



MINUTES

Emergency Management Coordinating Council

ATTENDANCE

DATE	April 25, 2012
TIME	9:00 am
LOCATION	Las Vegas Valley Emergency Management Center, 7551 Sauer Drive, LV 89128 DEM 2478 Fairview Drive, Carson City NV 89701
METHOD	Videoconference
RECORDER	Hanne Epstein

Committee Members	Present	Committee Members	Present
Bohl, Terry	X	Turner, Ryan	X
Curtis, Joe	X		
Stacey, Giomi	X		
Jake, Alfrieda	X		
Kenneston, Aaron	X		
Lake, Dan			
Levering, Carolyn	X		
Loveberg, Rob			
Munns, Sandy	X		
Navis, Irene			
Peacock, Russell	X		
Smith, Chris	X		

CALL TO ORDER – Chairwoman Levering called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

ROLL CALL – Hanne Epstein DEM called the roll and a quorum was declared.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairwoman Levering asked if there were any members of the public who wished to make a comment at this time. Hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairwoman Levering called for comments and discussions to the minutes of the EMCC meeting of May 11 of 2011. No comments were put forward. Russell Peacock moved to approve the minutes, Ryan Turner seconded the motion. **Chairwoman Levering** called for a vote; the minutes of the EMCC meeting of May 11, 2011 were unanimously approved.

NEVADA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORDINATING COUNCIL (EMCC) BYLAWS

Samantha Ladich, presented a draft proposal for changes to the EMCC bylaws to be reviewed by the members and voted upon during the next EMCC meeting. With the suggested changes the bylaws have been streamlined, modified and simplified. Some of the highlights in the draft by laws include:

- Membership is still 13 members, limitation of a one year term with possible re appointment.
- The Chair of the EMCC is the DEM Chief. The Chair is a non-voting member.
- The Vice Chair is elected by the membership of the Council and will serve a one year term. The Vice Chair will be a voting member.
- The EMCC will meet no less than quarterly.
- Sub-committee must be chaired by council members
- Simple majority constitutes a quorum, Proxies and alternates are not recognized
- Admin support is provided by DEM

Additional suggested changes to the proposed draft bylaws can be forwarded to Samantha Laditch from the AG's Office up till 14 days prior to next meeting.

Chairwoman Levering thanked Samantha Ladich for streamlining the EMCC by laws and added that she appreciated the recommended changes. Chairwoman Levering opened up for discussion about the proposed changes.

The council discussed and agreed to suggest that Samantha Laditch include language in the bylaws to state that the EMCC will be meeting on the fourth Wednesday of the month on a quarterly basis.

Concerning membership, the EMCC members discussed the importance of the appointed members being emergency management professionals and not include other disciplines in the Council that aren't focused on emergency management. The present proposed draft by laws does say that the members are emergency managers but it does not say what an emergency manager is.

Chief Smith suggested that the definition of an emergency manager in the state of Nevada may be something that the EMCC as a body can come to terms with. Chief Smith added that the present 13 voting members did not exclude possibly adding emergency managers from the private sector as non voting members to add to the diversity of the EMCC.

Stacey Giomi stated that he did not know for certain that it was the role of the EMCC to define what an emergency manager is; he suggested that it was rather up to the local governments to decide since the emergency managers are representing the local governments. The EMCC is a coordination council not a competency council. The council should not judge emergency management competency in the state.

Bud Marshall noted that DEM is in the process of pursuing EMAP accreditation. The EMAP definition of an emergency management program includes involvement from all organizations, agencies, departments, and individuals having responsibilities for emergency management activities. This means that you could include members to the EMCC from school districts, as well as other private organizations if they have an established emergency management program.

Joe Curtis cautioned that if EMCC tries to carefully define and detail what an emergency manager in Nevada is, including details on degrees and training, you may end up with a number of appointed emergency managers in the local jurisdictions that will not be able to fit into the definition.

Chief Smith noted that in his opinion it is important to work towards an agreed upon definition that would be applicable throughout the state. The EMCC as a coordinating body must work towards setting some standards including a baseline training that would be appropriate for emergency managers.

