



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE	July 9, 2019				
	TIME	9:00 A.M.				
	LOCATIONS	Nevada Department of Transportation Conference Room #302 1263 S. Stewart Street Carson City, NV 89701				
		Clark County Fire Administration Building 2 nd Floor Multi-agency Coordination Center 575 E. Flamingo Road Las Vegas, NV 89119				
		Nevada Department of Transportation Main Conference Room 1951 Idaho Street Elko, NV 89801				
	METHOD	Video-Teleconference				
RECORDER	Meagan Werth-Ranson					
Advisory Committee VotingMember Attendance						
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	
Caleb Cage	X	Jeremy Hynds	X	Misty Robinson	X	
John Steinbeck	X	Aaron Kenneston	X	Chris Tomaino	X	
Roy Anderson	ABS	Graham Kent	X	Rachel Skidmore	X	
Solome Barton	X	Annette Kerr	X	Corey Solferino	X	
James Chrisley	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Malinda Southard	X	
Cassandra Darrough	X	Chris Lake	X	Mike Wilson	X	
Craig dePolo	X	Bob Leighton	X	Stephanie Woodard	X	
Michael Dietrich	X	Carolyn Levering	X	Tennille Pereira	X	
Dave Fogerson	X	Connie Morton	ABS	Christina Conti	ABS	
Jeanne Freeman	X	Todd Moss	X			
Mike Heidemann	ABS	Shaun Rahmeyer	X			
Eric Holt	X	Ryan Miller	ABS			
David Hunkup	X	Carlito Rayos	X			
Advisory Committee Non-VotingMember Attendance						
Bunny Bishop	X	Melissa Friend	X	Jill Hemenway	ABS	
Felix Castagnola	X	Kacey KC	ABS	Elizabeth Breeden	X	
Bart Chambers	ABS	Rebecca Bodnar	ABS	Catherine Nielson	X	
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	
Kendall Herzer			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - South		X	

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

2. Public Comment

Chief Cage opened discussion for public comment in all venues. Yuri Graves, University of Nevada Las Vegas, thanked Chief Cage for his leadership to the emergency management community in Nevada and wished him well on his future endeavor. Deputy Chief John Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, inquired if this would be a good time to introduce the new membership to the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC). Per Chief Cage, that discussion will take place on the bylaws agenda item.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Cage called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes from the June 11, 2019, NRAC meeting. Dr. Craig dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, requested amendments to the minutes including the revision of Agenda Item #6, first paragraph, fourth sentence to read, "Nevada is the Basin and Range Province State, and the location of the California Platte Boundary System hypothetically increases the threat of earthquakes in Nevada." In the same paragraph, line #9 was amended to read, "There was a gap from 1960 to about 2008 where no large earthquakes occurred." Finally, in the second paragraph of Agenda Item #6, Line #7, was amended to read "Dr. dePolo also provided the history on the 1954 Churchill County Earthquakes." A motion to approve the minutes as amended was provided by Dr. dePolo and a second was provided by Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Quarterly Review of Current Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee Bylaws

Chief Cage opened discussion on the current NRAC bylaws and spoke to the changes that have occurred as a result of the 2019 legislative efforts. Changes included the following:

- Change from Nevada Resilience Commission to the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee;
- Added authority information that this body is created in statute within NRS 239C;
- Minor corrections to acronyms;
- Membership from no more than 40 voting members to no more than 34 voting members, and changing co-chairs to Chair and Vice Chair;
- Meetings remain monthly; and
- Subcommittee language.

Chief Cage thanked Deputy Attorney General Samantha Ladich for researching the law and updating the language accordingly. Chief Cage opened the floor for discussion. David Hunkup, Reno Sparks Indian Colony, inquired on the name change, and the difference between a commission and a committee. Chief Cage spoke to the differing bodies created in statute. There has been significant discussion on the roles of commissions within the legal realm. If there is a commission that is advising or reporting to an executive branch agency, and it has legislators on the executive branch agency's commission, there can be issues with separation of powers. There are commissions that are established in statute, and there are advisory committees. The typical structure hierarchy generally has the commission as the authority body, and advisory portion is called a committee. The committee then reports to the commission much in the same way that the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security Finance Committee reports the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS). Also, along the same lines, the NRAC is advisory to the NCHS.

Chief Cage spoke to the statutory membership of the NRAC and the challenges the legislature provided to the large size of the initial Resilience Commission. As a result, the membership requirement of not more than 40 voting members was reduced to 34 voting members. Using the methodology and collaborative model that

exists currently, some of the state agencies and other membership was moved to a non-voting status to maintain as much of the original membership as possible. New members were also added as well. Chief Cage asked for member introductions. Introductions ensued in all meeting venues.

Chief Cage made a motion to approve the updated bylaws provided to the NRAC with the caveat that DEM/HS can make non-substantive editorial changes prior to the next quarter. Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson, East Lake Fire Protection District seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Chief Cage instructed the NRAC that the meeting will move to Agenda Item #9 after this agenda item so staff can analyze ranking input to the Major Incident Response Vehicle (MIRV).

