



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE	August 13, 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	X	Misty Robinson	X
John Steinbeck	X	Aaron Kenneston	X	Chris Tomaino	X
Roy Anderson	X	Graham Kent	ABS	Rachel Skidmore	ABS
Solome Barton	X	Annette Kerr	X	Corey Solferino	ABS
James Chrisley	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Malinda Southard	X
Cassandra Darrough	ABS	Chris Lake	X	Mike Wilson	X
Craig dePolo	X	Bob Leighton	X	Stephanie Woodard	ABS
Michael Dietrich	ABS	Carolyn Levering	X	Tennille Pereira	X
Dave Fogerson	X	Connie Morton	X	Christina Conti	X
Jeanne Freeman	X	Todd Moss	X		
Mike Heidemann	ABS	Shaun Rahmeyer	X		
Eric Holt	X	Ryan Miller	X		
David Hunkup	X	Carlito Rayos	X		
Advisory Committee Non-Voting Member Attendance					
Bunny Bishop	X	Melissa Friend	X	Jill Hemenway	ABS
Felix Castagnola	X	Kacey KC	ABS	Elizabeth Breeden	ABS
Bart Chambers	ABS	Rebecca Bodnar	ABS	Catherine Nielson	ABS
Legal Representative			Entity		Present
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney General			Nevada Attorney General's Office		X
Analyst/Support Staff			Entity		Present
Karen Hall			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X
Meagan Werth-Ranson			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X
Kendall Herzer			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - South		X

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

2. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. Public comment was not provided by the Elko or Las Vegas venue. Roy Anderson, Washoe County School District, thanked the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for putting out a message that school has started and to slow down in school zones.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Luna called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes from the July 9, 2019, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) meeting. Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, requested an amendment to include the revision of Agenda item #7, first paragraph under threats, fourth sentence to read "Dr. Freeman spoke to funding available for training in the communities." Dr. Craig dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, requested the revision of Agenda item #11, first sentence to read "Dr. dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, opened the discussion with reference to the July 4,2019, and July 5,2019, Ridgecrest Earthquakes." Dr. Freeman made a motion to approve the minutes as amended and Connie Morton, Southern Nevada Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD), provided a second. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, spoke to Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) allocations. DEM/HS has been trying to figure out the allocation for a few years now. Unfortunately, allocations have remained at level funding since 2013. Feedback that was noted from the last NRAC meeting in July 2019, was to provide the Committee with spreadsheets containing historical value, straight population based allocations, and population with base allocations. DEM/HS receives approximately \$4.2 to \$4.5 million dollars every year from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Program activities need to take place within two years. As of last year, that performance period has changed from two years to three years. Primarily this funding goes to fund Emergency Managers and staff to support those activities for the State of Nevada. Currently DEM/HS retains 48%-50% of the funds. DEM/HS requested additional State general funds this past legislative session and ultimately that funding was not approved. DEM/HS operations are approximately 93%-95% federally funded depending on the given year. A portion of EMPG funds go towards full time positions with DEM/HS. The basis of this program is to be compliant with the core capabilities across prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery mission. DEM/HS focuses on planning, organization, training, exercise and equipping emergency management organizations. This is to support building and maintaining those focuses of the program goals every year. General requirements for EMPG include; an emergency operation plan revisited once every two years, participation in the Threat and Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA), be National Incident Management System (NIMS) compliant and or working towards being NIMS compliant, participate in exercises, submit and have approved hazard mitigation plans, meet the cost share requirement for this program which is 50%, be complaint with federal and state assurances, submit quarterly financial reports, and be compliant with the core capabilities.

One of the requests from previous NRAC meetings was to see where the local jurisdictions are spending their money. Ms. Anderson spoke to historical documents provided for this meeting in regards to EMPG funds for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015, FFY 2016, FFY 2017 and FFY 2018. These documents show which counties have been receiving funds, how much money has been received, and the areas that this funding is being spent in. In general, due to stable funding since 2013, the areas of expenditures have not changed. 80%-100% of funds are spent on personnel and basic operating supplies. This makes it challenging when talking about changing these allocations.

