



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE		November 19, 2019					
	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 4401 555 E. Washington Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89101					
			Great Basin College McMullen Hall – Room 102 1500 College Parkway Elko, NV 89801					
	METHOD		Video-Teleconference					
RECORDER		Meagan Werth-Ranson						
Advisory Committee Voting Member Attendance								
Member Name		Present	Member Name		Present	Member Name		Present
Justin Luna		X	Jeremy Hynds		ABS	Chris Tomaino		X
John Steinbeck		X	Aaron Kenneston		ABS	Rachel Skidmore		ABS
Roy Anderson		ABS	Graham Kent		X	Corey Solferino		X
Solome Barton		X	Annette Kerr		X	Malinda Southard		X
James Chrisley		X	Mary Ann Laffoon		X	Mike Wilson		ABS
Cassandra Darrough		ABS	Chris Lake		X	Stephanie Woodard		X
Craig dePolo		X	Bob Leighton		X	Tennille Pereira		X
Robert Dehnhardt		X	Carolyn Levering		X	Christina Conti		X
Dave Fogerson		X	Connie Morton		ABS			
Jeanne Freeman		X	Todd Moss		X			
Mike Heidemann		X	Shaun Rahmeyer		ABS			
Eric Holt		ABS	Ryan Miller		X			
David Hunkup		ABS	Misty Robinson		X			
Advisory Committee Non-Voting Member Attendance								
Bunny Bishop		X	Melissa Friend		ABS	Jill Hemenway		X
Felix Castagnola		X	Kacey KC		ABS	Elizabeth Breeden		ABS
Bart Chambers		ABS	Rebecca Bodnar		X	Catherine Nielson		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	
Ryan Gerchman					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 Meagan Werth-Ranson, DEM/HS. Quorum was established for the meeting. Chief Luna noted that Elizabeth Breeden with NV Energy has joined the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (Committee) as a voting member. Ms. Breeden replaces Carlito Rayos in representation of the

public utility sector. Additionally, Robert Dehnhardt, Department of Administration, replaces Michael Dietrich on the Committee moving forward. Chief Luna offered congratulations to Deputy Chief John Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, on being announced as the new Chief of the Clark County Fire Department beginning in February 2020.

2. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. Dr. Graham Kent, University of Nevada Reno, spoke to the Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) energy shutoff in the North Bay area and the success of this shut off process. Dr. Kent also provided a summary of the Kincadee fire and the benefit of the Alert Wildfire Cameras in catching the start of this fire. It was also noted the importance of the lessons the state can learn from such disasters. Battalion Chief Todd Moss, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, provided a brief update regarding the mental health of first responders. The Northern Nevada Peer Support Network is a movement trying to help first responders with mental health. Suicides are now outnumbering line of duty deaths at a staggering rate. This is a topic was requested to be on the agenda for next month. No public comment provided from the Elko venue, the Las Vegas venue, or from phone participants.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Luna called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes from the October 8, 2019, Committee meeting. Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District, requested an amendment to agenda item #6, last paragraph, third sentence should read "Misty Robinson inquired how the OCDC was planning for any events, like the internet of things, and how that is managed with cybersecurity efforts." A motion to amend the minutes with the correction noted above was presented by Ms. Robinson and a second was provided by Battalion Chief Todd Moss. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Quarterly Review of Current Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee Bylaws

Chief Luna opened the discussion by reviewing the two versions of the bylaws that were provided in the member packets. One copy of the bylaws is a clean copy and the second copy is a tracked changes version that was approved at the October 8, 2019 Committee meeting. Chief Luna provided the Committee a brief moment to review the copies as presented. Annette Kerr, Elko County, requested a correction under item "X" titled Amendments, under number three, the spacing between October and the numeric number needs to be corrected. Chief Luna noted that the correction will be made and he will work on getting the necessary signatures on this document.

5. NV Energy Public Safety Outage Management Program

Chief Luna discussed the importance of this current topic, especially in seeing the news coming out of California in regards to power shutoffs. Chris Hofmann, NV Energy, thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak regarding the Public Safety Outage Management Program (PSOM). NV Energy has conducted fire fuel mitigation on its own prior to working with other agencies and teams. In regards to the growing risks and issues that have been presented in California, NV Energy has had to adapt. Below are the highlights from Mr. Hofmann's presentation:

Protecting our Community

- Safety is our top priority.
- In response to changes in our climate and environment, NV Energy is implementing a number of efforts to help protect our customers and the beautiful communities of Mt. Charleston and Lake Tahoe from wildfires and extreme weather.

- We currently modify how our grid operates during fire season to reduce fire risk. This modification is called one-shot, non-reclosing policy during fire season. A circuit patrol is conducted prior to any reclosing or testing during the fire season.
- We are working to implement long-term measures including:
 - Installing equipment with less ignition risk;
 - Deploying weather stations (Currently four in the Incline area). These weather stations have wind gages, moisture monitors, fuel monitors, and temperature gages;
 - Installing wildfire cameras in high fire risk areas ;
 - Shortening our vegetation clearing cycles in all extreme risk areas from every eight to six years down to every four years; and
 - Conducting detailed inspections of overhead power lines and equipment, and making necessary repairs.
- Senate Bill 329 (2019) calls for NV Energy to submit a natural disaster protection plan and implement public safety outage management or proactive de-energization.

Mr. Hofmann spoke to maps that were provided in member packets. These maps indicate high risk areas as determined by NV Energy, University of Nevada Reno (UNR), Desert Research Institute (DRI), the National Weather Service (NWS), and various fire agencies. Tier 3 areas are defined as areas with the greatest risk.