5. Review and Discussion of Emergency Management Strategic Plan

Chief Cage began the conversation by noting that the Strategic Plan was approved in April, 2019, and during that NRAC meeting the concept for updating and reviewing the Strategic Plan was finalized. The finalized concept is for the NRAC to review the Strategic Plan quarterly and apply ways to improve or modify the process. Modifications that were minor in nature and would not impact the operability of the plan could be made quarterly. The major provisions would be handled via the Annual Report. The Annual Report is due in January. Chief Cage spoke to the dashboard document provided to the members that displayed performance measures. These are the ten performance measures for the state. It was identified that these are not the performance measures the NRAC needs to consider going forward. As preparations begin for the next budget cycle, different performance measures might need to be considered including whether the number of sub grantees receiving compliance reviews needs to be tracked, and on whether hazard plans approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) need to be tracked. There are numerous arguments for both of these ideas. The snapshot document is one picture showing where DEM/HS currently stands and will be used to drive conversations for improvement. Chief Cage advised that there are other committees and commissions that are part of DEM/HS that would like to have their recommendations considered as part of this process. Specifically, the recommendations set forth for consideration would be presented to the NRAC for review. A final change would be for the reference of the Nevada Resilience Commission to be updated to the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee throughout the document.

6. Briefing on Implementation Plan for Recent Legislative Efforts Associated with the Statewide Resilience Strategy

Chief Cage provided a brief overview on the current legislative efforts affecting statewide resilience including activities on the following legislation:

- Assembly Bill 71: Makes various changes concerning expenditures related to disasters and emergencies;
- Assembly Bill 206: Revises provisions related to emergency management;
- Senate Bill 15: Provides for the establishment of incident management assistance teams;
- Senate Bill 34: Revises provisions related to emergency management;
- Senate Bill 35: Creates the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee;
- Senate Bill 66: Revises provisions relating to emergency management;
- Senate Bill 67: Revises provisions governing local emergency management;
- Senate Bill 68: Provides for the expedited granting of certain provisional registrations to volunteer providers of health or veterinary services during an emergency declaration; and,
- Senate Bill 69: Revises provisions relating to emergencies and cybersecurity.

There are numerous bills that were recently passed that change the way emergency management business is conducted. Internally, DEM/HS has a plan for implementation. A number of high level tasks have been identified. One change is to ensure our tribal partners are aware that the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC) has been established, and that the Disaster Relief Account (DRA) is available to tribal entities. The second change is to notify all city, tribal, and county jurisdictions that the state level Individual Assistance Program (IAP) has been reestablished in state law after being removed in 2010-2011. Thirdly, informing partners of the regulatory changes and different requirements that have been passed through the legislative efforts. This notification is being done through these monthly meetings and the listservs. A number of these laws require the creation of regulations. Part of the plan on creating these regulations is to hold all three Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) workshops on one day. A number of commissions and committees are established here: NRAC, NTECC, and the State Disaster Identification Coordination Committee (SDICC). Senate Bill (SB) 69 requires implementation primarily through communication efforts. DEM/HS has four sectors of emergency management plans that are stored with DEM/HS. Those plans are for schools, public utilities, political subdivisions and resorts. These plans will now be due on date specific days on an annual basis. A priority for DEM/HS is the state IAP formerly known as Homeowner Disaster Assistance Program (HDAP). The goal is to get the regulations completed by the end of 2019. Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, questioned if under Assembly Bill (AB) 206, the Disaster Behavioral Health Plan, who in the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) would be taking the lead on this plan and if a draft plan would be made available by December 31, 2019. Dr. Stephanie Woodard, DHHS, advised that the goal is to have the plan prepared by December 31, 2019, and the draft is currently being worked on collectively. Dr. Freeman noted that any new plans the state is developing should address access and functional needs within the plans. AB 534 also requires that state plans developed under Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 414 have a victim advocate or a member of the planning team have a victim advocacy component to them. Deputy Chief Fogerson requested that as these plans are being written that the plans have to be derived for the state to support locals. The locals have to have the plans in place; it is the state's job to support the locals. There needs to be accountability for all agencies involved. Mr. Hunkup requested a fact sheet regarding new bills affecting the tribes be created and provided to the 27 tribes of Nevada.

7. Discussion on the State Behavioral Health Disaster Plan

Dr. Stephanie Woodard, DHHS, provided an overview of the new requirement for DHHS to maintain a Behavioral Health Disaster Plan for the state. Dr. Woodard provided a presentation on Developing an Effective Response and Deployment System for Disaster Behavioral Health. The discussion started by covering key points. Key points include the following: Disasters are often unpredictable, can have far reaching impacts, people and the communities they live in are resilient, not all who experience traumatic events will develop Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), there are effective interventions that communities and organizations can use to promote healthy coping, address needs and provide on-going support, and the process of recovery for individuals, communities and systems can be a long process that can result in healthier places to live and work.

There are phases of disaster response and operations. These phases usually come in cycles that include periods of time such as pre-disaster, impact, heroic, honeymoon, disillusionment and reconstruction. Important points to remember with disaster response and operation are that every disaster is different, trauma affects everyone differently, response strategy depends on disaster characteristics and that a disaster causes disruptions and changes. Dr. Woodward provided key concepts of a disaster. No one who sees a disaster is untouched by it, people pull together during and after an event, stress and grief are normal reactions, and people's natural resilience will support individual and collective recovery. It is important to be mindful of events that can trigger mental health implications. Events that can cause implications are

evacuations, ending search and rescue phases, death notifications, return to an impacted area, funerals, reopening of public facilities, and anniversaries or trigger events.