The first part of the final document that Ms. Anderson spoke about displayed changes that would occur in regards to funding if the allocation process was changed to better align with current population and using the percentage that goes into the base that FEMA gives the states. It is known that .75 % of the total allocation for

the Federal Government is the determined base for all states. Once the base allocation is established, then additional funds are allocated to the states based on population. On the handout labeled Draft County Allocation by population document, only the 17 counties are listed. The data for population came out of the approved census information that the State of Nevada collects from the State Economist. This population was certified in 2018. This document is for the potential Federal Fiscal Year 2020 draft allocation. This document is based off of counties and not cities and shows the potential increases and decreases of funding. Tribal nations that have participated consistently are noted on the bottom. This scenario would keep Tribal Nations at a level funding. It is extremely difficult to figure out an allocation base for Tribal Nations. There are 27 Tribes. Ms. Anderson noted that these allocations would be around \$1,000.00-\$5,000.00.

Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, requested clarification on the funding for the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC) and if the funding was for personnel or things. Ms. Anderson advised that this funding was for personnel. Currently there is one person that has been on boarded and DEM/HS is looking to bring on two more people in coordination with the health grants. This will pay for a small portion of rent, equipment to get them started, travel funds to get them out into the Tribal Nations, and their salaries. This is leveraged with the Homeland Security funds. This EMPG funding is being leveraged with the NIMS funding to hire three full time contractors to assist the Tribal Nations in Nevada. Annette Kerr asked for clarification on the total amount based on population only minus Tribal, and if the Tribal funds are subtracted from the 17 counties equally. Ms. Anderson noted that was correct.

The second part of the final document that Ms. Anderson spoke about displayed changes that would occur in regards to funding if the allocation process was changed to better align with current population and base. Using the base methodology that FEMA has accepted, which is .75%, each state receives this base amount. The spreadsheet leaves the Tribal Nations with level funding. Using the base of \$15,915.98 for each local jurisdiction and subtracting that base from the total amount. This shows the increases and decreases for using the base and population method. Dr. Freeman questioned why the Tribal numbers were so vastly different from each other. Ms. Anderson noted that this was old data and there are challenges in answering this question. However, looking back at the EMPG allocations from 2015, there were more Tribal Nations that participated. Slowly, the Tribal Nations have opted out due to challenges with producing match amounts. Dr. Freeman expressed concerns with the variations with the funding that has been allocated and noted this information needs to be discussed with the Tribal Nations. An analysis will be done with the newly hired contractors to figure out needs of the Tribal Nations. Dave Hunkup, Reno Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC), noted the amount of funds allocated each year for RSIC has been to cover 50% of the Emergency Manager Position salary. This funding does not cover all of the salary and fringe but does contribute to keeping the position filled. Deputy Chief Fogerson, East Lake Fire Protection District, suggested looking at the Tribal Nations the same way the counties are looked at. This might actually be a benefit. If we treat everyone the same, the amounts are defensible and justifiable. There needs to be a conversation to promote participation across all 27 Tribal Nations. Bob Leighton, City of Reno, questioned if the counties that have not participated have expressed wanting an allocation. If not and DEM/HS starts allocating funds this will lead to more deobligated funds. Ms. Anderson spoke to the new Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) that requires every county to participate (Legislative Session 2019 Senate Bill 67), without the funding these counties will not be able to comply with this new statute. The challenge with this is that this funding is twelve months behind, which means money is already being spent by the time the award is received. Then the allocation has the chance to change when the grant comes out.

Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas, asked for an idea how much funding would become available if all counties removed all costs besides personnel costs. Ms. Anderson stated that there would be approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000 that would become available. Ms. Levering suggested salvaging positions as a first priority and using left over funds as a pot to apply to other needs. This creates a cushion of funding for emergency needs or equipment needs. If DEM/HS levels out the allocation, this may lead to less deobligated

funds, less deobligations means less grant awards and less grant awards means less work. The cost to run a grant from the beginning to end costs about \$2,000.00. This could be a good way to manage deficiencies as they arise.

The third part of the final document takes a look at the counties and cities allocations by population. This is based on population only. This spreadsheet shows the increase and decrease in allocations for cities and counties. This methodology shows a more wide range of changes. Deputy Chief Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, noted that it would not be helpful to change the allocations on a yearly basis. It would be beneficial to reevaluate the allocation every five years. This will make changes easier to implement and will be more stable.