Stacey Giomi noted that the EMCC as a body could produce and publish a document to the political jurisdictions throughout the state with DEM minimum recommendations for what an emergency manager in Nevada would be expected to know in order to interface with the statewide emergency management program.

Terry Bohl commented that it was very important that it was just a recommendation

Chairwoman Levering concluded the agenda item with a request to Samantha Ladich to include the changes suggested by the EMCC to the draft bylaws and reissue them for review to meet the 14 days advance requirements prior to the next meeting on July 25 after which the EMCC can take action and vote on the draft bylaws at that meeting.

COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chairwoman Levering handed over the floor to DEM Chief Chris Smith for comments on his vision for the work of the EMCC.

Chris Smith started out by emphasizing the importance of the EMCC being a state of Nevada group that comes together to inspire and challenge one another to improve. Chris Smith stressed the importance of capitalizing on the skill sets present in the EMCC to help ensure the state of Nevada is going down the right road in developing standards for emergency management. He encouraged the EMCC to start to develop a certification program for emergency managers in Nevada. The program should include baseline recommendation of requirements as well as a set of standard skills expected of an emergency manager in Nevada. EOC standardization is another example of an area where the EMCC can come together and do what is right for the State. Chief Smith noted that if all EOCs statewide are standardized, emergency managers can rotate between EOCs throughout the state and still be able to perform their jobs.

The EMCC shall assist in developing emergency management programs that represent best practices around the country and develop the best people to take on the leadership in emergency management, thus work so ensure we are on the road to professionalize emergency management in the state of Nevada.

Chris Smith also stressed that he felt the emergency management community should pull together and articulate better to the public as well as to the elected officials the services that the emergency management community is providing.

Pete Reinschmidt noted that there is a problem getting the EMCC's suggestions and actions communicated to the rest of the State's emergency managers.

The EMCC members discussed the following ways to improve communication:

- Minutes from the meetings would be circulated to the rest of the emergency managers of the State
- Pod cast the EMCC meetings
- A quarterly 1-2 page Newsletter about the EMCC, with pictures and highlights
- Distribute minutes though LEPC and possibly representing the EMCC at the LEPC meetings

Chairwoman Levering commented that she would like to see an agenda item at the next EMCC meeting to further discuss how to ensure that EMCC meeting information gets distributed statewide to emergency managers not able to attend the meetings.

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER (EOC) CONTINUITY WORKING GROUP – Ryan Turner

Ryan Turner reported that there are approximately 45 EOCs/MACs that exist in the State of Nevada. An EOC Continuity Working Group has been formed in Southern Nevada. The group meets biweekly and is divided into the following subgroups: EOC plans, EOC boards, EOC WebEOC, EOC forms.

The working group has discussed the following items:

- Functionality
- EOC Policies and Procedures
- General Operations
- Operational Continuity

Questions raised and discussed:

- Is there a standard EOC model to follow?
- What level of training is required for EOC staff?
- What prompts (triggers) an EOC activation?
- How should EOC Operations be organized?
- How are communications facilitated within the EOC?
- What information is gathered at your EOC?
- What are the most likely (credible) sources for this information?

Questions referring to Management

- What if you were requested to manage another jurisdiction's EOC?
- Have you considered establishing protocols that would allow you to turn management of your EOC over to another qualified EOC Director?
- Would it be reasonable to create a state-wide model for EOCs?

The EOC plan subgroup reviewed various plans from throughout the state; and decided to utilize the City of Henderson EOC plan and activation lists as a template for the standardized approach. The plan is CPG 101 compliant.

Suggested common boards were discussed at the last meeting. Organization Chart, Weather, Structural Damage Assessment, Shelter Status, Road/Bridge Closure, EOC Objectives, Infrastructure/Utilities Status, Hospital/Medical Facilities Status, Casualty Statistics, Casualty Collection Points. WebEOC boards have to be aligned with those boards.