Typical outcomes of disasters are that some people will have severe reactions. Few individuals develop diagnosable conditions. Most people recover fully from moderate stress reactions within six to sixteen months. There is usually post-traumatic growth; this often happens when a traumatic experience has occurred and there is a realization that growth is happening. There are two primary models that are used within communities. The first model is the Crisis Counseling Assistance and Training Program (CCP). This model helps to foster a natural resilience and positive coping skills. Most disaster survivors have never received traditional mental health or substance abuse services, so overcoming the stigma can be a challenge in this model. The CCP model is strength based, anonymous, outreach oriented, culturally competent, conducted in a nontraditional setting, and is designed to strengthen existing community support systems. The second model is Psychological First Aid (PFA). There are eight core actions of PFA. These are contact and engagement, safety and comfort, stabilization, information gathering, practical assistance, information on coping, and linkage with collaborative services such as the American Red Cross.

Dr. Woodward spoke to lessons learned from the October 1, 2017, mass casualty incident in Las Vegas. One of the biggest challenges is that people want to do well and want to help. If there is not a plan for how to handle with self-deployed resources, there will be extra people that are now being dealt with and can cause another layer of challenges. Branding, marketing and messaging are also important pieces of the October 1st incident. There needs to be concern for the potential unintended consequences of messaging and branding. Having individuals available to offer advice and control messaging is a favorable option to have available. It was identified that there needs to be a resiliency center and on-going victim support. Often times, individuals do not seek help right away. There needs to be constant and consistent outreach to ensure when the time is right, resources are still available. As a state, there is a lack in Disaster Behavioral Health Coordinator positions. This is pivotal at the state level to ensure the state is able to provide resources and technical assistance to local jurisdiction and help to deploy resources as necessary. There is also the Crisis Standards of Care that does have a section specific to disaster behavioral response.

Dr. Woodard concluded with the passing of AB 206. AB 206 was enacted in 2019. This bill requires DHHS to develop a written plan to address behavioral health needs in an emergency or disaster. This should not be a standalone plan. It is also important to include this plan in any current or future exercises that are being conducted. The first step in the development of this plan is to engage the NRAC in a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) activity. This will provide informative data to move forward in the process.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke to the October 1st challenges. Some of those challenges included self-deployment, individuals trying to drive the direction of the incident, and messaging. There is a need for behavioral health subject matter experts during response, not just recovery. Deputy Chief Steinbeck is currently updating his own Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). This update will include that provision. There needs to be development for this resource statewide. Dr. Woodard agreed, and indicated that (Emergency Support Function (ESF) 8 struggled with identifying resources and needs, and agrees that knowing what the behavioral health resources are going into an emergency or disaster is beneficial. Deputy Chief Steinbeck also asked for help in developing task book criteria for key positions in the Emergency Operation Center (EOC) to ensure the right fit occurs. Dr. Woodard indicated she would certainly help with that framework. Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District, spoke to the ESF8.1 function, and if Dr. Woodard's ESF 8 position isn't available, it would fall to herself and Steve Kramer in the Clark County Multi-Agency Coordination Center (CCMACC). Dr. dePolo spoke to the "Day 3" phenomenon in realization after an event. Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, spoke to the health coalition, and use of volunteers at the Family Assistance Center (FAC). This would be a great time to start practicing the plan or parts of it for the November exercise.

Dr. Woodard spoke to the SWOT analysis. A request to send the SWOT electronically to Dr. Darcy Davis at (ddavis@health.nv.gov) was requested. The SWOT analysis was as follows:

Strengths:

- Chief Cage: Dr. Woodard's leadership on legislative efforts and NRAC involvement/momentum.
- Dr. Chris Lake, Nevada Hospital Association: Experience with mass disaster and outside partners that brought multiple solutions.
- Dr. Freeman: Having regional behavioral health boards across the state. This activity can be brought back to her region for discussion.

Weaknesses:

- Dr. Freeman: Using psychological first aid as an overall reference. There are multiple understandings on what this means. Capability between classwork and real life events can sometimes cause confusion.
- Dr. Freeman: Having the wrong personality types working with people experiencing a disaster. Misty Robinson agreed, its re-victimization
- Dr. Kenneston: Identifying accurate resources and who is the core provider of the service.
- Dr. Lake: Knowing the standards necessary and what the minimal standards are. Dr. Woodard asked if the state's behavioral health response plan would be a place to memorialize that. It's crucial to update the current methods.
- Deputy Chief Fogerson: Working in silos, and figuring out how it all works. Dr. Lake said the state plan has to be able to absorb teams from other states in addition to possibly pre-credentialing people from other states. From a hospital standpoint, that is done at the corporate level. It could be done the same way with larger behavioral health corporations. There are crisis teams that are available through some of the larger unions, etc.