The final portion of the document shows counties and cities based on population and base. There are only a few cities listed on this form. There are eight cities listed and there are 18 cities total. The potential of adding additional cities will create changes in allocations. If the cycle is on a five year period, this creates a dilemma in eligibility to opt in to the program. This will create unstable allocations. Dr. Freeman asked if the cities standard allocations added to the county allocations. Ms. Anderson stated that was correct. This was a way to show what the total county allocation is. Dr. dePolo inquired what has been done to approach the Federal Government about increasing the funding amount. Ms. Anderson spoke to the fact that it is unlikely that there will be an increase to this funding allocation. Ms. Levering stated there are a number of associations that have been working to increase the amount of funding at the national level with not a lot of success. When looking at Federal Funds, Emergency Management is placed in the same bucket as most of the other public safety services. Ms. Levering promoted participating in other organizations and partaking in the surveys that tell your story. This is an important way that can help increase the chance for increased funding.

Ms. Anderson elaborated on what the local jurisdictions spend on salaries versus what the current allocation is. Currently, local jurisdictions and Tribal Nations, spend roughly \$2,755,000.00 on salaries including match. \$1,721,000.00 is what is spent without a match. Subtracting that from the allocation of \$2,100,000.00, the difference is \$4,260,000.00. If everything is eliminated from every program besides salaries, the total is \$400,267.00. Dr. Kenneston advised that there was an expectation that the state was going to increase the base amount out of the state budget, therefore freeing up EMPG funding. This will have led to redistributing allocations and providing the opportunity to bring more personnel on board. This has not happened as there has been no increase. It appears that with this process it is a redistribution of wealth and takes money from programs that deserve the funding. Dr. Kenneston suggested taking a step back and looking at this when there are actual resources to distribute. Ms. Anderson spoke to the information bulletin #442, dated July 19, 2019, that was provided by FEMA announcing the guideline that outlines the need for guidance on the distribution management plans for FFY 2019 on EMPG. There needs to be a clear justification and documentation in the State Emergency Management Plan on how the distribution on EMPG is being conducted. The downside to this is that FEMA is requesting information for 2019. The State Emergency Management Plan will now need to be updated to reflect this change. Dr. Freeman recognized that there are some jurisdictions that have stepped away not because they did not have good programs or not NIMS compliant, some stepped away due to the financial crash from over ten years ago. These jurisdictions are finally starting to come back from the crash and are now able to meet the 50% match that is required. Deputy Chief Steinbeck, there needs to be a measurable and defensible formula. There needs to be an understanding when one jurisdiction receives an increase in funding, there will be a decrease to another jurisdiction's funding. There should be a focus on needs. Deputy Chief Fogerson stated this is the kind of conversation that needs to be taking place. The locals are now taking the brunt of this change, it was requested that the DEM/HS considers taking a cut and share the impact of changing the allocations.

5. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Programmatic Update

Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, spoke to the Report on existing Grants for the Federal Fiscal Years 2016, 2017, and 2018 document provided as a handout. This is a narrative format regarding all programs for the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP). This information was collected from Quarterly Programmatic Reports that are sent in with the Quarterly Financial Reports to DEM/HS. This is the same type of document that has been received every other month for this meeting. Dr. Kenneston noted his appreciation for this document and requested moving forward there is a focus on the funding stream for Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funds and how those funds compliment EMPG funds.

6. Briefing on the Metropolitan Statistical Analysis (MSA) Process

Deputy Chief John Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, provided a brief overview of the Metropolitan Statistical Analysis (MSA) process. This process is specific to Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funding for the Las Vegas Metropolitan area. The MSA determines which UASI will be funded and what the funded amount will be. The MSA includes a relative risk score that is calculated with numerous factors. There is a great deal of debate regarding the factors that are used to contribute to the score. Changes to the formula are difficult to undertake. The Las Vegas UASI has seen an increase to the funding that is received partially due to population changes and changes in consequences and vulnerabilities. The biggest portion of the increase is due to the addition of a special event metric. Taking a look at the worst 100 attacks in the United States and spreading that threat throughout the whole world, critical infrastructure is not the overriding target. Areas of mass gathering and soft targets certainly exceed the critical infrastructure index. It was noted the soft target index was previously not included in the MSA process and after working with respective delegations, this index was newly added. Due to this index being included, the Las Vegas UASI was ranked 17th for the last two years. It is important to note that in regards to funding, in 2013, zero funding was received. In 2014, \$1 million was received. This is the lowest level of funding available. For the last two years, \$5 million has been received in UASI funding. The relative risk score is still set as 25% threat, 25% vulnerability, and 50% consequence. Deputy Chief Steinbeck believes this mostly benefits dense urban cities predominantly on the East Coast and does not equate to where attacks have been seen. The consequence percentage is still too high. This percentage is not an easy thing to change.

There is an indication, based on the timeline of the data calls; this may push the grant process earlier than in previous years. The data call includes a request for information on special events and critical infrastructure. This information is then used in the MSA process. Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District, questioned if the population density is based on Clark County has a whole in terms of the full 8,000 square miles or just the urban area. Deputy Chief Steinbeck advised it is based on the urban area. Carolyn Levering noted this includes the entire MSA. The Clark County MSA includes portions of Nye County and Mohave County, Arizona. Deputy Chief Steinbeck asked if this included all the rural areas. Ms. Levering noted the MSA is not an origination of DHS and existed long before DHS; therefore these boundaries were created without regards to state and county boundaries. This helps to determine core urban districts. Ms. Robinson mentioned the Center for Disease Control (CDC) had based the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (ASPR) grants on population density based on all of Clark County and there was discrepancy on using this information and using the actual metropolitan area information instead. Ms. Levering made the argument for not using the MSA for similar reasons. This is the one part of the formula that has never been changed. Ms. Anderson provided a timeline regarding the potential 2020 grant processes. Usually, the data call requests begin in February, questions are asked on the data call information during the following month, draft MSA's are released in April, final MSA's are released in May, the notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) is released May 23, and the grant application is due June 20th. This process has now started in July and it is hard to know what this means for the grant process. This could possibly happen before Christmas. This would be a record in the

last seven to ten years. Ms. Anderson asked for information sharing and as information is collected from DHS it will be shared for timeline purposes.

7. Overview of Nevada Recovery Efforts

Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, provided an overview of the current statistics relating to recovery efforts. Discussion was provided on federal disasters 4303 and 4307 indicating the number of grants awarded, amount awarded, paid to date, balance, and pending reports for each disaster. Recovery updates also include the following:

- July 2019- DEM/HS is in the process of procuring the Emergency Operations System (ESRI), including the Survey 123 app as a new Preliminary Damage Assessment (PDA) Tool.
- August 2019 – The first Recovery-Focused Drill to exercise the deployment of the State PDA Team and introduce transition from response to recovery operations established in the Nevada Disaster Recovery Framework (NVDRF).
- November 2019- The Silver Crucible full scale exercise. The last day of the exercise is recovery driven.

Dr. Kenneston expressed his excitement regarding the new PDA tool and cannot wait until it is passed down to local jurisdictions and add it into the standard operating procedures. Ms. Anderson advised that DEM/HS is excited as well about this tool and noted that funding is not an issue for the tool; the focus is on implementation and approving the contract. DEM/HS will be working towards this goal.

8. Flood Hazard Briefing

Bunny Bishop, Nevada Division of Water Resource, provided an overview of the Nevada Floodplain Management Program. The goal of the Floodplain Program is to create flood resilient communities in Nevada that encourage protection of life, property, water quality, environmental values, and the preservation of natural floodplain functions. Ms. Bishop noted that this program has two full time staff members and two part time staff members. Ms. Bishop provided the following statistics: there are 35 participating communities in Nevada, the average policy premium is \$675.00, and losses paid since 1978 is \$1,777.00. The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) works with FEMA and agrees to make flood insurance available within a community when that community agrees to adopt and enforce floodplain management regulations. The goal of mitigation is that nothing happens when something happens. The NFIP was created in 1968 by the National Flood Insurance Act, participation is voluntary, participating communities adopt and enforce regulations, and benefits of participation include flood insurance, grants and loans, disaster assistance and flood resilient communities. Ms. Bishop discussed benefits of Flood Insurance vs Disaster Assistance to include claims paid with no disaster declaration, no payback requirement and the average award amount. There are four sections to the NFIP: Floodplain Management, Mapping, Insurance, and Grants. There are numerous NFIP partners. These partners can be lenders, realtors, agents and adjustors, and private industry partners. The definition of a flood is “a general and temporary condition” of partial or complete inundation of two or more acres of normally dry land area of two or more properties. Ms. Bishop provided background on the 100 year flood and noted that this flood does not occur every 100 years like the name would suggest. It was discussed that the Base Flood Elevations (BFE's) is a flood that has 1% chance of occurring every year and BFE is the expected height of water during a base flood.

