



Meeting Minutes Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE		July 28, 2020		
	TIME		2:30 PM		
	METHOD		Teleconference		
	RECORDER		Karen Hall		
Appointed Voting Member Attendance					
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Justin Luna – Chair	X	Kelly Echeverria	X	Carolyn Levering	X
Billy Samuels – Vice Chair	X	Dave Fogerson	Abs	Ryan Miller	Abs
Andy Ancho	Abs	Jeanne Freeman	X	Todd Moss	X
Roy Anderson	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Tenielle Pereira	X
Travis Anderson	X	Jill Hemenway	Abs	Shaun Rahmeyer	Abs
Elizabeth Breeden	X	Eric Holt	X	Misty Robinson	X
James Chrisley	X	David Hunkup	X	Rachel Skidmore	Abs
Casandra Darrough	Abs	Jeremy Hynds	X	Corey Solferino	Abs
Darcy Davis	X	Graham Kent	Abs	Malinda Southard	X
Craig dePolo	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Chris Tomaino	Abs
Bob Dehnhardt	X	Chris Lake	Abs	Mike Wilson	X
Appointed Non-Voting Member Attendance					
Bunny Bishop	X	Melissa Friend	X	Catherine Nielson	X
Rebecca Bodnar	X	Kacey KC	Abs		
Felix Castagnola	Abs	Aaron Kenneston	X		
Staff/Legal Support Personnel Attendance					
Representative		Entity			Present
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney General		Nevada Attorney General's Office			X
Karen Hall		Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North			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 Karen Hall, DEM/HS. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened discussion for the first period of public comment. Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps, spoke to the National Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Association, in partnership with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Ms. Laffoon reported that Nevada is well represented with CERT personnel throughout the state. All CERT groups are working hard to create statewide CERT capacity, and Ms. Laffoon thanked all the programs for their support.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Luna called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes of the June 29, 2020, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) meeting. A motion to approve with no changes was presented by Todd Moss, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, and a second was provided by Bob Dehnhardt, Nevada Department of Administration. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Mitigation Grant Program Update

Janell Woodward, DEM/HS, provided an overview of the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) mitigation grant program in addition to providing an informational report on the current status of expenditures and implementation for programs and projects funded through the Mitigation Grant Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2010, 2014, 2016, 2017, and 2018 in order to ensure oversight and accountability. Chief Luna indicated that Ms. Woodward would be referring to handouts labeled 4a, 4b, and 4c. Highlights from the update included:

- The BRIC program will replace the Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program beginning in the fall of 2020.
- BRIC is a new FEMA pre-disaster hazard mitigation program that replaces the existing Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program and is a result of amendments made to Section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act) by Section 1234 of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 (DRRA).
- The Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program aims to categorically shift the federal focus away from reactive disaster spending and toward research-supported, proactive investment in community resilience.
- Through BRIC, FEMA will continue to invest in a variety of mitigation activities with an added focus on infrastructure projects, and community lifelines.
- What are Community Lifelines? A lifeline enables the continuous operation of critical government and business functions and is essential to human health and safety or economic security. Lifelines are the most fundamental services in the community that, when stabilized, enable all other aspects of society to function. There are seven Community Lifelines including:
 - Safety and Security;
 - Health and Medical;
 - Communications;
 - Hazardous Materials;
 - Food, Water, Sheltering;
 - Energy (Power & Fuel); and
 - Transportation.
- Once the Notice of Funding comes out, there will be more information to give to the NRAC.
- Chief Luna inquired if, in any of the preliminary BRIC information received, information was provided on whether “Concept” projects will continue to be accepted with the new BRIC program. These types of projects receive a small amount of funding to develop a new project. Per Ms. Woodward, the former term for this type of project was referred to as “Advance Assistance”; however, now, that is changing to “Scoping Project” to reflect the nature of the project more accurately. No other questions were presented regarding the BRIC program.
- A PDM 2019 application update was provided, and the following projects were chosen for further review:
 - Carson City Hazardous Mitigation Program (HMP) update;
 - Clark County HMP Update;
 - Churchill County HMP Update;
 - Douglas County Kahle Community Center Generator; and
 - Reno City Hall Seismic Retrofit Project.
- The project not chosen to move forward in the 2019 PDM application process was:
 - Henderson Generator Project
- These projects are being reviewed for completeness prior to sending to Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation (EHP). The HMP updates are planning grants and will be funded once they are complete.

- Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) – Post Fire Applications submitted and in review currently by FEMA Region IX prior to sending to EHP include:
 - Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District – Jasper Fuel Reduction project
 - Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District – Long Valley Fuel Reduction Project
 - Washoe County Lemmon Valley Flood Advance Assistance
 - Washoe County Rhodes Road Bridge Project
- A National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program (NEHRP) 2020 project was submitted for the University of Nevada Reno (UNR), Bureau of Mines and Geology, by Dr. Craig dePolo. This project will summarize and document the May 15, 2020, magnitude 6.5 Monte Cristo Range earthquake, its impacts on the state, and effects of earthquake mitigation in affected counties that may have minimized damage.
- Chief Luna referred to Handouts 4b and 4c as additional information for the NRAC to review.

5. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Financial Update

Chief Luna referred to Handout #5 which provided the NRAC with an informational report on the status of expenditures for programs and projects funded through the Homeland Security Grant Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2017-2018 to ensure oversight and accountability. No questions were presented on this agenda item.

6. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Programmatic Update

Chief Luna referred to Handout #6 which provided the NRAC with an informational report on the current implementation for programs and projects funded through the Homeland Security Grant Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2016-2019 to ensure oversight and accountability. No questions were presented on this agenda item.

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

Chief Luna opened discussion on the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) program, its allocations for statewide programs, historical information for how this allocation model was developed, and the current EMPG allocation model in consideration of establishing an improved allocation model. Highlights of this discussion included:

- The NRAC was referred to Handout #7a – Certified Population Estimates of Nevada's Counties, Cities and Towns 2000 to 2019 Estimates from Nevada State Demographer, Nevada Department of Taxation. This is given to the NRAC as foundational material when reviewing different allocation scenarios provided.
- The NRAC was referred to Handout #7b which included:
 - Page 1 - EMPG Historical Allocations from 2016 through 2019
 - Page 2 - Population Change from 2010 Census to Current Population Estimates identified in Handout #7a,
 - Page 3 - Population numbers sorted highest to lowest for reference
 - Page 4 - Draft County and City Allocation by Population & Base. Page 4 and beyond explores different scenarios discussed during previous meetings on different allocation formulas, whether those formulas include a base amount/percentage for either counties only or counties/cities. On the left side of the scenario pages, there is reference to the current standard allocation breakout. On each of the scenario pages starting on Page 4 are different

scenarios created on changes in base percentage amounts using a tiered-base allocation method as well as a population allocation, and then adding those up showing what the percentages of total allocation are, and what the reductions are to the proposed/draft allocation scenarios. In these scenarios, the local city/county allocations receive 50% of the total award, and the other 50% is allocated between the State and Tribal governments. There are notes provided from previous meetings for reference.

- Based on allocation percentages and formulas presented, any increases or decreases in the future will be shared equally based on the formula.
- In keeping with emergency management responsibilities, if cities do not have eligible programs, the city's allocation goes to the county. If counties do not have eligible programs, their allocation would go to the State.
- Emphasis was placed on the new Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 414.090 requiring each county to have an emergency management program.
- The State Administrative Agent (SAA) may consider reallocations outside of the formula amounts, and Tribal allocations will be managed through the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC).
- It is noted that allocations may change annually if the grant award changes.
- Population updates will reflect release of census data. Five years after a census, population will be derived by the State Demographer for purposes of this program.
- Format changes have been applied to pages 11 and 12 to show 1% base allocation for all cities and counties, and the remainder of award based on population. Adjustment columns indicate that since some of the counties and one of the cities has not been receiving EMPG allocations, standard allocations are zeroed out. Adjustments were made to show if a city's allocation was reallocated to the county, and if a county's allocation was reallocated to the State.
- There are a few jurisdictions that show reductions still even after looking at several different scenarios. Despite how the allocations are calculated, there will be several jurisdictions that will take a reduction.
- Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, wanted a refresher as to how the percentages were determined. Chief Luna indicated it was based primarily off population. It appears this was done to ensure the fewest reductions to as many of the jurisdictions as possible. On Page 4's scenario, overall the cities and counties increase their amount that they are receiving; however the reductions total takes the sum of all the jurisdictions that actually have a negative allocation, and it fluctuates on how percentages are changed. Each scenario can be reviewed to see what is reduced. Ms. Freeman wanted an explanation on how tier-based percentages were determined to help the NRAC understand the different scenarios more effectively. Chief Luna indicated that not all scenarios include the tier-based percentages, but he will send out the explanation to the group.
- Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, inquired about FEMA's deadline of having to have a formula. That is still the case per Chief Luna, and this will be an action item in August 2020 for a formula to be presented as the 2021 award funding allocation formula.
- Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County Emergency Management and Homeland Security, spoke to Pages 11 and 12, and if cities did not have an eligible program, whether that allocation would reallocate to the county, but more importantly, could this be applied to other scenarios provided. Chief Luna indicated this could be done, and the intent is to impact the least number of jurisdictions negatively. Chief Luna indicated his interest in receiving feedback on any other ideas as to how to accomplish this, and he is open for suggestions.
- Carolyn Levering inquired on Page 1, noting it shows historical 2016-2019 allocations. Year to year is mostly the same for most jurisdictions listed; however, for the City of Las Vegas, the allocation changed during this time. On all the pages following, the standard allocation for City of Las Vegas reflects the 2016 allocation and should reflect the current program numbers. Ms.