Opportunities:

- Private behavioral health hospitals that don't know how to engage in the larger process.
- Deputy Chief Steinbeck: Identify a position specific to behavioral health in EOPs and a central coordinated credentialed expertise during response that can move straight into recovery.
- Carlito Rayos, Las Vegas Valley Water District: Formalize how the state is prepared to handle large scale emergencies.
- Ryan Turner, City of Henderson: Formalize ESF 8.1 in EOPs. It has two missions to organize response for responders, and another focus on services to people affected by incident. Spending a few hours during the response to gather recovery information would have eliminated wasted time in recovery. Mr. Turner indicated that as a consequence of mental health counselors dealing with crisis management situations, the mental health counselors can become a victim as well. Assistance suffers. If they can talk to someone who specialized in crisis counseling, the recovery rate is much higher for those individuals. Mr. Turner also spoke to services to the region, and Clark County's model is the model to follow. There is a need to capture what they did, what they could do better, and formalize that into a plan that everyone can use.
- Dr. Darcy Davis: Asked Mr. Turner if he could write that down and expound to get it in his own words.
- David Hunkup: It would be beneficial for outreach to the NTECC. People involved in that group, clinics, etc., could then implement best practice at a tribal level.
- Cassandra Darrough, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe: Echoed Mr. Hunkup's sentiment, and since there is a statewide plan, the 27 tribes within Nevada may have a behavioral health provider one day per month if relying on Indian Health Services. Outreach could improve that. Also, standardize what "psychological" means as there is still a stigma in addition to addressing the huge need for resources.

- Tennille Pereira, Vegas Strong Resilience Center: Having the Vegas Strong Resiliency Center share lessons learned in any planning. They have their own behavioral health coordinator that has worked through a lot of these challenges being spoken about.

Threats:

- Dr. Kenneston: Behavioral health is a perishable skill and requires cyclical training. It needs sustainability.
- Dr. Lake: People responding to the emergency have other jobs, the process cannot be overly bureaucratic, and it needs to be free of barriers (cost/judgement).
- Cassandra Darrough: Spoke to stigma and cultural competency when dealing with behavioral health.
- Dr. Freeman: Spoke to bureaucratic roadblocks and hard to follow rules. There is a need for best practices and guidance.
- Administrator Shaun Rahmeyer, Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (OCD): Expectation management is critical, as is articulating the purpose of the plan and what it is not.

Dr. Woodard asked if it's reasonable for ongoing engagement on this discussion to capture the necessary information. The NRAC agreed in such engagement and outreach from Behavioral Health. Dr. Freeman spoke to the diversity of experience and passion on this process. Dr. Freeman spoke to funding available for training in the communities. For qualification, there has to be delivery of three trainings per year as a criterion for such training. They identified costs to send four individuals to training, and it was a little cheaper to train sixteen individuals by bringing the training here. Dr. Freeman is unsure on how this would be budgeted in other agencies or jurisdictions. Deputy Chief Fogerson spoke to building training online and increasing participation at a low cost and work on collaboration. Dr. Lake spoke to time commitment, and in the rural areas, it needs to be a roadshow. It is important to go to the communities. Tennille Pereira spoke to the grant funding that supports her Behavioral Health specialist.

Chief Cage announced a lunch break. Lunch break taken at 12:10pm with instruction to reconvene at 1pm sharp.

Meeting resumed at 1:00pm. Meagan Werth-Ranson, DEM/HS performed roll call. Quorum was reestablished after the break.

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

Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, started her presentation with background information on the Certified Public Manager (CPM) Program. The state of Nevada had a consulting group that came in from a class setting. This was CPM Class #16. The CPM group was presented with a problem statement. The problem statement that was provided was the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) formula allocation. The CPM group came up with potential recommendations. The group was provided with historical information regarding the grant allocation, how much money is received, how much money is passed through to other jurisdictions, and what needs to be retained to run the division with salaries. There are challenges with the current allocations; there is not enough funding available. There is a 50% match with this grant and there are some challenges with the cycle of the grant. The funding should have been received October 1, 2018, and DEM/HS still has not received that funding. The funding is now seven months late and this creates a hardship for everyone. The mission of this grant is to coordinate preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation resources through partnerships to sustain safe and livable communities for Nevada's residents and visitors. EMPG background is to assist cities, counties, and tribal entities for local emergencies. There are five mission areas for this grant: planning, organization, equipment, training and exercise. There are sub recipient requirements. These requirements are: for a minimum amount of money to be retained for DEM/HS operation, pass through at approximately 50%, required to opt in, and quarterly reporting and billing. The

current situation is that DEM/HS is using old census data. This census data has been used for several years and the data is strictly population based. The goal of the DEM/HS is to ensure the outcome is fair and equitable, verifiable and justifiable, ensure stake-holder buy-in, and produces a formula based decision that can be identified for the next several allocation periods. The methodology of the group was to look at background information, benchmarks, and brainstorm as a group. DEM/HS was very involved in this process.

The recommendations that came out of the group are as follows: cover salary with risk/need allocation, allocation based on need which is analyzed by DEM/HS staff, base rate for emergency manager with additional funds, update population numbers, and base salary plus risk/ threat analysis. Ms. Anderson noted that not all recommendations are viable, but it was refreshing to have a new perspective provided. There are pros and cons to these recommendations. There is concern about increasing potential allocations because when more money is given to one jurisdiction, money is taken away from another jurisdiction. This could cause problems for other emergency management programs. Discussion ensued on whether the formula is correct or if it can be adjusted with the understanding that some jurisdictions have opted out of the program. Discussion ensued on looking at the pros with the allocation base, and the money that would be distributed to the jurisdictions that have a greater risk for need of funds as well as whether this concept exists or if there is a flat threat across Nevada. Discussion also includes using the base rate for emergency managers with additional funds; By using this methodology, sub recipients would know how much money they would get and additional funding might be available for all sub recipients to enhance their plans. Cons would be that some of the sub recipients would have to adjust duties based on this allocation and some sub recipients might opt out of this program based on this cut. Another recommendation was to update the population numbers. DEM/HS would be looking at making changes to allocations for 2020 starting October 1, 2019. A recommended solution was to look at different funding streams, and it was suggested to use the Threat and Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA) with a base. A pro to this would be the base component covers the salary and could encourage more participation. A con to this is the risk factor components, the potential threat can be subjective and some jurisdictions would lose funding. The recommended solution is basically using the well-established process for SHSP and UASI and looking at that assessment. The THIRA is a requirement as well for EMPG. Ms. Anderson spoke to examples provided by the CPM group graphs.