Public Safety Outage Management

- As part of work to prevent wildfires, NV Energy is implementing an extensive Public Safety Outage Management (PSOM) program in areas where wildfire risk is the greatest:
 - Eastern/Nevada side of the Lake Tahoe basin (northern Nevada);
 - NV Energy's northern California transmission territory; and
 - Mt. Charleston (southern Nevada)
- PSOM means that NV Energy will shut off power in high fire-risk areas when certain environmental conditions are met in order to prevent power lines and other equipment from causing a wildfire.
 - This is something that can be done as needed to reduce fire risk;
 - Done only if needed, and as a last resort ; and
 - This is the new reality to mitigate our climate change risk, and no grid resilience efforts will change this reality.
- PSOM reflects best safety practices among utilities that face a similar risk.
- NV Energy has de-energized for safety before – at request of fire agencies, or when we feel there is fire danger.
- Other measures will provide benefits in the long-term. PSOM can be done as soon as it is needed for immediate benefit.
 - High-risk areas were determined through work with state fire agencies, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA), NWS, and UNR:
 - Service territory related ignition risk;
 - Wildfire hazard potential, including fuel loading;
 - Fire weather - including wind speed, temperature, humidity; and
 - Urban interface.
- NV Energy is working with a REAX, a leading weather analytics expert, to define our PSOM criteria and provide ongoing monitoring.
 - REAX has supported the California Public Utilities Commission and utilities for the last several years.
- This criteria is based on vegetation levels and potential energy release; level, or lack, of precipitation; temperature, humidity, wind gusts and wind speed.
- Benchmarking was also conducted with neighboring utilities and those with similar risk.

- No single factor drives a PSOM event. NV Energy will closely monitor a number of dynamics, as indicated above, as well as field observations and information from first responders to determine whether to employ a PSOM event.
- Based on the historical application of PSOM criteria, there is a high likelihood of at least one de-energization event per fire season in each of the high-risk areas.
- Criteria; specifically, a combination of Energy Release Component (ERC), Fosberg Fire Weather Index and Wind Gust.
- It is expected that this event will last at least a few hours to allow for completion of all restoration steps in a safe manner.
- The actual frequency and duration of these events may vary due to differences in weather conditions from one year to another.
- This is a planned outage with enhanced analytics, communications, customer needs assessment and fulfillment.

PSOM Internal Process and Timeline

- 8-10 days out (Preparation)
 - Monitor long term forecast and receive 8, 3.5 and 1.5 day notifications.
 - Seek executive approval for a PSOM event.
 - Conduct stakeholder outreach with customers, government and regulatory stakeholders, critical facilities, neighboring utilities and first responders.
 - Plan for comfort center(s), portable gensets, etc.
 - Perform specific tasks per the communications plan, including ongoing communications with all stakeholders – including customers. The customer is notified at least 48 hours in advance.
- 1 day out (Outage)
 - If something changes and there is no longer a concern, will not move forward with the shutoff.
 - Validate extreme fire weather conditions.
 - Notify all stakeholders of outage.
 - Open comfort centers and provide generators if outage is extended.
- Restoration
 - Confirm conditions fall below thresholds and seek executive approval.
 - Conduct equipment inspections and patrols, this can be done in some areas with drones.
 - Make repairs, if needed.
 - Restore power and notify all stakeholders.

PSOM Communications

- Communication is an essential part of this program
 - Create awareness of PSOM.
 - Encourage outage/emergency preparedness.
 - Keep customers informed prior to, and during a PSOM event.
- Direct Outreach
 - Ongoing stakeholder and large customer communication; and
 - Customer phone, text and email alerts to provide outage time and expected duration.
 - The goal is to begin notifying customers at least 48 hours in advance of a potential de-energization event followed by regular updates.
 - During the PSOM event, customers will receive updates to the status of the outage.
- News Media
- Social Media
- Paid Media
- NV Energy Website
- Community Partnerships/Grass Roots
- Meeting one-on-one with emergency personnel, government entities, large customers and others.

- The trigger for an update will be when the status of the outage or the estimated time of restoration changes. If a previously noticed PSOM event is cancelled, customers will receive a cancellation notice.

PSOM Re-energization

- During the outage, NV Energy will have trouble responders, wire watchers, drones and helicopters in the area to patrol for:
 - Vegetation issues;
 - Hardware issues;
 - Corrective actions will take place as issues are found; and
 - NV Energy will begin the restoration process after the PSOM conditions end, and will not soon return to above dangerous levels.
- NV Energy will patrol the entire line and make any necessary repairs prior to re-energization to ensure safe and reliable operations and restoration.
- Any needed repairs may contribute to the length of an outage.
- If NV Energy determines the outage will be extended, comfort centers will be opened in the impacted areas and employ other mitigation efforts.

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)

- Public Safety Power Shut Off (PSPS)
 - PG&E utilizes a utility fire potential index and outage producing winds model that is evaluated by their meteorologist for potential risks.
 - The index designations range from R-1 (lowest) to R-5 (highest) which factors in Red Flag warnings, low humidity (<20%) conditions of the dry fuels, real time observations and sustained wind speeds above 25 mph with gusting in excess of 45 mph
 - PG&E does not have the same design requirements that NV Energy has in its Tier 3 areas based on the National Electric Safety Code for ice and wind loading in higher elevations where the winds can exceed 100 mph.
 - NV Energy currently uses a one-shot, non-reclosing policy during fire season. A circuit patrol is conducted prior to any reclosing or testing during the fire season.

Mr. Hofmann spoke to working with local jurisdictions in regards to table top exercises specifically in Douglas County and the Mt. Charleston area. There were a lot of lessons learned from this exercise. Mr. Hofmann provided the example of South Tahoe. In South Tahoe, there is one specific circuit that feeds all of the casinos. The majority of this is 90% underground, thus there is no fire risk. The remaining 10% is over head, NV Energy would stage people through that area during a PSOM event to ensure that area has power so people have a place to go to if needed. NV Energy is also working with Liberty Utility to evaluate resiliency zones to also keep those underground lines energized. This same process is being done with Plumas Sierra and Truckee Donner Public Utility. NV Energy plans to continue with the table top exercises, to include Elko and Winnemucca. Elko and Winnemucca are also experiencing grid resiliency builds. Part of this process includes replacing wooden polls with steel structures. Finally, NV Energy is also working on increasing vegetation management.