Discussion ensued regarding types of flood zones and descriptions. There are six types of floods in Nevada. Riverine, Alluvial Fans, Flash Floods, Canal Breaks and Flooding after fires are the most common. Ms. Bishop's presentation continued with pictures from previous flood events. The conversation continued with the effects of flooding; damages to infrastructure, erosion and economic losses. There have been a total of 18 Federal Flood Disaster Declarations in the last 65 years. Ms. Bishop advised there are numerous Floodplain

Management partners with special emphasis on the Nevada Silver Jackets. The Nevada Silver Jackets is a state-led interagency team that promotes flood safety and mitigation. Ms. Bishop spoke to resources that are available to include training, outreach and public awareness, outreach events, Flood Fighter Nevada video game, websites and the Flood Awareness Week. This year's Flood Awareness week will take place November 16-22, 2019, more notification regarding this event to be forthcoming. Ms. Bishop noted that DEM/HS works closely with the Nevada Division of Water Resource for state hazard mitigation planning, grant workshops, mitigation plans and maintenance and the State Assessment and Response Team (START). Nevada is an enhanced mitigation plan state. This means that Nevada gets a bigger percentage of funding when a Presidential Disaster Declaration is made. Effective Floodplain Management comes down to people; collaboration leverages scarce resources, address needs, mapping and engaging people in understanding their flood problems.

Dr. Kenneston mentioned that Nevada also has closed-basin flooding. There are at least three closed-basin floods in Washoe County alone. Ms. Bishop noted that presentation materials will be updated to include this flooding. Dr. Kenneston inquired if there was any training regarding filling sand bags. This training used to be done with resources from California. Ms. Bishop stated that she would look into this program and how to conduct this training in Nevada. Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps/Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), requested resources that could be handed out during events to promote community outreach. Ms. Bishop stated FEMA has various resources that would be beneficial and she will research further community literature. Ms. Anderson also requested literature that would be beneficial for the Citizen Corps. Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired as to why more mitigation projects are not approved or even applied for and what can be done to increase this. Ms. Bishop noted that these funds are nationally competitive. On top of this, the benefit cost analysis is an issue. This Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) acts as a barrier that is hard to pass. Producing a 25% match for funds is also creating a barrier for this program. The conversation concluded with Deputy Chief Steinbeck requesting funding resources for sand bags and Ms. Bishop advising she would follow up with more information.

9. Presentation on the Statewide Interoperability Program

Melissa Friend, DEM/HS, provided an update on interoperability in regards to the state. As of June 2019, the Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan is currently in draft form and should be completed relatively soon. Once completed, this will be sent out for input to all partners before finalizing the plan. The DHS National Emergency Communications Plan should also be coming out within the next few weeks with a few significant changes. DEM/HS has the honor of hosting the statewide Communication Rodeo in October of 2019. Planning meetings for this event will be scheduled to start next week. In regards to alerts and warnings, the AlertSense contract expires August 31, 2020. At that time, the request for proposal (RFP) process will need to be conducted and there is no guarantee this will be the vendor that is selected. FirstNet update included the notice that there are ten new FirstNet cell towers around the state. There are four towers already on the air. These towers include Pyramid Lake in Washoe, VC Highlands in Storey County, Boulder City in Clark County and 95/Bruce Woodbury Beltway in Clark County. There are six more towers that are planned. These towers include towers in the Carson City, Vya, Virginia City, West Las Vegas, and two different locations in the Henderson areas. Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, asked to clarify if the new interoperability within the state will be able to talk to Southern Nevada Area Communications Council (SNACC). Ms. Friend advised that she was unaware of that but would be willing to look into that further.