Dr. Freeman, inquired if one of the goals is to have some of the smaller entities that have not been engaged to become engaged, this divvies up the money correct. Ms. Anderson advised that this idea is correct. Dr. Freeman inquired if there was any concern in this being just for counties, not any other jurisdictions. Ms. Anderson noted that DEM/HS does provide funds for local jurisdictions. In the beginning every county received allocations. There were a lot of tribes that opted in as well. At one point, tribes started opting out because it was difficult for them to manage. DEM/HS is currently in the hiring process with Malinda Southard , Division of Public and Behavioral Health Public Health Preparedness (DHHS), to fill Tribal positions. This will greatly help in this process. Dr. Freeman noted that emergency management sits in different agencies across the state with different types of salaries. That creates some challenges with the funding piece. This will bring up some concern with impacting the funds and what the base amount would be. Ms. Anderson indicated that Nevada is very unique in digging deep and making the best decisions at the local level. Douglas County only uses the money for the emergency management building and not salaries. These decisions have to be considered as well. Ms. Freeman asked if there was any concern with the THIRA being engaged in this and that there becomes a push for individuals to pad the THIRA. Chief Cage indicated that the THIRA is a beginning point, or snap shot, and it is not a binding document. Chief Caged noted that he would take more engagement even if it meant padding in some way. Dr. Lake inquired what the formula is from the Federals perspective's for providing funding for the state. Ms. Anderson advised that it is never really a clear answer on that. The allocation is typically population based. Misty Robinson, spoke to the State, Local, Tribal, Territorial Government Coordination Council (SLTTGCC) working on getting Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to reevaluate the funding formula for all FEMA grants. This could be years out.

Ms. Anderson spoke to the documents provided in the handouts. Mr. Hunkup, spoke to one of the handouts and the tribes being included on the census. Tribal Nations information is indicated at the bottom of the form. Administrator Shaun Rahmeyer asked if there has been consideration of using a scoring matrix to see what the specific vulnerabilities look like. Dr. Lake is not supportive of using a threat or perceived threat formula as a methodology in this case. Administrator Rahmeyer spoke to some of the threats looking at critical infrastructure such as in Clark County with Hoover Dam. Dr. Lake noted that if looking at population only, all of the money will go to Clark County not just based on threat. Nevada would lose ground federally as Nevada doesn't hold a candle to other national threats in other states. Administrator Rahmeyer inquired on how to reduce subjectivity regarding the issue. Dr. Lake is still looking at possible population or other funding streams that can support this. Dr. Freeman indicated that if FEMA is moving to a risk based model, Nevada will lose out. There are other states that have multiple disasters. Deputy Chief Fogerson spoke to looking at a base plus population model. Ms. Anderson spoke to risk. In regards to the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) that funding has been lost in the past, but the state has never lost HSGP funding. Funding has been cut up to 80%, the UASI lost urban area funding one time in 2013, and then received \$1 million for sustainment only in 2014. EMPG money is not intended to be used as Homeland Security funding.

Chief Cage stressed the importance of determining goals of this conversation to drive outcomes. Risk approaches are treacherous on their own. One thing most can agree upon is to ensure funding is maximizing emergency management at the local, state, and tribal level. The current system needs some tuning up. There are numerous jurisdictions that are getting along with limited funding with no room to grow the program. In order to fund newer programs, funding would have to be taken from existing programs. There is no long-term vision that allows sustainability. If there is a silver bullet to this problem, it will take major coordination for the next budget cycle. When we look at distribution, there is reliance on the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) model. There are communities that collaborate around State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) funding. In many areas, it is an all-hazard approach. A suggestion is to go to the LEPC and coordinate with local jurisdictions and come back with a breakdown distribution for the county and then bring it back to the state. All of the partners are involved in this if it's considered as a next step. No county will come back with reducing EMPG allocations, but there is room to look at coordinating solutions. Cutting money from any program will result in loss of capability right now. Changing the process and dialogue may be a place to start. Ms. Levering spoke to her elected body would not support the LEPC model for EMPG because of the politics between the city and county. Chief Cage indicated all jurisdictions have political issues, and not addressing this would result in nothing ever changing. Ms. Levering spoke to the previous conversation related to EMPG allocations nationally. Aside from the carve outs for specific regions, the rest of the allocation is distributed on population-based models. On the practical side, there needs to be a definition of what an Emergency Manager is either full time, part-time, what percentage should go towards salary versus equipment. If jurisdictions spending their money, and if there are deobligations that are being given back causing loss of capacity. Annette Kerr, Elko County, pointed out the SB266 requires county governments to maintain emergency management. This could be an unfunded mandate. There are huge issues with the school district population models, and in the future this may affect them as well in the same way the EMPG funding does currently. Ms. Kerr emphasized looking at the actual programs and what the funding supports as a baseline.