Dr. Chris Lake, Nevada Hospital Association, inquired as to during the eight day monitoring of an event, at which point is DEM/HS notified. Mr. Hoffmann answered that agencies are notified at a minimum of five days. Dr. Lake asked if this notification would be added to the DEM Daily Situation Report. Chief Luna noted that this information is shared with the local jurisdictions that will be impacted but will add it to the Daily Situation Report. Chief Luna asked who NV Energy was coordinating with during this notification process. Mr. Hofmann responded that coordination occurs with fire departments, sheriff departments, highway patrol, emergency managers, and then individuals with major accounts. Rebecca Bodnar, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), asked for clarification on what the notification process looks like for account holders when these shutoffs occur. Mr. Hofmann noted that outreach is done in forms of public messaging/outreach and

finding out specific needs. Mr. Hofmann also noted that if there are any areas of critical infrastructures, these companies are added to the distribution management list to help with re-energizing them first or as quickly as possible. Annette Kerr noted that the work that will be occurring in Elko is news to her and asked for a contact she can reach out to in regards to questions and concerns. Mr. Hofmann noted that Dick Campbell is the area service manager. Elko is still considered Tier 2, and the only work that has occurred in that area is to increase vegetation management and the replacement of polls.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck asked for clarification on the table top exercises and if these exercises were internal. Mr. Hofmann noted that was correct. Deputy Chief Steinbeck mentioned that these exercises and functional exercises will help with the preparedness effort and looks forward to building this partnership. Mr. Hofmann spoke to four weather stations being deployed in Southern Nevada as a result of this table top exercise to help gap the shortcomings in communication. Deputy Chief Steinbeck emphasized the opportunities available to travel to other areas and absorb some of the elements from other exercises and bring back the best practices to local jurisdictions. Mr. Hoffman also offered a tour of the Beltway Control Center in Southern Nevada or the GOB Building in Northern Nevada to offer a different perspective on the types of information used. Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, referred back to a few months ago with the table top exercise in Douglas County concerning the comfort centers, what those comfort centers might look like, and how the notifications might be made to people who are power dependent in their homes. The Quad County Coalition had conversations with health partners to ensure the necessary people were registering with the Green Cross Program. The question was posed by Dr. Freeman if NV Energy has seen an increase in the amount of individuals registering with the Green Cross Program due to the PG&E shutoffs. Mr. Hoffman noted that NV Energy has seen an increase of about 10%, especially in effected areas. Dr. Freeman requested if the individuals who were registered with the Green Cross Program were receiving notifications at the same time of the general public. Mr. Hoffman noted that these individuals are receiving a special notification from the call centers, but there is concern of reaching out too early and creating a false panic. The people are notified at least 48 hours in advance. Dr. Freeman expressed concern with the notification period and stated that weekends and holidays should be considered for individuals with durable medical equipment.

Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson, East Lake Fire Protection District, noted that he appreciates the partnership that has been formed throughout this process and the ability to be involved in the decision making process. Misty Robinson identified the Green Cross Project as an opt-in and voluntary process and expressed concern in using this single source of data. Ms. Robinson noted the HHS emPOWER Program through the health department as being a good data source that helps to identify individuals on durable medical equipment and those who are electricity dependent. Dr. Freeman indicated the local health departments and the state public health preparedness arena are able to access this system; the challenge is without a declared emergency it becomes difficult to get the identified data. Dr. Freeman conveyed the importance of building partnerships between NV Energy and local jurisdictions in regards to messaging. The benefit of using emPOWER data prior to a declared emergency is the ability to compile percentages of the community that require different types of durable medical equipment. Ms. Robinson agreed that emPOWER data is de-identified but there are benefits in using these numbers to better prepare the comfort centers. Dr. Kent advised looking at the big picture in regards to disasters. It is possible to eliminate the threat from utilities but it is difficult to take the human threat out of these situations. Dr. Kent stressed the importance of communication which is an aspect that still needs drastic improvement. Chief Luna pointed to the priority of information sharing and being a critical part of day to day activities. Dr. Malinda Southard, Division of Public and Behavioral Health Preparedness (DHHS), advised that DHHS is working with NV Energy in regards to the Green Cross program data and will be exercising the process of information sharing here in the near future.

6. Seismic Risk Recommendations

Chief Luna opened this agenda item by discussing the previously approved five categories to help structure the discussion around these recommendations. The five categories are earthquake public awareness, unreinforced masonry buildings (URMB's), earthquake early warning systems, earthquake hazard studies and earthquake response training. Dr. Craig dePolo began the presentation by discussing the seismic hazard study. Dr. dePolo stated "The NRAC endorses earthquake hazard studies in and around Nevada communities as a foundation for the seismic provisions in building codes. Building codes are the largest investment society makes in creating earthquake resilient communities. The earthquake input for building codes is based on the National Seismic Hazard Map produced by the U.S. Geological Survey. The earthquake hazard of a fault is considered in this map if it has been explored and characterized through geologic studies. Many communities in Nevada have not had their local faults studied and thus, the earthquake hazard input is underestimated. At the current pace of study, it will take many decades to complete these investigations. Meanwhile, communities are potentially under-designing buildings for earthquake resistance. The study of faults in and near Nevada communities needs to be greatly accelerated so the proper levels of seismic input can be used in building design."

Dr. dePolo spoke to a very large study that is taking place in Las Vegas. The largest city in Nevada was wildly understudied in regards to faults. This lack of documented faults was made clear in regards to the 2008 Wells Earthquake. Dr. dePolo spoke to the geological map that was provided in the packets titled "2008 Wells Earthquake". When looking at the Wells community and basin in detail, there were a number of faults, one in particular that moved, but there were a number of other faults that did not move at all. These faults were very visible in the basin; it just had not been looked at previously. The next example is the Pahrump Valley Fault System. This is considered a strike slip fault. In preliminary studies, there have been two events in the last 10,000 years making this a fairly active fault. The next map that Dr. dePolo spoke to shows in color, numerous fault lines that have been mapped but not been characterized adequately for the United States Geological Survey (USGS) to include them in the seismic hazard map. The next map shows what is included in the 2014 National Seismic Hazard Map. This map depicts the orange and yellow on the western side of the state. The green and blue areas depict the lack of studies that have been included in the Seismic Hazard Map. The higher colors mean there needs to be stronger resistance put into buildings when they are built. Dr. dePolo spoke to a map that showed the potential threat in Pahrump Valley. This map shows from a satellite view, the potential URMBs that have not been field verified. There is a definite risk. The final picture is of downtown Pahrump; this shows the area of potential development. It is important to consider the faults when moving forward with new developments.