Levering presented concern on this allocation model based on the 2016 data, as it will impact her program. Chief Luna indicated the amounts on Page 1 include deobligation and reobligation amounts provided to the City of Las Vegas, and that is why the numbers increase. The standard allocations do not include any reobligated funds. Ms. Levering spoke to those considerations as personnel costs, and not one-shot projects. Any allocation that puts City of Las Vegas below the 2016 level will impact personnel. Chief Luna understood, as this funding stream supports personnel throughout the state. Any change may impact that and should be taken into consideration. Chief Luna re-emphasized the need to develop a formula based allocation method per FEMA's guidance. The standard allocation amount origins appear to be a historical breakdown of jurisdictional need at the time, as opposed to being based on any specific metric or measure. The discussion has gone on for years trying to figure out a better formula. In each scenario, there are some jurisdictions that will take a reduction. Chief Luna appreciates Ms. Levering's concerns.

- Kelly Echeverria referred to Pages 11 and 12 again and inquired if those funds that roll up to the state could be placed in supplemental funding that can then be applied for by jurisdictions as necessary. Chief Luna indicated that the state/tribal portion is taking a significant reduction as cities/counties are being allocated 50% of the award amount. In all scenarios, the State is taking the largest reduction amount. For the Tribal jurisdictions, a nominal increase is presented. Noting the county amounts that do not have programs participating, the State takes on some of that responsibility, and in a scenario like this, if allocations come up to the State, and if those counties do build up an eligible program and want to begin participating in EMPG allocations, the State would work with that county and allocate from the state portion back to the county. There will still be a deobligation and potential reobligation process done on an exception basis depending on funding availability.
- Jeremy Hynds presented concern on the number of options presented and if certain scenarios should be eliminated from consideration. Chief Luna indicated that review would take place at August's meeting, and the scenarios will be redistributed in a consistent format so it will be clearer about the choices.
- Carolyn Levering spoke to Page 1's "not participating" and "past allocations" and asked if the NRAC is to assume that none of these entities will participate in this year's process. Chief Luna spoke to the non-participating as amounts allocated previously, but the standard allocation amount refers to the current participation list.
- Kelli Anderson indicated that each subrecipient must fulfill certain criteria to become eligible. One consideration is to understand that as a local jurisdiction comes to the table as eligible, and they are approved to participate after demonstrating competency, it will affect everyone's allocation. Noting outreach efforts regarding this issue, Ms. Anderson indicated that Lyon County has indicated an interest in participating, and Ms. Anderson can bring more information to the NRAC in future meetings. Lyon County did not apply as of current date.
- Carolyn Levering noted four counties not participating in Page 1; however, in the charts following, the City of Sparks is listed as participating but they have no allocation noted. Ms. Levering asked where their allocation went. Kelli Anderson indicated she was aware of an agreement between the City of Sparks and Washoe County that the City of Sparks would be participating regionally, but their allocation would roll to Washoe County. Carolyn Levering asked about Reno being a stand-alone city as well, with Ms. Anderson explaining some of the challenges and complexities of that program. The City of Reno deobligated their entire allocation and it was reobligated several years ago, but the City of Reno has been eligible and received a consistent standard allocation in recent years.
- Billy Samuels, Clark County Fire Department, referred to Clark County's (Mesquite) 2019's allocation being zero; however other charts show nothing is allocated for 2019, but other charts show receipt of funds if they have an increase in total population in Mesquite. Kelli

Anderson spoke to challenges with Mesquite's program being compliant. If the NRAC votes on an allocation next month, it will be based on current allocation dates. It is hard to determine allocation dates and compliance because DEM/HS must see the applications before that determination is made. Chief Luna spoke to standard allocations not being based off population but rather a historical amount that is not determinable. With the new formula-based scenarios, the population is included in almost all the scenarios. Even though Mesquite's population grew the largest percentage, the overall population numbers have not increased dramatically relative to the state's total population.

- Carolyn Levering requested a scenario that shows 0.75 percent base allocation to counties only, and not cities. Chief Luna indicated he can do another scenario for 0.75 percent for counties only with the remainder divided up by population.
- Chief Luna thanked the membership for their input, and hopefully this information helps the members prepare for the August meeting where the NRAC will be asked to recommend a specific allocation scenario.

8. Public Comment

Chief Luna opened the second period of public comment for discussion. No public comment was presented.

9. Adjourn

Chief Luna called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was presented by Mike Wilson, Clark County School District, and a second was presented by Jeanne Freeman. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.