Ms. Anderson clarified Ms. Levering's wishes regarding the list that Ms. Levering would like to see in what actual emergency management program stats exist within Nevada. There is a need to know what an emergency management program looks like. There are minimal federal requirements (training, planning, and exercise). The state has added additional features as requirements. Additional features may include codification of emergency management programs, and if not codified, Ms. Levering presented concern on why are we funding these programs as a mandate. Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, asked that the population numbers be updated in any next reiteration of data provided to the NRAC. Ms. Anderson left the information for this meeting at the older models based on existing allocations. Ms. Levering spoke to the instructive purpose based on today's population. Clarification discussion included the following topics:

- How many emergency manager positions are part-time and full-time;
- Emergency Operation Plans (EOP);
- Mitigation plans;
- Match requirements being met; Kelli Anderson spoke to match requirements being fair and equitable;
- How much additional funding is being applied to their emergency management programs
- Put in all the counties and all the cities; Kelli Anderson indicated that there is a base allocation that has to be considered.
- If the funding formula that Ms. Anderson presented earlier is used, there is a concern on what that would look like. Chief Leighton said that not knowing, it's hard to grasp; and
- Factoring in THIRA participation

Chief Cage thanked everyone for their input.

9. Major Incident Response Vehicle Resource Transfer

This agenda item was discussed earlier in the meeting at the request of Chief Cage in order for DEM/HS staff to analyze the result of the Major Incident Response Vehicle ranking while the NRAC addressed agenda items #5-#8. Break was taken at 10:00 a.m. for the collection of ranking sheets. Kendall Herzer, DEM/HS, collected member voting sheets in Las Vegas, Annette Kerr collected voting sheets in Elko, and DEM/HS staff collected voting sheets in Carson City. Each venue received a complete set of voting sheets for review and public posting. The meeting resumed at 10:15 a.m. with DEM/HS staff analyzing the input received from the NRAC.

Chief Cage provided an overview on the Major Incident Response Vehicle (MIRV) process in 2019 and spoke to DEM/HS's receipt of the MIRV from Nevada Division of Investigations (NDI). DEM/HS wanted to make the MIRV available to statewide partners. Communication was sent out via multiple listservs with a list of questions related to maintenance of the vehicle and capabilities. Seven entities responded to this request. Presentations on the applications received will be limited to questions only from the NRAC membership. NRAC membership reviewed the applications provided.

The floor was opened for questions. Questions included:

- Dr. dePolo inquired how many of these vehicles are in the state and where they are located. Per Chief Cage, there are numerous throughout the state.
- Jeremy Hynds inquired if any of the applicants have a vehicle with matching capabilities. Mike Wilson, Clark County School District (CCSD), indicated that they do have a mobile response van that they are looking to replace. Lieutenant Corey Solferino, Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), spoke to having a critical incident response vehicle, and they are looking for means to replace it.
- Dr. dePolo inquired what would be the added benefit of having this vehicle at WCSO, and per Lt. Solferino, it is about functionality. Their current vehicle does not have the capability that the MIRV does.
- Annette Kerr, spoke to a letter of support that may be missing from the Elko Fire Department package. To address this, Elko Fire Chief Matt Griego's testimony was allowed with Chief Griego speaking to not having a single vehicle like this in the region making coordination efforts difficult for response. Elko County Sheriff's Office (ECSO), Elko County Fire Department (ECFD), etc., must coordinate on every event within and around the community. Command and control is difficult. The Interstate 80 (I80) corridor comes through the city directly; there are multiple hazardous chemical incidents annually. Chief Griego spoke to significant closures in transportation routes including highways, railroads, etc.

- Administrator Rahmeyer inquired if the capabilities in this vehicle are available through other resources in the communities. For Elko, Annette Kerr indicated this would be a new capability. Mike Wilson, CCSD, indicated this is a new capability. Scott Lewis, Nye County Emergency Manager, also spoke to this being a new capability.
- Alex Kukulis, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD), indicated there are similar units within the county, and the intent is to modify the vehicle to address capability gaps. Lt. Solferino spoke to WCSO having multiple vehicles, and they are always deployed. Lt. Solferino spoke to the class specifications for driving those vehicles. Yuri Graves, indicated that this capability doesn't exist within his jurisdiction. There are other mobile command vehicles regionally, but not specifically identified for the numerous events.
- Jeremy Hynds, asked if other agencies have the capability to house the vehicle, etc. Annette Kerr spoke to using the vehicle regionally. CCSD has the capability for drivers and maintenance of the vehicle.
- Carlito Rayos inquired if the capability exists with proposers for interoperability between agencies. Mike Wilson indicated that interoperability exists with all agencies with unified command incidents. Scott Lewis indicated that he has an Information Technology (IT) group. University Police Services can house and maintain the vehicle. Elko indicated that the goal is to enhance capability with the MIRV, and are willing to address expenditures. TMFPD has over 100 personnel and a bay. Lt. Solferino can dedicate resources to this project, and it would be housed and maintained at the Longley facility. Interoperability will not be an issue.
- Deputy Chief Fogerson spoke to who has a plan in place for collaborative use of the MIRV
- Annette Kerr spoke to their specific need for collaboration due to the size and complexity of their region. The plan has already been put in place to work with numerous jurisdictions and counties. Working with LEPC, mutual aid agreements, etc. Without collaboration, the emergency management program in Elko couldn't survive.
- Mike Wilson spoke to CCSD not being able to operate by itself. Events that happen within or outside of schools require cooperation of numerous agencies. Communication with agencies in paramount.
- Scott Lewis spoke to the collaboration with multiple jurisdictions, and mutual aid
- Alex Kukulis spoke to RSIC, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and wherever else needed
- Lt. Solferino spoke to multiple MOUs.
- Yuri Graves spoke to emergency management being a collaborative partnership. The unit would be available through mutual aid agreements.