Dr. dePolo spoke to this kind of recommendation being the kind that if something bad happened in the state, and the state was willing to put funds toward trying to reduce the risk of earthquakes in the future, this would be the way of doing just that. This type of recommendation can also be placed in proposals. Deputy Chief Steinbeck asked about the typical study cost and how many faults do you get out of that study. Dr. dePolo stated the typically, if everything is done right, the cost is somewhere between a few hundred thousand and half a million dollars. There are modern techniques that we can use to assure ourselves that every fault is found along the surface. When thinking about counties that had situations like Pahrump Valley, looking at the total price tag in a reasonable way, the minimum came out to somewhere between four million dollars and eight million dollars to do everything. The first recommendation is as follows: "The NRAC endorses earthquake hazard studies in and around Nevada communities as a foundation for the seismic provisions in building codes." A motion was provided by Dr. Graham Kent and Deputy Chief Fogerson provided a second. Motion passed unanimously. Dr. dePolo noted the second recommendation being as follows: "Major earthquakes pose unique risk and emergency response settings that require specialized training and resources, such as responding to and managing structural collapses, especially in unreinforced masonry buildings. The NRAC recommends training for firefighters, incident commanders, and EOC managers in

responding to post-earthquake structural collapses. Further, emergency planning should specifically address obtaining Type 3 level urban search-and-rescue resources to rural and frontier firefighters.” Deputy Chief Fogerson spoke to the fact the Nevada Earthquake Safety Council had a lot of great mitigation planning efforts but the one thing that was lacking was how to respond to these incidents. Deputy Chief Fogerson spoke to having the best Urban Area Search and Rescue team (USAR) in Clark County and a robust team in the Reno, Sparks, Incline, and Carson areas to advance search and rescue activities, but there is a lack of these resources in the rural areas. Deputy Chief Fogerson advised looking to the Committee to not only say they want to reduce the damage of earthquakes but also how to respond to them when the next event occurs.

Dr. dePolo mentioned that after the Wells Earthquake, the Wells community was on their own for the first hour before help arrived from Elko. It would make a lot of sense to coordinate this effort. Mike Heidemann, Churchill County, made a motion to include this recommendation along with a caveat that the Committee identifies training resources and funding to bring these trainings out to rural Nevada. Dr. Chris Lake seconded the motion. Chief Luna asked for clarification as to whether it would be acceptable to add that comment to the end of the statement. Mr. Heidemann advised that to be correct. Chief Luna asked for clarification on the caveat in terms of being limited to rural Nevada or as a statewide resource. Mr. Heidemann noted that this would be acceptable to change it to be statewide but urged the importance of bringing these trainings to rural areas as to not be forgotten. Deputy Chief Steinbeck noted that beyond the training there needs to be a statewide strategy for the response portion of this. The statewide strategy would include the cooperation of the newly formed Incident Management Assistance Team (IMAT) in the North, the IMAT team in Southern Nevada, the USAR resources, and the extended recovery resources. Deputy Chief Fogerson agrees with that statement. Looking at California, they have a nice response strategy that is missing here in Nevada. California has numerous training opportunities along with the deployment of the resources. There needs to be a state strategy to ensure the state handles areas where there might be a deficiency.

Chief Luna noted the motion on the floor is “Major earthquakes pose unique risk and emergency response settings that require specialized training and resources, such as responding to and managing structural collapses, especially in unreinforced masonry buildings. The NRAC recommends training for firefighters, incident commanders, and EOC managers in responding to post-earthquake structural collapses. Further, emergency planning should specifically address obtaining Type 3 level urban search-and-rescue resources to rural and frontier firefighters. Also, identify resources and funding for training opportunities statewide to develop a strategy for response and recovery to seismic risk.” Mike Heidemann agreed with this statement. Dr. Lake confirmed. The motion passed unanimously. Dr. dePolo ended his presentation by stating that earthquake activity in Nevada has increased since the Ridgecrest Earthquake at least in Southern Nevada. Dr. dePolo spoke to the last map included in the member packet that shows an increase in activity. Chief Luna noted that it is his plan to compile all the recommendations from the past several meetings into one comprehensive report that will be submitted to the Committee in December for final review.

7. Follow up on the State Behavioral Health Disaster Plan

Dr. Stephanie Woodard, DHHS, reminded the Committee of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis that was completed at the July 2019 Committee meeting. From this Committee meeting, a number of resources were put together including, a small informal workgroup to assist in the development of the Disaster Behavioral Health Response Plan with a number of key stakeholders. Dr. Woodard spoke to the draft plan being presented today and the hope is that an opportunity for comment and feedback is provided to ensure that this plan is signed, sealed, and delivered by December 31, 2019. In addition, this will be considered as a living document. Dr. Darcy Davis, Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) spoke to the documents provided in the member packets. The documents include the actual Disaster Behavioral Health Response Plan Draft, summary of the SWOT analysis, and a copy of the presentation. Based on the SWOT analysis, additional research was completed, it was discovered that the

Committee was spot on with concerns of the plan. Dr. Davis reminded individuals to please provide any input or comments by the end of business on November 22, 2019 to ensure the deadline is met. Highlights from Dr. Davis presentation are listed below:

AB206, (2019) Section 11

The Department shall develop a written plan to address behavioral health needs in an emergency or disaster. (NRS 414.0335/disaster and NRS 414.0345/emergency are defined as an occurrence.)