EOC forms to be used consistently:

- ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)
- IRF (Incident Reporting Form)
- ISP (Incident Support Plan)
- EOC 214 (Activity Log)
- ARF (Action Request Form)

Next steps for the working group will be to start up a contractor to package the information for dissemination to specific groups in Southern Nevada, and discuss training to present the EOC standardized material to EOC staff and allied agencies, possibly through an adapted ICS/EOC interface class. **Chairwoman Levering** added that the project should be done by the end of summer and it can be shared statewide for anyone who is interested to take a look at the product. It is the hope of the group that the outcome will be standardized and useful enough to other jurisdictions in Nevada both urban and rural alike.

Aaron Kenneston commented that he would like to see the final product and compare it against his regional EOC. He also stressed that he is against any imposed EOC standards. **Stacey Giomi** asked if it was possible for the EMCC members to see the suggested boards and other relevant information at this point **Terry Bohl** expressed his opinion that there needs to be consistency across the state, not just a localized standardization.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANT (EMPG) –Valerie Sumner

Valerie Sumner presented a spreadsheet with the projected FY 12 EMPG grant allocations. She noted that the allocations for FY2012 were based on discussion the EMCC had in the summer of 2011 about a grant formula. **Terry Bohl** commented that as far as he remembered the group never came up with a funding formula but rather walked out of the room by the end of the day upset with each other and nothing happening.

Rick Martin noted that May 6 is the deadline for DEM to push the button in order to get the award for the EMPG, so a formula has to be in place. There was no conclusion made at the meeting held last summer, but the then DEM Chief Wright also had said that if there was no formula coming out of the meeting then DEM would have to come up with a formula and this is such a formula based on the concerns raised by the EMCC during that meeting. **Terry Bohl** noted that he was opposed to using a strictly population based funding formula. The tribes, he said, apparently went from flat funding for two years to a decrease in funding this year although there is an increase in the EMPG. He asked that someone explain to him how it got to that point.

Valerie Sumner explained that funds from the discretionary fund would cover any decreases the jurisdictions may encounter this year, leaving everyone basically with the same amount of level funding from previous year. She then noted that the tribes may go to a single source of funding for a flat rate for the future. Next year there will be changes for everyone as the THIRA will be in-cooperated into the EMPG funding formula, after which risk as well as population base will be considered.

Russell Peacock pointed out that the population numbers used in the EMPG formula are incorrect. White Pine County has about twice the population number reported in the spreadsheet. He asked that the numbers be checked. **Valerie Sumner** noted that the population numbers are from the 2010 consensus.

Aaron Kenneston noted that he still believed there was a need for someone independent to take a look at the EMPG and the funding formula. "The EMCC will never walk away happy."

Chris Smith commented that the EMPG is meant to assure that we are addressing capabilities within our jurisdictions and make sure we raise and enhance those capabilities to a level that is a functional emergency management performance. Next year the State THIRA will be taken into considerations which means we really have to address and focus on our capabilities to respond to the identified threats.

Valerie Sumner reminded the EMCC members that with the EMPG grant applications each jurisdiction also has to fill out a form saying which of the EMAP standards the jurisdiction will work towards utilizing the grant allocated.

Terry Bohl noted that the tribes will come up really short in the capabilities when you do the THIRA. He wanted to know if that finding would then lead to increased funding for the tribes to enhance those shortfalls of capabilities identified. **Valerie Sumner** replied that next year funding will be based on population and risk, so if you have a greater risk than somebody else the percentage is going to change. **Terry Bohl** responded that building capabilities does not come from a population base; it comes from funding opportunities with which to build capabilities. If you have no money, it is not happening. If you are looking at enhancing capabilities you have to look at who doesn't have them and build them up while keeping others at status quo, which would mean reduction in funding to those that already have the capabilities. **Chris Smith** commented that not everyone needs to have every single capability and duplicate effort across the state. We are all part of the same emergency management support group and can help each other out. There is no need for individual entities to build capabilities in a vacuum because in reality we will all have to share. This is not about who have the most equipment but how we are going to share the equipment we have.

Alfrieda Jake commented that the 27 tribes have been working hard to improve capabilities and sign MOUs to share resources between them but to maintain the reached capabilities there is a continued need to get higher funding to the tribes to sustain what they have achieved. **Alfrieda Jake** noted that it is true that some counties are close to the tribes and will help out but she suggested that it would be better to help tribes to help themselves and take the burden away from the counties.

Don Pelt from Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe asked to get clarification whether the talk about risk includes influx of tourists into the jurisdiction? Pyramid Lake has a small population on a large landmass but when you consider the tourist population Pyramid Lake has as large a population as some of the counties.

Chairwoman Levering responded that everyone is being dictated new rules through THIRA which will impact what future funding will look like. She said her hope was that even if we do see a significant swing in what our individual jurisdictions look like as far as threat and risk assessment is concerned, when we integrate the results of the THIRA into the funding formula we can temper that somewhat so that if it equates to a significant increase or decrease for any given jurisdiction we have an ability to temper it and not provide excessive resources to a jurisdiction that may not be able to handle it nor take away excessive resources from a community that will not be able to recover from that loss as well. This is a similar approach as DHS took in the funding allocation for 2012. The urban area lost 67 % of funding from 2011 -2012, a devastating blow which would have been worse had they not tempered it. We have an opportunity to look into the future and take that approach as well as we get the results of the THIRA and make the attempt to integrate that into this current population based formula.

Rick Martin explained that in the future it may be necessary to incorporate into the EMPG funds support for the six counties throughout the State that allow the transuranic waste to come through their counties as the current EPWG funding these counties presently receive to enhance their emergency response capabilities may go away. He also wanted to make clear that the State has lost a lot of funding this year including the pre disaster mitigation grant that allowed DEM to do the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The State has to update the plan every three years but has lost the funding source to do that. The State is also in danger of losing the Nevada Hazard Mitigation Committee which has been funded out of the grants. He noted that also training has become more expensive. Books that were previously granted from FEMA now have to be purchased by the State. All in all there are a lot of costs to absorb. So if you ask, "How come that some EMPG funding to the jurisdictions have been cut when the EMPG funding allocation to the State has gone up?" The answer is that the little extra money that has come in through the EMPG has to be extended further than usual in order to make ends meet. **Chairwoman Levering** concurred that it is important for all to realize, that while we nationwide have seen a modest increase in the EMPG funding; DHS has eliminated a number of entire funding streams, which puts a lot more pressure on the EMPG.

THE STATE OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS –Jeffrey Yeagley

Started out defining interoperable communications as:

- The ability for first responders to communicate by voice directly with each other at an incident.

There have been lots of Interoperable communications projects over the years, lots of money spent, plenty of high tech equipment made available but not being fully utilized or understood by the end users. The key people and central point of contacts for all things ICOMM in Nevada are the SWIC and CPM.

United States Homeland Security Office of Emergency Communications has established certain goals and objectives nationally for interoperability. Our guide in Nevada is The Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) which trickles down to the Nevada Interoperable Field Operations Guide (NEViFOG), and the three regional Tactical Interoperable Communications Plans (TICP). Currently the three regional TICPs and the NEViFOG are under rewrite.

There are many interoperable communications activities in the state, the following are the major projects:

- Nevada Core (NCORE)
- Nevada Dispatch Interconnect Project (NDIP)
- Cross Band Rep (X-Band Repeaters)

Nevada Core (NCORE)

NCORE connects the entire State with 16 "virtual" interoperability channels, converting radio signals to IP packets and transporting them all across the state. Training for users is on-going; thousands of radios are being programmed. Frequency charts from each participating agency is under review. The participants in the NCORE project at this time are:

Washoe County Regional Communications System, Nevada Shared Radio System, Desert Sky Radio System, Southern Nevada Area Communications Council (comprised of 36 different agencies), Department of Energy/Department of Defense, & Tribal/ Rurals

What Remains to Complete NCORE?

- Programming several thousand radios & Public Safety Answering Points (dispatch centers) and operator consoles.
- Additional Hardware is installed
- Training, on how to select a talk-group from a dispatch console, how to find it on your radio, and governance on when and how to use the 16 interoperable channels.