The results of the ranking analysis were shared with the NRAC members and the public attendees in all venues. The results were as follows:

- #1 – Elko County
- #2 – Nye County
- #3 – CCSD
- #4 – UNLV
- #5 – TMFPD
- #6 – WCSO
- #7 – Lyon County

Mike Wilson motioned to accept the results of the ranking to award the MIRV to Elko. Annette Kerr seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

10. Statewide Bomb Squad Capability Overview

Battalion Chief Todd Moss, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, provided an overview of statewide bomb squad capability including the following topics:

- Public Safety Bomb Squad (PSBS) Background. Prior to 1971, the U.S. Air Force (USAF) Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) team addressed bomb threats. After 1971, the Hazard Device School was established, thus specific bomb squads came into being. There are 466 accredited PSBSs across the nation with approximately 3,000 technicians.
- Timeline and commitment to become a bomb tech is strenuous. One must be part of the Law Enforcement or Fire Department community. There are numerous requirements including agency appointment, extensive training, secret clearance requirements and on-going training requirements.
- NRS 476.110 defines the roles of a PSBS, bomb squad commander and the bomb tech itself. It also defines the responsibilities of the PSBS. It outlines the procedure for notification of incidents. The National Bomb Squad Commanders Advisory Board (NBSCAB) drives the PSBS policies and procedures.
- The Nevada Bomb Squad Task Force organizational chart was provided. This was a breakdown of whom to call, phone numbers and the county which is in the response zone.

Chief Cage inquired if locals should use local resources first, or reach out to state or military resources. Per Chief Moss, they are to use local resources first, then call in the PSBS or military resource as needed. Under agreements of public safety bomb tech, they cannot charge for the response. If going straight with the military, the potential for high cost is certain. Chief Moss spoke to education being key, so that locals can contact the local PSBS contingents.

- Responsibilities include the following: investigate, render safe and dispose of hazardous devices, explosives, coordinate with local, state, and federal partners, post blast investigations, evidence preservation, special operation support and public education.
- Capabilities and training: all are FEMA Type 1 Bomb Squads, Electronic Counter Measures (ECM), dismounted operations, K9 training, US Military EOD Partnership.

Richard Brooks, Las Vegas Bomb Squad, spoke to an involved canine training program with numerous jurisdictional involvements.

- Consolidated Bomb Squad 2018 statistics – 168 bomb squad sweeps, 44 calls for service, 14 demonstrations, 67 trainings and 4,073 hours.
 - Community Events participated in - Street Vibrations, Graduations, Reno Air Races, Reno Rodeo, Burning Man, Rib Cook-off and PGA events, etc.
- Tahoe Douglas Bomb Squad 2018/19 statistics – 20 bomb sweeps, 24 incidents, 15 public education, 30 regular training days and 1,960 training hours
 - Community Events participated in- Harvey's Outdoor Concert Series, American Century Golf Tournament, AMGEN Bike Race, VIP Visits and community outreach
- Las Vegas Bomb Squad 2018/19 statistics – 51 bomb sweeps, 103 incidents, 24 public education, 86 training days and 2,473 training hours
- Elko Bomb Squad 2018/19 statistics – 2 bomb sweeps, 14 incidents, 4 public education, 86 training days and 1,280 training hours

Annette Kerr spoke to live ammunition issues and the bomb squads and Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team securing the cars involved in the Elko train derailment. She thanked them for their efforts on that front.

Dr. Lake asked what the difference is between bomb squads and All-Hazard Regional Multi-Agency Operations and Response (ARMOR). Noah Boyer, Consolidated Bomb Squad, advised that ARMOR has a nexus to hazmat, where PSBS nexus is primarily explosives.

- Grant funded equipment includes larger robots, smaller robots, x-ray equipment, total containment vessel and bomb suits
- Future of task force – Nevada road show to promote education, 5-10 year training and equipment budget, seek guidance in potential Homeland Security Grant Program “carve out” and statewide interoperability.

Chief Cage thanked Chief Moss for this presentation and addressed the possibility of setting aside specific funding for PSBS. Chief Moss spoke to Utah’s model where bomb squad funds are awarded to the association. It is divided appropriately. An example was given of \$400K going to bomb squads and needs are identified to maintain capabilities. Chief Cage spoke to bomb squads being one of the eight strategic capacities to be maintained. Moving forward, there could be interest in carving out specific capacities as needed. If there is not a carve-out, discussion needs to occur on whether the strategic capacity is to be maintained.