- (a) Prescribe a process for assessing the need for behavioral health resources during and after an emergency or disaster based on the estimated impact of the situation and the estimated depletion of resources. Not meant to dictate, just prescribe a process.
 - (b) Ensure continuity of services for existing patients with a mental illness, developmental disability, or intellectual disability *during* an emergency or disaster.
 - (c) Prescribe strategies to deploy triage and psychological first aid *during* an emergency or disaster.
 - (d) Identify opportunities for the rendering of mutual aid *during* an emergency or disaster.
 - (e) Prescribe procedures to address the behavioral health needs of first responders *during and after* an emergency or disaster.
 - (f) Prescribe measures to aid the recovery of the behavioral health system *after* an emergency or disaster.
- (a) Prescribe a process for assessing the need for behavioral health resources during and after an emergency or disaster based on the estimated impact of the situation and the estimated depletion of resources.
- DPBH, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee and Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council will assist political subdivisions and tribal governments to identify *or* develop culturally-diverse, community-based, assessment teams (CATs).
 - CATs will use a collaborative, whole community approach to build on the work already being accomplished in the local communities and to ensure all Nevada communities have an opportunity to participate in the assessment and in the statewide behavioral health emergency and disaster planning process.
 - Each CAT will conduct a community-specific Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) to identify the:
 - Community-specific threats and hazards
 - Impact they would have on the community
 - Community's capability to address them
- (b) Ensure continuity of services for existing patients with a mental illness, developmental disability, or intellectual disability *during* an emergency or disaster.
- There are many State and Federal regulations to help ensure continuity of services for this population. Examples:
 - All State agencies include this element in their Emergency Operations Plans
 - All Rural Regional Center contracted-providers
 - All Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics
 - The Joint Commission and CARF

Recommend

- DPBH assist local government entities and behavioral health treatment organizations and agencies to develop continuity of operations plans (COOPs) to identify each program's essential functions and essential staff and to provide MOUs for mutual aid.
- (c) Prescribe strategies to deploy triage and psychological first aid *during* an emergency or disaster.
- Strategies currently in place

- State Emergency Registry of Volunteers-Nevada (SERV-NV) which is a national, web-based, network of state-based systems used to register, qualify, and credential healthcare professionals in advance of an occurrence.
- AB 534 Sec. 21 amends NRS 641 to allow suspension of certain licensure requirements; requires certain licensing boards to maintain lists of licensees trained in the treatment of short- and long-term mental and emotional trauma; and requires those boards to provide their lists to a governmental entity responding to an emergency or disaster.
- DPBH administers the Everbridge system which allows for mass communication to enrolled DPBH staff.

Recommended strategies

- Formalize Emergency Support Function 8.1 in the DPBH Emergency Operations Plan.
- Ensure local-jurisdiction behavioral health teams are integrated into the statewide disaster plan.
- Each local-jurisdiction designates a behavioral health coordinator who will work with the local CAT.
- Each local-jurisdiction develops a comprehensive behavioral health mobilization and deployment plan and protocols; include protocols to address self-deployers.
- DPBH develop an intra-state mutual aid behavioral health resource inventory and disseminate it to the local communities.
- Use Everbridge to conduct drills.
- Develop and implement a standardized, statewide, initial and refresher, training-plan; ensure trainings are based on best practices and address cultural-sensitivity; recruit and train community-based peer supporters, faith-based community, and other natural community helpers.

Deployment

- Activate the behavioral health mobilization deployment protocols and processes.

(d) Identify opportunities for the rendering of mutual aid *during* an emergency or disaster.

Existing

- DPBH, other governmental and non-governmental entities have behavioral health interstate mutual aid agreements and systems in place.
- The Nevada Intrastate Mutual Aid System authorizes the provision of State equipment, services, or facilities for statewide use during the response and during the recovery.
- The Nevada Hospital Association and participating hospitals within the geographical boundaries of the State have a mutual aid agreement.
- DCFS in partnership with the Vegas Strong Resiliency Center maintains a list of trained disaster response mental health and supportive services providers within Nevada and other states.
- SERV-NV-registered volunteers can be mobilized anywhere across the State.

Recommend

- Develop mutual aid agreements with the criminal justice agencies.

(e) Prescribe procedures to address the behavioral health needs of first responders *during and after* an emergency or disaster – Preparation

- Develop policies for the organizational care of responders, write strategic plans, and develop clear written protocols.
- Develop a clearly defined team and leadership cadre and establish sub-teams. Model the structure of the team on the Incident Command System.

- Develop a strategy to address the stigma, misunderstanding, and perceptions about responders who use behavioral health services.
- Address the behavioral health needs of responders in employee handbooks and orientation; provide workshops and training seminars.
- Train EAP professionals on how to provide psychological first aid and crisis counseling that is specific to responders.
- Develop policies and procedures to provide initial and follow up incident defusing and debriefing sessions.
- Continue to develop public and private-sector response capacity by expanding the standardized psychological first aid and crisis counseling trainings.
- Establish a network of responder agency peer-support teams trained in crisis response and distress recognition to be mobilized for other responder agencies when local peer-support providers are involved in responding to the occurrence and are not available to assist their own agencies.
- Use a mass notification system to alert and mobilize behavioral health providers and crisis counselors so they are available to the responders at the beginning of the occurrence.
- Activate the responders in the teams of which they were trained.
- Monitor responders throughout the occurrence and provide confidential outreach, interventions, assistance, and referrals to those who show obvious signs of distress, or as otherwise indicated.
- As requested by the responder, provide confidential, one-on-one crisis interventions and assistance any time during the occurrence.
- Conduct regular confidential one-on-one defusing and debriefing sessions with each responder at the end of her or his event-shift.
- Provide small defusion/debriefing groups throughout the occurrence.
- Provide confidential, one-on-one *debriefing* sessions with each responder over time:
 - Immediate - at the time of demobilization
 - Intermediate - within 72 hours of the demobilization
 - Follow up - approximately 30 days post-occurrence
- Provide small stress *defusion* groups - 8 to 12 hours post-occurrence.
- Provide small critical incident stress *debriefing* groups that follow a standardized curriculum and are staffed by teams of trained behavioral health specialists and peer support specialists - 24 to 72 hours post-occurrence.
- Make and facilitate referrals: EAP, peer-support providers; self- and peer-help groups.
- Provide family information sessions and family support services.
- Facilitate a responder communication and support system by establishing listservs, an online communications platform, by encouraging the sharing of contact information, and by providing conference calls.
- Monitor responders over time and provide confidential outreach, interventions, assistance, and referrals to those who show obvious signs of distress, or as otherwise indicated.

(f) Prescribe measures to aid the recovery of the behavioral health system *after* an emergency or disaster.