Nevada Dispatch Interconnect Project (NDIP)

The goal of this project is to connect all of Nevada's Public Service Answering Points (dispatch centers) using the existing and soon to be rolled out interoperable communications architecture.

What Remains to Complete These Connections?

- Nevada Dispatch Interconnect Project Phase III (NDIP) is currently in front of the Nevada Commission of Homeland Security Finance Committee for funding for the next fiscal cycle.
- Nevada Core (NCORE), get all users on the virtual talk groups
- Cross Band Repeaters (X-Band Repeaters)

Cross Band Repeaters (X-Band)

The goal of the cross band repeaters is to connect the entire State by fielding an additional 19 Radio Sites. This need was identified by the Nevada Communications Steering Committee (NCSC) in April 2008. An engineering study was performed and certain sites were recommended, selected and equipped.

The cross band repeaters will:

Convert VHF (150 MHz) to 800 MHz & vice versa. Of the 19 sites 6 sites are up and running in Southern Nevada.

The sites being fielded in the north will follow the same concept of cross banding the difference being coverage. The northern sites will cover from the middle of US-95 North and the I-80 corridor from east to west.

What Remains to Complete X-Band?

- Finish "Punch List" items, including running power and equip microwave backhaul for some of the sites
- Turn them on
- Test

Nevada Interoperability Communications Seminar May 9, 10, and 11 at Washoe Regional Training Center will include comprehensive update on ICOMMS from subject matter experts, break-out sessions on governance and technology and a great opportunity to network with communications professionals from across the state, neighboring states and US DHS/EOC.

Joe Curtis asked that now when everything seems to be 700 MHz, has money spent on other radio systems been wasted?

How will it all work in smaller mountainous rural areas, will there have to be a lot more repeaters? **Jeff Yeagley** responded that the goal of the interoperability program is to tie them all together. There are both 700 MHz and 800MHz radios, and cross band repeaters which will convert 800MHz to VHF. Jeff Yeagley also noted that the "magic" of IP is coming soon. The virtual channels, the NCORE, takes any kind of radio signal irrespective of which frequency band it is on, converts it to IP, digitize it and transport it through packets across a fiber back bone, and those get reconverted into audio. That audio retransmits out each agency's radio system. It is interpreted by each piece of end equipment, so it does not matter which frequency you are on. Instead of hanging more radios, we are converting everything to IP Packets, virtual talk groups, which will not seem any different to the user; they will not look any different to the user on the radio display. There are 16 of these channels available locally, regionally and statewide. All the different radios will work as one.

Terry Bohl: commented that the project the tribes are suggesting for funding will build out the sites in the rurals including building up into the mountainous areas. The project should cover all the rural areas.

Mark Blomstrom asked how the things just described relate to the 700 MHz broadband LTE. **Jeffrey Yeagley** responded that all the things being done now, the entire architecture, the NDIP the NCORE the cross band repeaters; all of these will come together irrespective of what frequency band the user is on. The president signed a bill into law February 22, 2012, which established a 4G LTE broadband proposal for the entire nation. This will create a wireless broadband using the lower part of the 700MHz spectrum referred to as the D-block. There is \$7 billion budget at this time to build this national broadband

system. In the future the land mobile radio (LMR) will be replaced by a thin client such as a smart phone you will still push to talk but you will be able to travel coast to coast and never have to change channel. Each state will build out their piece. What we are doing in Nevada is building out our piece it is the foundation which will roll into the national 4G LTE broadband. **David Fein** noted that it is important to remember that the 4G LTE broadband system will first process data; voice will come at a much later date.

CREDENTIALING

Chris Smith reported that work is ongoing to get the project rolled out; the project should gain some traction within the next 3-4 weeks. He noted that a full update would be available at the next EMCC.

STATE/LOCAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE TEAM (IMAT) –Chris Smith

The concept of what a local incident assistance team may look like and the possibilities of having personnel from the State ready to employ during incidents was introduced at the Directors Conference in 2011. At the next EMCC Kelli Baratti will present work done in the area since the Directors' Conference.