Administrator Rahmeyer inquired if there was a charge for PSBS response. Battalion Chief Moss advised that when PSBS responds it’s a federal rule that they cannot charge for the response. There are old Memorandum of Understandings (MOU’s), and there are contracts out that provide training funding for the program. Bomb response includes suspicious packages as well as actual bomb materials. Looking at the stats, the bulk of the time is spent on training for bomb sweeps, etc. Administrator Rahmeyer inquired if it’s possible to build a cost model to generate a more sustainable statewide ability, with Chief Moss indicating that may deter people from calling out the bomb squad. The bomb squads are funded locally, and a lot of those budgets do not have specific line items to maintain. Noah Boyer noted that UNR ties up a lot of sweeps annually, and in return, UNR has dog handlers that are allowed to be used off university property as the result of an existing MOU. There are agreements in place to counteract costs with providing that service. The Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) does not want hesitation in people calling for assistance. Deputy Chief Fogerson asked if this is focused on just HSGP, and if there are other opportunities that exist to reallocate funding to support these local teams. Dr. Lake inquired if it’s possible to agendaize further discussion on carve-outs in the next NRAC and/or Finance Committee. Chief Cage agreed if there is discussion for carve-outs across the board for specific capacities. Carolyn Levering spoke to the law enforcement terrorism prevention program that was absorbed into the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) and SHSP funding streams. There is a carve-out for Law Enforcement at 25%, and fusion centers, both north and south, acquire the majority of that funding most often. In past years, with more money, initial investments were larger. With dwindling funding streams, a lot of the equipment is expiring and replacement is difficult with reduced budgets. It would be helpful to attain a chart of some type noting equipment replacement necessary rather than an overall carve-out. Chief Moss agrees, and they will work on getting that information to the NRAC.

11. Seismic Risk Recommendations

Dr. dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, opened the discussion with reference to the July 4, 2019, and July 5, 2019 Ridgecrest Earthquakes. Nevada did experience damage as a result of these earthquakes in California. There was a water main break in Pahrump, Nevada as a result of the July 4, 2019, earthquake with the July 5, 2019 causing numerous brush fires due to wires touching and arcing. It is speculated that these earthquakes caused a death in Pahrump. This would be the first death on record due to an earthquake in Nevada. Dr. dePolo referenced the concern for Las Vegas from the last Commission meeting in June, 2019. There is cause for concern in regards to tourism and earthquakes. Tourists who do not have a tie to the community will leave

and this has the potential to create a mass exodus. This is something that will need to be tactically managed moving forward. It is also a great idea that can be included in training exercises moving forward.

Chief Cage spoke to the Earthquake Hazard Recommendations memo that was included for this agenda item. There are numerous updates that are of importance. These are categories that can frame future discussions. The four categories include public awareness, unreinforced masonry buildings, earthquake early warning systems, and earthquake hazard studies. The idea is for the NRAC to come back at the next meeting with specific recommendations based off of the provided categories. This is the framework that will aid in the future development of earthquake legislation and policy recommendations. Dr. dePolo suggested that a presentation be provided for each category so the members have background information. One other recommendation has been suggested. The suggestion is for earthquake response training. For consideration: NRAC should endorse earthquake response training including, but not limited to, Urban Search and Rescue and post-earthquake messaging. Dr. dePolo stressed that now is the time to push out earthquake messaging. Dr. dePolo noted that Nevada is not out of the woods and that earthquakes come in groups.

Deputy Chief Fogerson advised that there is a great class to train local government fire fighters on how to respond to earthquakes. He noted that the California model, where the state is providing the equipment to local government for response is beneficial, however Nevada does not have the assets or the flexibility that California does. It is possible to look at how Urban Area Search and Rescue (USAR) assets are spread across the state. There are great resources and assets in Washoe County and Clark County but there needs to be consideration that the smaller communities are lacking those resources. There needs to be increased education and resources to address this gap. Deputy Chief Fogerson also stated that building codes for mobile home parks need to be addressed. It needs to be ensured that mobile homes are being secured and not being dislodged from the foundations and disrupting the gas lines. This is a big concern coming out of the Ridgecrest earthquake incident.

Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps/Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), mentioned that earthquake safety has always been a part of the CERT program. After the last NRAC meeting, CERT has already been looking at upgrading that part of the program. Ms. Laffoon has been a part of two community events thus far to spread the earthquake message. This included providing handouts, talking to people and conducting a community drill in a park with local youth. Dr. dePolo noted how proud he is of all the work that is being done in regards to earthquake awareness. Mike Wilson, Clark County School District, noted that per the shakeout.org website, only nine schools and districts participated in the Nevada Shakeout event. Mr. Wilson asked that local jurisdictions reach out their respective school districts to encourage participation.

12. Public Comment

Misty Robinson spoke to updates on activities of the SLTTGCC. Ms. Robinson advised that she was notified there are a few school safety grant opportunities available and the grant information will be sent out shortly to the school districts. The SLTTGCC is still looking for regional success stories from different jurisdictions and regions. These are due at the end of August, 2019. The regional snapshot will be conducted in the near future; once this is completed it will be sent out to all the Homeland Security Advisors (HSA). Ms. Robinson ended her discussion by thanking Chief Cage for his service. Chief Cage addressed his departure from DEM/HS and his newly accepted position with the Nevada System of Higher Education. Chief Cage appreciates the opportunity in working with everyone over the course of the last four years. Chief Cage noted his last day is July 12, 2019. Dave Hunkup questioned who would be the temporary replacement for this position. Chief Cage noted he was unaware of whom the replacement would be and that it will be up to the Director and Governor.

13. Adjourn

Chief Cage called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion to adjourn was presented by Dr. dePolo, and a second was provided by Deputy Chief Fogerson. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT