



Meeting Minutes Resilience Commission

Attendance	DATE	November 20, 2018			
	TIME	9:00 A.M.			
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management State Emergency Operations Center 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701			
	METHOD	Video-Teleconference			
	RECORDER	Karen Hall			
Commission Member Attendance					
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Caleb Cage	X	Melissa Friend	X	Connie Morton	X
John Steinbeck	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Todd Moss	X
Roy Anderson	X	Eric Holt	X	Shaun Rahmeyer	X
Solome Barton	X	David Hunkup	X	Andy Razor	X
Bunny Bishop	X	Jeremy Hynds	X	Carlito Rayos	X
Felix Castagnola	X	Kacey KC	X	Misty Robinson	X
Bart Chambers	X	Aaron Kenneston	X	Jim Seebock	X
James Chrisley	Abs	Graham Kent	X	Rachel Skidmore	Abs
Cassandra Darrough	Abs	Annette Kerr	X	Corey Solferino	X
Craig dePolo	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Malinda Southard	X
Michael Dietrich	X	Chris Lake	X	Mike Wilson	X
Dave Fogerson	X	Bob Leighton	X	Stephanie Woodard	X
Jeanne Freeman	X	Carolyn Levering	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
Kendall Herzer			Nevada Division of Emergency Management – South		X
Paul Burke			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chief Caleb Cage, State Administrative Agent (SAA), called the meeting to order. Karen Hall, Management Analyst, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEM) performed roll call. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chief Cage opened discussion on public comment in all venues. No comment provided in Las Vegas or Elko. Chief Cage spoke to administrative instructions for the meeting and the extensive agenda. The predominance of discussion-only items on this agenda reflects the necessity to build a foundation of information sharing necessary for this body to move forward with its mission. It is the intention to have more action-related agenda items in future meetings.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chief Cage called for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 25, 2018, Resilience Commission meeting. Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Citizen Corps/CERT, called for a correction to Page 2, third paragraph, second sentence, to change misspelling of “wthe” to “the”. Mike Wilson, Clark County School District

motioned to approve the minutes with the correction noted, and Mary Ann Laffoon seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. OVERVIEW OF THE NEVADA OPEN MEETING LAW

Samantha Ladich, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Nevada Attorney General’s Office presented the Commission with an overview of Nevada Open Meeting Law. Emphasis was placed on the intent of the law set forth in Chapter 241 of the Nevada Revised Statutes and the requirements necessary including agenda posting, agenda content, and the importance of quorum. Additional discussion was presented on the importance of administering meetings according to agenda items only, and not risking legal implications by straying from agenda content. Ms. Ladich emphasized the requirement of majority vote in all action items, and that motions resulting in a tie vote fail. Should there be issues identified during a meeting, there are legal remedies that can correct certain issues to avoid violations; however such remedies are very specific and can result in rescheduling of meetings, and delaying action on agenda items. The subject of walking quorum was thoroughly discussed, and the importance of this Commission to not convene outside of a public meeting. DEM staff is aware of this issue when notifying the Commission on meeting specifics, and work to avoid “reply all” responses. Deputy Chief John Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, inquired about the reasonable accommodations requirement for public meetings, with Ms. Ladich indicating that such accommodation requests are noted on all agendas with specific instruction to notify DEM staff of the specific request. Additional discussion ensued on what is considered reasonable, with Ms. Ladich indicating that if there is a request, it would be the expectation that if possible and within a reasonable standard, that request is met.

5. OVERVIEW OF THE RESILIENCE COMMISSION MEETING TIMELINE

Karen Hall, Management Analyst, DEM, provided an overview on the timeline developed for managing the Commission deadlines and deliverables on a monthly basis. The timeline denoted specific requirements of a rolling timeline including specifics on planning, administrative, actual in-meeting deliverables, and post-meeting due-outs. Emphasis was placed on the collaboration that will be required moving forward between DEM and Commission members in developing and presenting information as required. As the Commission moves forward in 2019, this timeline will be shared to ensure those individuals with assigned tasks are aware of deadlines. Deputy Chief Steinbeck requested that the Urban Area Working Group (UAWG) be added to the timeline.

6. OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT OF RESILIENCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Chief Cage provided the Commission with an overview of the current strategic plan and ongoing effort in establishing resilience goals and objectives. Highlights of the overview included:

- The phases of the emergency management strategic plan from its inception as an action plan in 2016, evolution to a strategic plan over the course of the next five years, implementation of the State Resilience Strategy in tandem with the strategic plan, and the 2018 interim plan;
- General discussion on the changes to the 2017-2022 strategic plan to include replacement of the current Governor’s strategic planning framework and that of the Department of Public Safety’s framework with that of resilience goals and objectives, modifications to ensure a true emergency management statewide program, removal of extraneous information, and expectations for future Commission meetings; and
- Review of resilience definitions, resilience goals and objectives at the federal level in addition to other states, development of a maintenance plan to provide ongoing revisions, and finalization of the resilience goals and objectives in January to address future grant and/or policy changes.

Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District, inquired if the Governor-Elect has been briefed on this plan, and Chief Cage indicated that during the transition, he will have a chance to brief the Governor-Elect. Carlito

Rayos, Las Vegas Valley Water District, inquired if the expectation of the Chairs was for membership to come back with recommendations to this plan at the next meeting, and Chief Cage indicated that what he wants to do right now is to frame out what resilience is, what the goals are, and how to take objectives in the plan and modify them as necessary. Additional discussion ensued on existing Executive Orders, and whether they sunset at the end of the current Governor's term. Samantha Ladich indicated that while the Executive Orders do sunset, every Governor is different. Orders can sunset or be continued based on the incoming Governor's preference. Dave Fogerson, East Fork Fire Protection District, indicated that it would be beneficial to make the plan less DEM-centric and more resilience oriented for other stakeholders, with Chief Cage indicating that is exactly what he wants to accomplish. Connie Morton, Southern Nevada VOAD, inquired about the 100 Resilient Cities model, and how that could be incorporated into resilience initiatives.

7. OVERVIEW OF NEVADA DISASTER RECOVERY FRAMEWORK

Suz Coyote, State Recovery Officer, DEM, provided an overview of the Nevada Disaster Recovery Framework. Highlights of the overview included:

- The recovery continuum as a constant process throughout the emergency management cycle including preparedness, short-term, intermediate-term, and long-term recovery considerations;
- Recovery Support Functions (RSF) as the coordinating structure assisting with organization prior to, and after, a disaster;
- RSF organizational structure and the flow of information within that structure;
- An overview of each RSF's mission, activities, and primary agency represented;
- Implementation of RSFs;
- Association with Component 2 of the Statewide Resilience Strategy; and
- RSF supporting agencies.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired on the role of RSFs during a disaster, with Ms. Coyote indicating that RSFs would be activated at the beginning of the response in a pre-planning capacity and as requests and needs are identified, they would begin recovery efforts. Additional inquiry was presented on the structural contact procedure and whether that would be direct or through the State. Ms. Coyote indicated that it's a parallel process during response, and as the response dies down, the disaster recovery coordinator would effectively become the same function as the EOC manager. Chief Cage spoke to his vision of standing up the EOC during the response, activating ESF14 early on, and how typically it ends there with damage assessments and declaration procedures. What this framework does is to provide an additional structure where ESF14 is stood up during emergency, and then becomes the point of contact for RSF14 with a hand off from the EOC to the Recovery Operations Center. Timelines are extended and RSFs are activated as needed. Instead of a State Coordinating Official, there would then be a Recovery Coordinating Official. Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired if the Washoe County Regional Emergency Operations Center is currently using this model, with Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, indicating that he is assigning RSF functions although his EOC is organized a bit differently under the five sections of the incident command system. There are some issues with cross-walking certain capabilities to the RSF structure. Misty Robinson spoke to National Response Framework, and changes to the recovery component reflecting community lifelines now. Discussion ensued on those changes; with Carlito Rayos indicating this was a hot topic at a recent conference he attended, and where to address many of the public utilities within the new structure. Due to these changes, Mr. Rayos inquired if this needed to be readdressed by the Commission as to what agency takes over primary ESF functions. Chief Cage indicated that the Commission was the correct forum for discussing those issues moving forward, and thanked Aaron Kenneston for his efforts applied to the statewide disaster recovery framework. Misty Robinson spoke again to the national framework and the issue of recovery. Deputy Chief Steinbeck requested a future agenda item addressing RSF standardization throughout the state.

8. OVERVIEW OF NEVADA PREPAREDNESS EFFORTS

Jim Walker, Emergency Management Program Manager, DEM, provided the Commission with an overview of Nevada preparedness efforts. Highlights of the overview included:

- The State Emergency Operations Center's (SEOC) role, organization under the Incident Command System, Emergency Support Functions (ESF);
- The indirect role of the Commission in the planning, training, and exercising prior to a disaster or emergency;
- The role of the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (SCEMP) in the definition of organizing the SEOC, review and revision of the SCEMP, collaborative review and support, and reports that will be ongoing to the Commission on state planning efforts;
- The role of DEM in creating, maintaining, or monitoring plans including the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), Continuity of Government Plan (COG), the Nevada Enhanced Mitigation Plan, jurisdictional plans, utility plans, school plans, and resort plans
- The role of the Commission with regard to training and exercise opportunities, the coordination across all jurisdictions and disciplines, recommendations for funding such programs, and alignment of training and exercises to address capability gaps identified by annual assessments;

Chief Cage indicated that this discussion is designed to set the stage for future discussions. The Chief reiterated previous comments by Deputy Chief Steinbeck regarding a National Incident Management System refresh. Mr. Walker was instructed to reach out to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) counterparts from Region IX for a presentation on this information in the future.

9. PRESENTATION ON THE OUTLINE OF THE 2019 RESILIENCE COMMISSION REPORT

Chief Cage presented the Commission with an outline of the 2019 Resilience Commission Report in order to begin looking at how to structure the final report. Highlights included the following:

- Emphasis on the Statewide Resilience Strategy Component #4 and the requirement of an ongoing assessment annually to measure progress, document successes and findings, facilitate transparency and collaboration, and most notably to provide an opportunity for advocacy. Chief Cage spoke to the approval of 10 bill draft requests for Nevada recently and having a legislative agenda moving forward will aid the ability to make changes going into legislative sessions and feed the following year's activities.
- Overview of "How We Got Here" including historical events leading to the final strategy including introductory statements, executive summary, background and meeting overview, the strategic plan itself, resilience goals and objectives, and 2019 legislative session changes.
- Information on "Where We Are" including agency overview, planning, training, and exercise overview, after action reports, actual disaster overview and resulting after action reports, combined threats and hazards assessments, and grant expenditures overview.
- Information on "Where We Are Going" to include sustainment project recommendations, budgetary and policy recommendations defined by hazard and discipline, member biographies, and a glossary of important acronyms and terms.

10. PRESENTATION ON THE NEVADA HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM (HMGP)

Janell Woodward, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, DEM, presented the Commission with an overview of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). Highlights of the presentation included:

- A review of what the hazard mitigation entails including grants, projects, planning, the enhanced State plan, local plans for Nevada counties, and technical assistance to tribes;
- A review of DEM and Nevada Division of Water Resource contacts for the Nevada Mitigation Program;

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the December 11, 2018, RC Meeting

- A review of Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) available to include the HMGP Post Disaster Program, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants (PDM), and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA);
- A review on the current statistics of Nevada Hazard Mitigation Plans including plan updates, individual plans, regional county plans, and tribal plans;
- An overview of State activity with regard to administrative and technical support of the program;
- An overview of the current PDM/FMA 2018 grant cycle, cost share requirements, important application deadlines and cost share requirements;
- An overview of the post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; and
- An example of a HMGP project created for the City of Reno with regards to sewer protection measures for the Truckee River in addition to an overview of eligible activities for mitigation projects, planning, technical assistance, and management costs.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke to concerns of locals on applying for mitigation funding due to cost share concerns. Ms. Woodward acknowledged the difficulty in applying for technical-heavy projects, but inferred that cost share or match can take many forms such as cash match or in-kind match, and that outreach is ongoing to educate people on how to work within that cost share system. Chief Cage reiterated the difficulty with some mitigation projects and the application process as daunting; however this is an opportunity to incorporate more discussion with regards to hazard mitigation and perhaps look at how other communities have accomplished meeting such a requirement. Ms. Woodward indicated that for lower economic populations where local funding may not be as available as it is for larger population centers, the match split can be less at 90/10. Additional discussion was presented on the difference between deobligations between the HSGP program and the HMGP program. In HMGP, deobligated funding is returned back to FEMA's general fund, and it is lost if not utilized. Annette Kerr, Elko County, spoke to HMGP Post Fire issues where the county had to have FMAG declarations in order to qualify. The county wasn't granted FMAG status due to how the regulations are written in regards to not having enough structural damage even if ranching communities were highly targeted in their historic fires. Elko is not even eligible, so when cost-match is a requirement, it becomes a bigger issue. Chief Cage indicated that FEMA looked at developing further the fire management grants. FEMA gives Nevada the ability to designate statewide projects with expectation of priority falling within FMAG areas. Elko had fire damage, and they are looking at projects in Elko to fund currently. Whether or not an FMAG makes Elko eligible for program, Elko is a priority from the state's perspective. Ms. Woodward indicated that final eligibility rests with FEMA approval. Chief Cage agreed with the concerns presented and spoke to parts of Nevada that technically won't ever be eligible due to lack of physical structures. David Hunkup, Reno Sparks Indian Colony, inquired if tribal entities could apply directly to FEMA, and Ms. Woodward indicated that tribes have their own set-aside funding for both PDM and FMA, and it's best to go directly to FEMA. Anything above that, the tribes are competing with only the other tribes. Annette Kerr asked about the FEMA mitigation team efforts affecting exposure to the grants, with Ms. Woodward indicating that is an effort only to help with the grant process. Additional discussion was presented on the extremely tight timeline for application and the efforts of both NDF and contractors to develop projects ahead of the deadline to utilize the \$3.4 Million available. The goal is to have potential projects submitted to DEM and then reviewed by mitigation and fire experts. Bunny Bishop, Nevada Division of Water Resources, spoke to identification of projects by FEMA, and resources available. Chief Cage emphasized about the extremely tight timeline on the Fire Mitigation grant and the efforts both the Nevada Division of Forestry and hired contractors are putting forth to develop projects with a December 7, 2018, deadline in order to apply for \$3.4 Million. The plan is to get those projects into DEM and have mitigation/fire experts look at those projects and time permitting, bring them to the next Commission meeting as ranked projects. The Commission will review and modify as necessary. The intent for the future is to have the Commission put forth potential projects.

11. PRESENTATION ON CAPACITIES THAT ARE RECOMMENDED FOR SUSTAINMENT FOR THE UPCOMING HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (HSGP)

Chief Cage presented the Commission with project capacity recommendations for the upcoming HSGP process. Emphasis was placed on changing the method the program currently uses. Whereas in the past, the driver of the program was the establishment of five core capabilities chosen and used to align project submittals, it is goal now to recommend capacities that should be sustained. The following capacities were presented to the Commission including:

- Community Emergency Response Teams or Citizen Corps Projects
- Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and Explosives
- Fusion Centers
- National Incident Management System (NIMS)
- Metropolitan Medical Response System
- Incident Management
- Cyber Security
- Continuity of Operations Planning
- Resilience/Recovery
- Communication

Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke to this being one of the key objectives the Commission is faced with establishing. The capacities presented reflect many of the capacities used during recent emergencies and disasters. The funding associated with this program drives much of what the program does, and without sustainment of crucial capacities, defending communities becomes difficult. Discussion ensued on the capacities listed and whether these recommendations mean to fund projects fully that represent such capacities or to potentially look at other capacities. Chief Cage indicated that this new initiative may help drive the deobligation process as well. Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, spoke to looking at functional or hazard-specific sustainability of the capacities presented. Chief Cage spoke to focusing on the capacity and not the actual list noted citing an example if fusion has information sharing capacity, that capacity would need to be sustained. Discussion ensued on ensuring the capacities presented are the right capacities, and the process used to define this issue moving forward. This is a goal of this Commission. Concern was presented by Mr. Hynds of limiting the Commission's focus. Chief Cage indicated that the purpose of this is to exactly do what Mr. Hynds is referring to in truly identifying necessary capacities versus focus only on specific core capabilities or projects to support. Fusion, bomb squads, CERTs, all of which have had to compete for every dollar in the past, may be viewed differently moving forward as necessary capacities.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke to the ongoing necessity to maintain projects that are working as well. Additionally, the Deputy Chief spoke to the national problem with having cybersecurity as the top priority and the challenges as a result of that determination in determining what that means in the way of cybersecurity. Sustaining those projects that are often large in dollar value can often take the majority of funding available. Chris Lake, Nevada Hospital Association, inquired on the possibility of getting a visual graph to show how much these projects have accomplished based on funding applied, as many of these capacities may or may not be made up of multiple components. Chief Cage indicated that is a due-out that can be accomplished and shared in future meetings. Carlito Rayos spoke to stacking projects for sustainability. Funding is always uncertain with regards to allocations, especially in the UASI. Chief Cage indicated the only thing that is different is getting away from the core capability approach to moving projects forward. It's important to sustain capabilities that are detrimental if lost.

This is the plan as it is right now with solid support, but the next Governor's administration is not known currently. The belief is that because of the support and the plan that has been developed, we will be able to continue as we have been. Right now, the need for additional EOs may not be needed. How the BDRs and budget proposals will affect the HSGP process is currently unknown, but Chief Cage indicated that if the

creation of the Resilience Commission in statute moves forward, that will have a positive effect on the process. Additional funding to DEM could result in having more state-funded capability in house and more grant funding available.

Misty Robinson spoke to the cybersecurity issue and what the federal government is actually looking for with regard to cyber grants projects. The ad-hoc Grants Working Group associated with the SLTTGCC made the recommendation that a baseline be identified for cybersecurity, and that cybersecurity not be a part of the HSGP funding stream. Additional recommendations were to develop gap analyses, and continued outreach. On 10/31/18, DHS and FEMA were provided with these recommendations, and acknowledged this was a national concern. Ms. Robinson indicated that although there may not be an apparent appetite for separating out cybersecurity currently, there could be other avenues to begin addressing the problem such as the THIRA and SPR process. There most likely won't be changes in the 2019 cycle, but there is hope for additional guidance in 2020. Chief Cage requested that the recommendations be forwarded to him so that he can distribute to the members. Annette Kerr spoke to the categories listed, how many are required to be funded, and secondly, if there is a way to view past deobligations applied to the capabilities listed for the past five years.

Kelli Anderson, DEM, spoke further about requirements of the HSGP. There is an approved application for FFY2016 deobligated funding, and while changes to projects may happen, it is mandatory to maintain the integrity of the projects to align with the approved application. Should this Commission, Finance Committee, or the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security shift the focus from the FFY16 application, it is possible through a project change request. There are no programmatic guidelines driving the funding of specific projects. The slide shown represents "project" based capabilities after looking at projects funded over the course of the past 3-5 years, and the consistency of capability sustainment during that time as approved by the HSWG, Finance Committee, and the NCHS. Annette Kerr clarified she is looking forward, that in order to receive HSGP funds, is it necessary to mandate funding for fusion, CERT, or the other capacities listed. Kelli Anderson indicated that is predicated by the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) released by DHS annually. In the past, capabilities have been a requirement such as fusion, volunteer groups, the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator, and NIMS. For 2019, there is no guidance yet, and there is only historical perspective. Additional concern was presented on whether the Commission could be tying its hands by listing only the capabilities shown should the NOFO come out with a different focus. Kelli Anderson indicated that although it's never a known quantity prior to funding notices, supporting NIMS, fusion, CERT, and communications-based projects is still extremely important. Deputy Chief Steinbeck indicated that the list provided, and any subsequent NOFO, would not change the strategy put forth to the Commission. The projects listed are they type of projects that have been sustained and important to the state in the past five years. Should the NOFO come out with additional requirements, the Commission will have to abide by those requirements. That does not change the strategy of supporting vital capacities.

12. PRESENTATION ON GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEOBLIGATED FUNDS FROM THE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (HSGP)

Kelli Anderson, DEM, presented the Commission with an overview of grant funding opportunities within the HSGP program. Highlights of the presentation included:

- The process to apply for deobligated funding;
- The total amount of FFY 2016 funding available which includes \$423,818.43 in State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSP) funds and \$208,464.47 in Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Grant Program funds;
- The current status of the grant and why funding is available due to deobligations of grant funding in FFY 2016 of 3 SHSP and 5 UASI projects;
- The timeline for applications;

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the December 11, 2018, RC Meeting

- The process for recommending the grant priorities to FEMA;
- Discussion on Commission input on the application process and administration of the grant
- Priorities for deobligations;
- Compliance with approved FFY 2016 core capabilities including cybersecurity, intelligence and information sharing, public information and warning, operational coordination, and operational communication.
- The process to apply for deobligated funding to include, 1) completion of an investment justification, project proposal, and line item detail budgets, 2) meeting funding priorities established in FFY 2016, 3) meeting all FFY 2016 grant guidance compliance, 4) receipt by DEM of final reimbursement by July 31, 2019. Applications are due to DEM by November 30, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. PST. Applications are to be submitted to DHSGrants@dps.state.nv.us
- Additional instruction on submitters attending the Commission meeting scheduled for December 11, 2018, was presented, and the final prioritized list of projects will be forwarded through the HSWG process including the Finance Committee and the NCHS.

Solome Barton, City of North Las Vegas, inquired if project representatives can be chosen to represent submitted projects outside of Commissioners, and Ms. Anderson indicated that the project presenters, if present, can be whoever the project manager wishes them to be. Annette Kerr inquired if applicants may present from remote locations, and again the answer was yes. Chief Cage indicated that he will be coming to Elko for the next meeting.

13. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chief Cage opened discussion on public comment in all venues. Misty Robinson spoke to State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Government Coordinating Council (SLTTGCC) points of interest including the Regional Initiatives Working Group membership, working with the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Infrastructure Protection, and current membership as the Chair of the Policy and Planning Working Group. Additional information was provided on a pending Disaster Recovery White Paper and an update to critical infrastructure key resource information due out next year. Chief Cage inquired on the Disaster Recovery White Paper, with Ms. Robinson indicating that currently she can only provide a historical regional snapshot as the paper is still in conception mode. Irene Navis, Navis Strategic Services, spoke to the Critical Infrastructure Committee not being listed on the Resilience Timeline, and to historical efforts applied to a critical infrastructure plan that has been on hold for several years. With DHS's restructuring of ESF14, it may be a consideration to re-review that plan with updates from SLTTGCC. In terms of looking at capabilities, and addressing critical infrastructure within the fusion arena, it may be good to address this in the Recovery Framework moving forward.

14. ADJOURN

Chief Cage called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was provided by Deputy Chief Steinbeck, with Chief Cage seconding the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.