NEVADA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE COMPACT (NEMAC)

Chris Smith reported that Kelli Baratti has been working with the NEMAC and will present the progress at the next EMCC meeting.

Terry Bohl noted that there is some confusion about NEMAC and whether the tribes can sign on to it without giving up sovereignty. He asked if Samantha Laditch from the Attorney General's Office had any news on the matter. Samantha Laditch responded that this question needed to be looked into in time for the next draft of the NEMAC.

NEVADA DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FIELD LIAISON

Chief Smith noted that DEM has the capability to send out field liaisons to affected jurisdictions to make sure the jurisdictions have ready access to state resources during an incident. He had no names attached to the field liaisons at this time.

HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM FY2012

The State and the UASI combined has taken roughly a 75% cut in state and homeland security funding over the last two years. Rules are changing in Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and this is a transition year. DHS wants us to draw down the funds that we currently have, and use the funds in a responsible manner. The commission assigned priorities that were taken to the working group. The working group spent two sessions going through investment justifications. We were able to fund wholly 10 investment justifications of the 22 submitted. All of the UASI investment justifications were funded for the coming year. The Nevada Homeland Security Commission will at their meeting May 26 make decisions on whether or not to go ahead with the investment justifications proposed by the Homeland Security Working Group and the Homeland Security Finance Committee. Many of the Citizens Core Groups programs were not funded outright this year. This is a concern for the Chief of DEM as well as for the Governor, and there may be directions coming from the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security to take a look at de-obligated funds to support specific Citizen Core Programs.

Alfrieda Jake asked if the tribes will be able to get some help through the investment justifications that were approved.

Chris Smith responded that the tribes are in- cooperated in several investment justifications such as training and exercise.

Aaron Kenneston also confirmed that the tribes were welcome partners in the Washoe County task force. There will be both training and equipment opportunities.

Joe Curtis asked if there had been any decisions on potential merging of the Nevada fusion centers. **Chris Smith** responded that there will be a fusion center summit with the fusion center chiefs and the sheriffs mid May. The intent of the summit is to merge into two fusion centers in the State

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACCREDITATION PROGRAM (EMAP) – Bud Marshall

The Emergency Management Standard by EMAP is based on a set of 64 standards by which emergency management programs that apply for EMAP accreditation are evaluated. The standards were developed by state and local emergency

management stakeholders and set out what components must be in place to assure a solid quality emergency management program. Nationwide 41 local/state jurisdictions and one federal agency are accredited. Nevada DEM is seeking accreditation in December 2012.

The EMAP approach is to look at a jurisdiction-wide emergency management system. The system encompasses all organizations, agencies, departments and individuals having responsibilities for the emergency management activities. The EMAP process includes identification of all hazards in the jurisdiction. The process of hazards identification is of utmost importance and ties back to 14-16 of the total number of EMAP standards.

There are 6 steps to accreditation:

- Subscription: access to 64 EMAP standards, tool and training
- Self Assessment: compiling documents, corrective action and strategic planning
- Application: seek accreditation and schedule for assessment
- On-Site Assessment: week long peer review of compiled documents
- Committee Review: reviews and recommends to EMAP Commission
- Accreditation Decision: grants denies or conditionally accredits jurisdiction

DEM is currently at the second step, the self assessment, where we evaluate how close we are to meeting our 64 standards, take a close look at and review programs, recognizing where we are at within the programs in terms of meeting standards. During this period of time there have also been visits from DEM to local jurisdictions, where the local emergency managers have been asked to express what DEM is doing right and wrong which helps to identify gaps and shortfalls in the DEM emergency management program. December 3-7 will be the on site assessment for accreditation. DEM is asking the EMCC members to assist in the DEM in the EMAP process by aiding to identify and bridge gaps and shortfalls throughout the state wide emergency management program, actively seek and become engaged in the EM program process as local stakeholders and possibly volunteer for EM Program interview during the final assessment (December 3-7).

