSIC and Pyramid Lake have his full support for both of those programs and appreciates their contributions over the years. Dr. Kenneston's contention is to not hurt good programs. If the total amount is \$4.6 million it does not make sense to see red ink with counties that have good programs. There are 100 counties that have met the Emergency Management Assessment Program (EMAP) standard. Washoe County is one of those counties that have achieved the EMAP accreditation. To take big-dollar cuts does not make sense.

Carolyn Levering spoke to a draft position paper that she prepared on this topic with contributions from other stakeholders. The bottom part of the current situation section reads "It is logical that DEM should have a formal and defensible method for distribution of funds however programs that are meeting and exceeding standards in areas that are experiencing growth should not receive a decrease in funding simply for the sake of having a formal model." A proposed solution, elements of which are negotiable, is as follows "In today's environment of all disasters that are local, it is clear to local stakeholders in Nevada that more resources are required to meet the national preparedness goal. Funds appropriated for FFY2020 include a modest increase to the State of Nevada. This increase should be passed to the sub recipients for increase in demands especially in communities experiencing unprecedented growth rates. Beginning with FFY2020, DEM should pass through no less than 50% of total EMPG funds to counties and municipalities. The spreadsheets before us today do not reflect that. Given the unique needs and sovereignty of the federally recognized Tribes in this state, support to eligible Tribes shall be managed through the portion of funds retained by the state. Additionally, DEM should establish plans to achieve meeting its own organization's match requirements. No sub recipient funded in FFY2019 should receive a reduction in funds if the following requirements have been met; all administrative requirements for federal eligibility are documented, no more than 25% of total award has been deobligated for any reason, and program meets its own 50% match requirement. This area is negotiable in regards to figures. Sub recipients who fail to meet these requirements may be considered for funding reductions commiserate with the level of nonperformance or inability to demonstrate capacity to meet those same

requirements for FFY2020. All county sub recipients of FFY2019 who met the above requirements should be eligible for base funding of .75% of total funds to be allocated of the 50% of the federal award. All counties and municipal sub recipients for FFY2019 who met the above requirements should be eligible for funds based on population. Population based funds are the sum total of funds remaining after the county receives its .75% base. In the event that funds designated for local government use are not adequate to meet existing obligations, the shortfall shall come from the portion of funds retained by the state. Counties who do not receive FFY2019 funding but wish to pursue FFY2020 funding must file a notice of intent to apply letter with DEM. This notice should include details regarding the applicant's ability and commitment to use funds to meet administrative requirements as well as match requirements. A procedure to evaluate such requests must be established.

As provided by Nevada Revised Statue (NRS) 414, if two or more counties wish to enter into an inter-local agreement for the provision of a single local emergency management program, the new organization is eligible to receive combined base funding and population funding. An example would be a tri-county solution. Base funding times three plus population funding on total combined population equals eligible funding level. There is currently no model for this solution. Organizations must file a notice of intent to apply with DEM. This notice should include details regarding the applicant's ability and commitment to use funds to meet administrative requirements as well as match requirements. A procedure to evaluate such requests must be established. Municipalities that did not receive FFY2019 funding but wish to pursue FFY2020 are subject to requirements established by their county. The absence of an emergency management program at the municipality becomes the responsibility of the county. Establishment of a new municipal program will impacts the funds received by the county and must be negotiated and agreed upon. If a county elects to support a new municipality emergency management program, it must detail the support in writing to DEM. A procedure to evaluate such requests must be established." Ms. Levering advised taking a look at the current spreadsheets with this view in mind.

Deputy Chief Fogerson thanked Ms. Levering for providing some considerations that need to be made. It needs to be noted that the NRS says the counties must provide this service now; it needs to be figured out how to do that. Most programs are barely hanging on currently so it does not make sense to cut them. Deputy Chief Fogerson again thanked Ms. Levering for her research on this item regarding maintained programs and how to proceed with programs that would like to now opt-in. Ms. Levering is also requesting more information from DEM/HS in order to look at this model in dollars and cents. Kelli Anderson advised the need to be strategic moving forward when discussing NRS and Federal funds. NRS cannot be used with any of the guidelines to manage federal funds. When implementing something for programmatic, the depth of staffing levels needs to be considered for managing this. Considering most funding is nine months behind and spending has already begun, allocations for FFY2020 cannot be made today for emergency managers that have already spent it six months ago. An allocation for FFY2021 has not been spent yet. Chief Turner, City of Henderson, spoke to concerns on the EMPG formula. Chief Turner noted the intent of the EMPG grant is to create capabilities for preparedness across the country to lower the impact of disasters to their jurisdictions. The intent is to reduce the loss of life and infrastructure and not just to hand out money. The intent is not for everyone to get a piece of the pie. The reason the federal government continues to fund this program is due to International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM) and National Emergency Management Association (NEMA) are making the pitch there is an increase or rise in disasters across the country. The investment is to lower the impact across the country. There are many minimum requirements the local jurisdictions need to meet. Take an honest look back and look at what has been done across the state. This means are these investments worthwhile. There is a huge increase in the urban areas population risk that is hard to manage. The formula is difficult because you do not want to lessen the investments that have been made across the state, specifically in rural communities with their programs, but still manage the demand in the urban areas. There is more risk with population. This risk includes more schools, casinos, and soft targets. This is a drain on the emergency management programs. Chief Turner expressed support for Ms. Levering's

recommendation of the .75% base for all the counties and using the populations for all municipalities. There should not be a decrease in FFY2020 funds for any jurisdictions that have been receiving EMPG funds.

Kelly Echeverria agreed with the statements made by Chief Turner and Ms. Levering. Ms. Echeverria also noted the numbers for the standard allocation for 2015-2019 for Washoe County are incorrect. The amount should be \$170,877.00 and not \$160,877.00 this might be a result of the allocation from last year where equipment was taken out and submitted separately. Chief Luna spoke to the potential of voting on this for next month's meeting. With the current discussion from today, looking at some of the positions that were stated, there will need to be additional work completed before voting can take place but opened the floor for discussion. Rachel Skidmore inquired as a voting member if it would be possible for this discussion to be opened up to local entities to provide what their solutions would be based on specific funding and possible solutions for this topic. This would help in making a decision as there is conflicting information at this point. Chief Luna advised this body does not include representation from all agencies that receive this funding. This is another concern that needs to be considered in the timeline of recommendation that this Committee would provide to the State Administrative Agent. This may need to be further vetted with the jurisdictions that are not included in this Committee. The goal in this discussion was to try to get to a formula that is defensible and consistent. The suggestions brought forth will be taken into consideration for the March 2020 meeting. Mike Heidemann, Churchill County, agreed with Chief Turner that the rural counties do need this money but this is a performance grant. It would be helpful to know which counties are performing and which counties are not. It would be helpful to know who is participating in the THIRA and SPR. James Chrisley, Clark County Department of Aviation, noted it would be helpful to understand the real impact of these potential cuts as well. Is there a way to better quantify the effects of those who would be negatively impacted. Chief Luna noted it has been discussed over the past few months that this funding is primarily used to support emergency management personnel and is the primary funding source at the state level. This is one of the big impacts that has been discussed and why this is such an important item. Dave Hunkup requested this topic be added to the next NTECC meeting to get the input of Tribal partners. Jill Perez, Ely Shoshone Tribe, agreed this is something that NTECC should be involved with moving forward. Chief Luna advised this will be added to the NTECC agenda.

10. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. No public comment was provided by any of the venues.

11. Adjourn

Chief Luna called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion to adjourn was presented by Dr. Jeanne Freeman and a second was provided by Misty Robinson. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.