- Integrate behavioral health activities and programming into other sectors (e.g., education, health care, social services) to reduce stand-alone services, reach more people, foster resilience and sustainability, and reduce stigma.
- Teach clients and the community strategies known to impart resilience (e.g., coping skills, social connectedness).
- Involve the local communities in behavioral health recovery planning; identify and build on local resources, capacities, and networks (faith-based community, families, schools, and friends).

- Develop capacity for the system to respond to the surge in behavioral health care needs by providing clinicians and other service providers with emergency- and disaster-specific treatment and intervention education, training, and skill building.
- Develop a recovery-specific section in the behavioral health plan that addresses how to quickly resume mission-critical functions, how to analyze post-occurrence business processes and continuity needs, and how to develop a comprehensive recovery timeline.
- Develop an intra-state mutual aid behavioral health resource inventory and disseminate it to the local communities.
- Provide post-disaster messaging using a coordinated, unified, messaging system using:
 - Joint Information Center
 - State/county/local crisis communication groups
 - Regional behavioral health coordinators
 - Regional healthcare coalitions
 - Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council
- Integrate the Nevada Security Awareness Committee into any emergency preparedness groups to ensure recovery of electronic health records and of the Medication Management Program.

Chief Luna thanked the Committee for previous contributions in supporting this plan. Battalion Chief Todd Moss spoke to interest specifically in Section E of this plan and looks forward to working on this in regards to the Northern Nevada Peer Support Network for a more robust plan. Deputy Chief Fogerson spoke to the plan being fantastic but expressed concern in how to operationalize this plan because in Nevada, besides Washoe County and Clark County, no other counties provide behavioral health services. This plan places numerous requirements on local governments when actually the state is the behavioral health provider for these local governments. In this plan, it says the local government should do things, how does the state employee get tasked with this duty when that individual does not report to the local jurisdiction. Dr. Woodard stated that each of the outpatient clinics in rural areas do have an Emergency Operations Plan and by policy should be working with the local governments and continue to foster partnerships. There are additional behavioral health providers in some of the rural communities that can also be brought to the table, for a greater plan moving forward. Deputy Chief Fogerson again expressed concern in the wording of this plan that states local governments will designate different people to do these things. In regards to the rural counties there is no one that is a behavioral health specialist. The positions are provided by DPBH. There is concern in making the bridge between this requirement and the locals, yet the true service provider is DPBH. Dr. Woodard was open to amending the language to encourage collaborative coordination versus the idea of the locals having to do this on their own. Dr. Davis also noted that none of these are requirements but instead are recommendations and suggestions.

Dr. Freeman expressed concern on the timeline regarding feedback on the Disaster Behavioral Health Response Plan Draft based on the comprehensive elements provided. Dr. Freeman stated when looking at the expectations for the locals, behavioral health facilities, and providers, what is the timeframe of expectations for this plan to be implemented and in place. Dr. Woodard advised that the Committee did not want specific requirements to be handed down but more of a guideline for best practices and what the local jurisdictions could and need to consider in regards to infrastructure, communication, training and resources. It is dependent on the local communities to decide which of these are feasible and what the timeline of implementation looks like based on availability of resources. Dr. Freeman noted looking at some of these elements, Threat and Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA) is not a very good word in the state. The THIRA process is exhaustive, the thought of another THIRA that is related to behavioral health that is within a certain jurisdiction is daunting, is there a way to incorporate this into the process that already exists. Dr. Davis encouraged local communities to be fluid in terms of change. Do what makes the most sense and build on existing structures already. Dr. Freeman asked for clarification on which organizations, outside of the Committee and other state agencies, has this plan been vetted. Dr. Davis mentioned that from the July

Committee meeting, there were numerous contacts brought up at that meeting. Dr. Woodard noted that DPBH is managing towards a timeline to have a draft plan in place; certainly there is a lot that needs to occur with this plan once it has gone through the preliminary process. This Committee will be able to provide additional comments and review after the December 31, 2019 deadline. This plan is a living document and can be amended to be the best plan possible moving forward. Misty Robinson asked for feedback on the potential of using the Jurisdictional Risk Assessment instead of the THIRA. That does incorporate mental health component already. Dr. Freeman expressed hesitation with asking the jurisdictions that she deals with to do another assessment on top of the THIRA, because it becomes additionally cumbersome and would rather integrate some of the questions from the Jurisdictional Risk Assessment into the THIRA process making this a unified process.

Malinda Southard spoke to DHHS working closely with DEM/HS to align the Jurisdictional Threat Assessment with the THIRA. It would be beneficial to include these types of behavioral health questions in that assessment and doing a one shot report to reduce the burden on those participating. Dr. Woodard, indicated by way of policy, this plan will be put out for a 30 day open comment period for other entities to provide feedback. Dr. Woodward stressed the quick turnaround time. Chief Luna inquired on the requirement to review this plan and what that timeline looks like. Dr. Davis noted this plan is to be reviewed annually. Lieutenant Corey Solferino, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, noted that he would like to take the opportunity to sit with the clinicians in the jail to ensure there is a good wrap around in regards to these parameters. Lt. Solferino inquired if this plan is prioritized and if a tiered approach to these recommendations would be acceptable. Dr. Davis advised to do whatever is the best for the community and to prioritize based on needs. This plan is just a guide. Dr. Davis spoke to the resources available in the back of the draft plan.