10. 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, earthquake early warning systems, earthquake hazard studies and earthquake response training. Dr. dePolo started the presentation by providing an overview on earthquake preparedness. Earthquake preparedness messaging includes the following:

- Drop, cover, and hold,
- When the shaking stops, assess your surroundings, help others, exit the building if you need to and it is safe to do so,
- Do not use elevators,
- Make sure everyone is accounted for
- Evaluate if there are any hazards,
- Check your neighbors,
- Help comfort and listen to each other,
- Prepare to be on your own for several days,
- Be aggressive in cleaning up messes and helping others clean up, and
- Be mindful of strong aftershocks

There is a potential for loss of communication, power, water, and sewer for three to five days with possible damage to dwellings. Being prepared includes having power sources, water, temporary housing, food and medications for five to seven days. It is a good idea to have sturdy shoes by the bed in case of an emergency. The conversation shifted to the underutilized resource of the Great Nevada Shake Out. In 2018, there were only 600,969 participants out of 3,3034,00 Nevadans. The largest underrepresented group is in regards to individual families. The greatest window of opportunity is right after an earthquake occurs.

Discussion ensued on crafting a statement that will be used in the final report. Dr. Kenneston suggested using community groups instead of Community Emergency Response Teams as there are other organizations such as the American Red Cross and Volunteer Organizations Active in Disasters (VOAD) whom assist as well. Mr. Hynds suggested using the word could instead of should. Chris Lake suggested moving the Great Nevada Shakeout to the front of the statement and removing the second “using” after Shakeout. Annette Kerr suggested using will instead of should and also using whole community instead of a single organization. Chief Luna noted that title should read Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee. The final statement should now read “The Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee will identify mechanisms to develop and promote local earthquake awareness, preparedness, and seismic risk mitigation. These efforts could include using the Great Nevada Shakeout, whole communities, and windows of opportunities (such as earthquake events) when people are more receptive to engaging and preparedness.”

A motion to approve the statement was provided by Deputy Chief Fogerson with a second motion provided by Dr. Chris Lake, Nevada Hospital Association. Motion passed unanimously.

Roy Anderson, requested additional literature regarding the Great Nevada Shakeout. The school district prepares students and staff for this event but would like to see more information that can be sent home to families. The school district focuses on educating staff as to why the need for this training is important. With more understanding from the staff, this translates into better education for the students. All schools in Washoe County participate in this event. Mr. Anderson would like to see this become more comprehensive to address this throughout the community. Mary Ann Laffoon noted that the American Red Cross participates in the Pillowcase Project. This is a project that teaches third through fifth graders about four major disasters; including earthquakes. The students that participate each receive a book and take a pledge to pass on the information they have learned to their families. This is a good program to promote in the schools. My. Hynds,

spoke to the program that Henderson created with the EMPG funds received. This program is called Captain Kid. The Captain Kid program is specifically designed for students Kindergarten through fifth grade and showcases preparedness. This is another tool that encourages the sharing of information learned. The Captain Kid idea was submitted to the International Association of Emergency Managers Public Awareness Award. Henderson is receiving this national award this year.

11. Public Comment

Deputy Chief Steinbeck congratulated Justin Luna on becoming the official Chief of DEM/HS and a job well done on his first NRAC meeting. Deputy Chief Steinbeck also congratulated Henderson on the award they will receive for the Captain Kid campaign. Zenny Marsh, American Red Cross, spoke to how the American Red Cross teaches preparedness courses to whole communities and is eagerly standing by to work with other organizations. The American Red Cross serves 13 out of the 17 counties of Nevada. Ms. Marsh noted the American Red Cross will be participating in future VOAD meetings and will be working with the Quad Counties moving forward. Dr. Kenneston noted that Silver Crucible exercise will be occurring in November and requested continued promotion of this exercise. Ms. Anderson stated that her staff, specifically under the Compliance area, wanted to thank everyone for participating during the compliance visits and working through the process. There have been 20 compliance visits in the last six to eight months. This is a big task. Ms. Anderson also mentioned the Homeland Security Grant has released. It does not appear there is a hold on the funds and so these funds should be received within the next 45 days.

12. Adjourn

Chief Luna called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was presented by Christina Conti, Washoe County Health District, and a second was provided by Jeremy Hynds. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.