TREAT AND HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT (THIRA) – Paul Burke

THIRA is our process to assess this State's ongoing and continued threats and hazards in addition to looking at our risks. It is a requirement under the Homeland Security Grant Program to conduct a THIRA this year. This is the first time that this kind of comprehensive evaluation has been done in this State to the extent that the guidance is calling for. The other issue is that as we move into a competitive process for grants in the coming years, the THIRA is going to be a foundational document they are going to look at to gauge whether we may get, or not get, funds to support our programs here. The THIRA is thus important to everyone, small and large jurisdictions alike. CPG 201 is the guidance set that tells what we need in the THIRA. We have been waiting for FEMA to develop a tool and a process by which we can conduct a THIRA that is consistent throughout the country. That tool is to be discussed regionally and nationally with FEMA. In Nevada we will have a contractor to work on the THIRA statewide.

Joe Curtis asked if the individual county will be responsible for this or will it be done in cooperation with the contractor?

Paul Burke replied that the contractor will work on the state THIRA which means working with each jurisdiction on their individual part of it. The local jurisdiction does not have to do work by themselves on the THIRA. **Paul Burke** also stressed that the contractor, besides visiting the jurisdictions, will seek out subject matter experts with the most updated and relevant data on specific hazards and risks throughout the State such as state seismologist and geologist to cover the earthquake hazards.

Pete Reinschmidt noted that it is important to remember that much of the work that needs to go into developing the THIRA has already been done, partly in the State Hazard Mitigation Plan. A lot of the information from the State Hazard Mitigation Plan can be derived and put into the THIRA. **Aaron Kenneston** agreed that it was important to take a look at the hazard mitigation plans that each jurisdiction has already made and not lose all that information.

Paul Burke noted that the EMAP accreditation calls for the THIRA to include a consequence analysis. He asked that everyone please contribute to the consequence analysis in support of the states accreditation process.

Joe Curtis asked if any part of the THIRA would be classified material. **Paul Burke** replied that the THIRA will eventually be used as background for the competitive grant process which is on public record, but the details about classified or unclassified materials are not out yet. **Chris Smith** added that there could be threat elements of the THIRA that might not be public record but available to trusted agents.

Alfrieda Jake required that the tribes be included in the visits from the contractor in creating the THIRA and suggested that they may visit together with Shelley Horton. Paul Burke confirmed that the State wished to include the tribes in the THIRA process. **Terry Bohl** confirmed that he had information that the tribes were included in the State's THIRA project.

DIRECTORS CONFERENCE / TRAINING AND EXERCISE PLANNING WORKSHOP (TEPW)

The Directors Conference Training and Exercise Planning Workshop is tentatively scheduled for September 18-20, 2012. Venue will be in Henderson. DEM will fund travel. Paul Burke encouraged the local emergency managers to do their local TEPW prior to the conference. The conference will focus on gathering information about the activities and needs of the local jurisdiction in the areas of exercise, training and planning. Any suggestions for agenda items for the conference can be forwarded to Michele Candee: mcandee@dps.state.nv.us . More information about the conference will be coming out in the near future.

RECURRING AGENDA ITEMS AT EMCC MEETINGS

Chairwoman Levering asked the EMCC members if they had further recurring agenda items for the next EMCC meeting. **Chris Smith** wished to add the "Director's Conference" as an agenda item in addition to already discussed items.

EMCC MEETING DATES

The EMCC members agreed to meet quarterly, 4th Wednesday of the first month of the quarter.

Next meeting is scheduled for July 25 at 9:00 am.

EMCC meeting schedule for the remainders of 2012 will be discussed at the next meeting

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairwoman Levering called for any public comments, hearing none she moved on to the next agenda item.

ADJOURN:

Chairwoman Levering called for a motion to adjourn the meeting, **Ryan Turner** motioned to adjourn the meeting **Terry Bohl** seconded. **Chairwoman Levering** called for a vote. All voted in favor, none opposed, **Chairwoman Levering** adjourned the meeting.

Meeting notes completed by Hanne Epstein, for questions call (702) 486-4430 or email hepstein@dps.state.nv.us