8. Overview of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program

Janell Woodward, DEM/HS, provided a presentation on Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Program. The PDM grant is a nationally competitive grant process and is appropriated by the Consolidated Appropriations Act. Congress appropriates this funding and there is not a set amount. Each year the amount of funding can change. The PDM grant is authorized by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. There was \$250 million dollars appropriated this year. This is currently the last year of the PDM program. Next year a new program called the Building Resilient Infrastructure in Communities (BRIC) will replace this program. Their program will be similar to the PDM program but there is not a lot of information being released yet. The planning grants are for the hazard mitigation plans. Every county has a hazard mitigation plan or is part of a regional plan. The project grants can be based on numerous identified hazards. The PDM performance period consists of three years for a regular project/plan and four years for a large infrastructure project. The period of performance begins when the funds are awarded to the state. There is a 25% cost share required as part of this grant and 10% for impoverished communities. Also, a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approved local mitigation plan must be in effect at the time of the application deadline of January 31, 2020, and at the time of the award. FEMA has set priorities; State/Territory Set-Aside, Advance Assistance, Resilient Infrastructure Competitive Funding, and Traditional Competitive PDM Funding. The State/Territory Set-Aside is \$575,000.00. This is the same for any federally recognized tribe as well. The Advance Assistance is up to \$200,000.00 per applicant including tribes. This is project focused. The Resilient Infrastructure Competitive Funding can be up to \$10 million dollars. For this funding, it must benefit the community or communities as a whole. Each applicant may only submit one application. Finally there is the Traditional Competitive PDM Funding. Ms. Woodward went on to speak about the PDM funding limits being the following; \$4 million limit for regular mitigation projects, up to \$200,000.00 per applicant for Advance Assistance, \$10 million for Resilient Infrastructure projects, \$400,000.00 limit for new mitigation projects, \$300,000.00 limit for State/Territorial and multijurisdictional local/tribal mitigation plan update, \$150,000.00 limit for single jurisdiction local/tribal mitigation plan update, and 5% of plan/project can be added for management costs. Ms. Woodward spoke to eligible mitigation projects to include wildfire mitigation,

advance assistance, structural retrofitting of existing buildings, and structure elevation. PDM Grant applications must be submitted to FEMA via the Mitigation eGrants system with the assistance of Ms. Woodward. Ms. Woodward discussed the PDM timeline. The PDM announcement was made in August 2019, the application period opened in eGrants September 30, 2019, applications are due to DEM/HS by December 2, 2019, a list of potential applications will be presented to the Committee at the December 2019 meeting, another Committee presentation and vote at the January 2020 meeting, and applications are due to FEMA by January 31, 2020. Ms. Woodward concluded the presentation by explaining the Prioritization Form that is used with mitigation grants. This form helps in the review of the necessary information and will be brought back in January 2020.

Chief Luna understands that mitigation projects can be difficult to start and requires a long process. With an increase in investment at the federal level in the mitigation process, this is a tremendous opportunity when the top threats in Nevada such as fire, flood, and earthquake can be impacted by these mitigation funds. Deputy Chief Steinbeck asked for clarification on the in-kind match. Ms. Woodward advised that was correct, the match can be in-kind or cash. Deputy Chief Steinbeck commented that the seismic risk has been prioritized through this Committee, and whether there has been further discussion between the presenters as to which projects can be funded with this source. Ms. Woodward advised that no, a project for City of Reno was put through last year but it needed some work and was not approved by FEMA. Another study was conducted that showed this would not be a cost effective option for the current building they were in. No other projects have been submitted in regards to seismic risk. Deputy Chief Steinbeck questioned if any of the studies from today would qualify for this funding and if seismic studies in regions of the state could be folded into this. Ms. Woodward indicated the only way to put forth these types of studies would be for them to end up as projects. This would enable these projects to use the Advance Assistance. The planning alone would not be viable for this funding. Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, echoed Chief Luna's sentiments pertaining to how important this process is and to continue to work towards the mitigation effort. This is a huge opportunity to bring money into the state. Nevada is one of the lowest grant funded states in the United States. This is a huge opportunity to change this. Ms. Anderson understands the short turnaround time for this grant, and it is difficult for mitigation projects. It was encouraged to begin working on projects that can be brought forth for next year as it could take possibly one to two years to be approved through FEMA. Chief Luna inquired if the application requirements for the Advance Assistance are the same as for a regular project. Ms. Woodward noted that this is more of a planning grant. This funding helps with conducting studies and should result in a project.

***** Break at 10:45 a.m. and resumed meeting at 11:55 a.m. *****

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

Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, spoke to the four different scenarios on draft allocation formulas for the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) that were provided in the member packets. Taking information that was provided at previous meetings, Ms. Anderson spoke to another scenario that is not included in the member packets for potential discussion. Nothing has changed in the backup documentation from the last meeting. The spreadsheets are still using certified population from the State of Nevada and getting away from the census data from 2010 that is obsolete. The first spreadsheet shows the draft county allocation by population only, the second spreadsheet shows the draft county allocation by population and base, the third spreadsheet shows the draft county and city allocation by population only, and the fourth spreadsheet shows the draft county and city allocation by population and base. One area of conversation from a previous meeting had to do with the Tribal allocation amounts specifically for the four emergency management Tribal programs that are listed on the bottom of the spreadsheets. Ms. Anderson spoke to the difficulty of trying to research where those specific allocations came from. It was determined that it appeared to be need based and not based on population. The overall allocation for the Tribes was \$67,040.00 which is a historical

amount, and it cannot be determined how that number came to be. It was suggested that Ms. Anderson look into the population of these four Tribes and create an allocation based on the similar allocations used for the other counties and cities. This document has not been released due to the concern of validating the population with the Tribal entities. Ms. Anderson will reach out to the Tribes to verify these numbers. However, base is used and funding is amended on the spreadsheets, it will increase the base by \$1,000.00 per allocation. Looking at population, for example, it appears that the Duck Water Shoshone would get an allocation of \$296.00 based on population and an additional \$16,000.00 for base bringing the funding level down by half. The population totals and the amount of money that would give is a small amount, in between \$8.95 to \$591.00 for population and base. The smaller jurisdictions, rural counties, would suffer without a base. That would bring the allocations down to minimal amounts of \$3,000.00 to \$4,000.00. DEM/HS needs to make these decisions by summer of 2020.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck noted this is a hard topic since money will be transferred, and he is in support of having clearly defined ways of allocating this money. If there are any allocations that are based on needs, needs should be clearly defined and applied consistently throughout the state. No matter which formula is used, if a jurisdiction is receiving more funding, that also means a jurisdiction is losing funding. This can only be avoided if there is an increase in EMPG funding. Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired if whether this funding is allocated out to the State based on population or base. Ms. Anderson answered that the allocation is based on population and base. DEM/HS received \$4.4 million dollars, and out of that base the State of Nevada takes out 50% to run the emergency management programs. This amount has consistently changed as local jurisdictions have needs. As far as an allocation amount for the state, where the population is this and the base is that, and the State of Nevada is taking this, no there is no formula for that process. Deputy Chief Steinbeck questioned if whether the EMPG funding is distributed to all of the state based on population and base. Ms. Anderson responded that yes, the allocation is based on population and base and the base is .75% of the total allocation goes towards base and the rest towards population. Deputy Chief Steinbeck expressed support for trying to stay as close to the federal allocation as possible to make this more justifiable. This is also a way to prevent syphoning funding from rural areas.

Dr. Freeman asked if when the Federal partners are using the population, what standard or population numbers are being used. Ms. Anderson spoke to believing it is census information being used. Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas, verified that to be correct. The base is determined on each state and a smaller portion of base for the territories. The state would get .75% of the total available allocation per base, territories get .25%, and the remainder is disbursed based on census data. There will be brand new census information in 2020 which may shift things quite a bit. Dr. Freeman inquired if how that updated census information aligns with the certified state demographer numbers. Ms. Anderson advised that information is not currently known. Ms. Levering mentioned that the numbers presented to the Committee contain a lot of red columns. It should be a reminder that there are a couple of different ways to distribute the EMPG funding. There needs to be consideration as to where these funds are going in each organization and the need to prioritize the maintenance of the personnel allocation to keep people on the job in the community that making these programs work. Equipment, supplies, and training need to be focused on as well. It is important to not lose focus on funding people and not the programs. It also needs to be considered that the state retains 50% of funds and is that necessary. The state has had a lot of extended vacancies that result in cost savings. The question is where those funds go when they are not being utilized. There is a lot more to this situation that needs to be considered before making a final decision.

Ms. Levering asked if DEM/HS has heard about EMPG funds being held back until certain requirements were meant, specifically exercise requirements. Ms. Anderson advised in 2019, FEMA came out with some new requirements that were presented in a memo format after the applications were submitted. The application was submitted and Region IX would hold back funding for this region at 50% until their region reviewed and made changes to their training and exercise program. During this process, the Region Administrator released

50% of the funds to each state. At the state of Nevada level, management made the decision to release that 50% to the local jurisdictions and not hold back the funding. It was not 50% of the state funds it was 50% of the entire grant. The local jurisdictions funding was pushed out as a priority. There is a hold on the states portion pending compliance. Ms. Levering was unsure if there is any potential recourse to address the issue, and indicated it is alarming that post-award requirements were made like this. Ms. Anderson noted there was push back from the state. It would have been appreciated to have more time to achieve those requests and not push too hard to where DEM/HS is not covering what needs to be covered. Planning situations take time. It has been agreed that a preliminary plan will be submitted by December 31, 2019 at which point the state's portion of funding will be released. An additional update will be provided at the December 2019 Committee meeting. Chief Luna noted the original plan was to include this in next year's award but it was looped into this year's award and there was a lot of confusion on the states part within the region. DEM/HS worked with region partners to voice displeasure in this and are trying to work out what exactly the requirements are they need to have in place to release the funds. DEM/HS will build on these requirements moving forward.

Annette Kerr spoke to using the allocation formula without base; this will have a detrimental effect on the rural counties and the emergency management programs. The state has now passed the new Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) that counties are required to have an Emergency Manager. The formula without base will force a reallocation of duties and having individuals wear two hats. As a result of this, emergency management programs that have been established will suffer. A majority of EMPG funds are used for personnel and not much funding is left for equipment. It is important to leave the base portion and not just use population because rural counties will never be able to catch up to the bigger counties. Ms. Anderson spoke to the state portion of the funds. DEM/HS spent between \$1.4 and \$1.6 million per year on salaries based on the salary certifications. This is a challenge if the funding is not there to associate with each position. Currently, losing one position would devastate the DEM/HS. Chief Luna agreed with the statements made by Deputy Chief Steinbeck. The goal is to develop a defined allocation method that can be consistent, will benefit the entire state and make emergency management, preparedness, and resilience much stronger. Ms. Kerr pointed out in the bylaws under section two relating to purpose and mission, first paragraph, last sentence reads "The Committee will ensure statewide collaboration in the development and implementation of all homeland security and emergency management preparedness initiatives and propose balanced allocation of grant funding to address statewide needs", and this may need to be updated when an allocation model is determined.

10. Discussion of Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2020

Chief Luna discussed the results of the survey that was sent out to Committee members in regards to the best day of the week and the best week of the month in terms of future meeting dates. The regularly scheduled second Tuesday of the month Committee meeting needs to be moved as it conflicts with the State Board of Examiners (BOE) meeting. Looking at the results of the survey, the next best day is Wednesday of the second week of the month. Based on the results, Chief Luna would like to proceed in this manner for future meeting dates in 2020. Dr. Lake requested the survey be sent out again with the removal of the option of the second Tuesday of the month. It was determined the poll for the Calendar year 2020 meeting dates would be sent out again with the understanding there would need to be a quick turnaround for responses.

11. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. Misty Robinson provided an update on the State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Government Coordinating Council (SLTTGCC). The revised National Response Framework is now available including the Emergency Support Function (ESF) 14 annex, which is now Cross-Sector Business and Infrastructure. The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) within Department of Homeland Security (DHS) released their Strategic Intent for 2019. There is a heavy focus on

cybersecurity and elections security. The SLTTGCC is initiating the process of updating Regional “Snapshots”. There will soon be a survey going around to State Homeland Security Advisors to complete but also looking for additional stakeholders to include in updating the snapshot. It may be a good idea to send it out to the Committee for its situational awareness. Nevada is under-represented in the “Success Stories” section, and there are a lot of good things going on that can be highlighted. Robert Dehnhardt, Department of Administration, spoke to the ransomware attack that occurred in Louisiana on Monday November 18, 2019. This was announced by Governor John Bel Edwards. The attack took down several servers and resulted in the decision to shut down all of the remaining servers to prevent the spread of the ransomware. It may take several days for all of the servers to be turned back on. The attack resembled one that took down 23 school districts in Texas a few months back. This attack started with phishing emails that contained malicious software. Mr. Dehnhardt encouraged all organizations to have good backup systems for critical information and to ensure that employees have proper, current training. No public comment was provided from the Elko venue.

12. Adjourn

Chief Luna called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion to adjourn was presented by Jeanne Freeman, and a second was provided by Solome Barton, City of North Las Vegas. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.