



Meeting Minutes Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

Attendance	DATE	February 22, 2022			
	TIME	1:00 p.m.			
	METHOD	Zoom/M Resort – Marche Room			
	RECORDER	Sherrean Whipple			
Appointed Voting Member Attendance					
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
David Fogerson – Chair	X	Kelly Echeverria	X	Tennille Periera	X
Billy Samuels – Vice Chair	X	Andrea Esp	X	Matthew Petersen	X
Andy Ancho	X	Jeanne Freeman	X	Shaun Rahmeyer	X
Roy Anderson	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Misty Robinson	X
Travis Anderson	ABS	Eric Holt	X	Rachel Skidmore	X
Noah Boyer	ABS	Jeremy Hynds	X	Corey Solferino	X
Elizabeth Breeden	X	Graham Kent	ABS	Malinda Southard	ABS
James Chrisley	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Cary Underwood	X
Jason Danen	ABS	Chris Lake	ABS	Mike Wilson	X
Cassandra Darrough	ABS	Carolyn Levering	X	Stephanie Woodard	X
Bob Dehnhardt	X	Ryan Miller	X		
Appointed Non-Voting Member Attendance					
Bunny Bishop	X	Sheryl Gonzales	X	Kasey KC	ABS
Rebecca Bodnar	X	Mojra Hauenstein	ABS	Selby Marks	X
Melissa Friend	X	Patricia Herzog	ABS	Catherine Neilson	X
Legal/Administrative Support Attendance					
Representative		Entity			Present
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy Attorney General		Office of the Nevada Attorney General			X
Sherrean Whipple – Administrative Assistant		Nevada Division of Emergency Management			X

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair David Fogerson, State Administrative Agent (SAA), Nevada Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security (DEM/HS) called the meeting to order. Roll call was performed by Sherrean Whipple. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chair Fogerson opened the first period of public comment for discussion.

Vice-Chair Billy Samuels, indicated his happiness at seeing everyone in person for the first time since the onset of the pandemic and suggested that the Committee meet in the north or south based on the weather patterns.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chair Fogerson called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes of the October 26, 2021, Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) meeting. Mike Heidemann, Emergency Manager Churchill County, motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mary Ann Laffoon, CERT Program Coordinator, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps, seconded the motion to approve. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Updates from the Nevada Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security (DEM/HS)

a) Staffing changes at DEM/HS

Chair David Fogerson introduced Jared Franco, new finance officer, who will be in charge of finance and grants and Jon Bakkedahl, Deputy Administrator, will be in charge of operations. Chair Fogerson indicated that DEM/HS is working to fill Mr. Bakkedahl's prior position. Chair Fogerson explained that former recovery supervisor, Suz Coyote, will now be the grant manager supervising the Recurring Grant Section with Samantha Hill-Cruz, whose position in Recovery will need to be replaced.

b) Organizational changes at DEM/HS

Chair David Fogerson indicated that the DEM/HS is being reorganized to include a Financing/Grant side and an Operations side, which will include preparedness with planning and training exercises. Chair Fogerson explained that Interoperability has been renamed to Mission Support to mirror FEMA's naming convention, and will be headed by Melissa Friend, who will be responsible for IT, communications, and interoperable communications facilities.

Jared Franco introduced himself to the Committee.

Suz Coyote introduced herself to the Committee and explained that she has been working at DEM/HS in Disaster Recovery for the last seven years and is excited to be moving to the position of Grants Manager.

Chair Fogerson next informed the Committee that there are now two new tribal specialists, Jay Martin and Josie Burnett are DEM/HS's liaisons for Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council (NTECC) as well as Crystal who has moved from DEM/HS to become the DEM/FEMA Tribal Liaison.

Vice-Chair Billy Samuels indicated that should anything be needed from the Clark County side to please reach out to him to help meet those needs.

c) The Mission, Vision, Value, and Goals at DEM/HS

Chair Fogerson explained that the goal is to be better tomorrow than today and to become even more customer-friendly and customer oriented. Chair Fogerson indicated that DEM/HS now has great partners at FEMA Region 9 to help with the mission of making Nevada more resilient.

5. Annual Review of Committee Bylaws

Vice-Chair Billy Samuels asked if the Committee should be meeting monthly or quarterly.

Chair David Fogerson indicated that meetings are quarterly, not monthly.

Jeanne Freeman reminded the Committee to be sure to update the date at the end of the document.

Chair Fogerson called for a motion to approve the bylaws as recommended for change. Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas Emergency Manager, motioned to approve the bylaws. Roy Anderson, Washoe County School District Emergency Manager, seconded the motion to approve. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Reports for Federal Fiscal Years 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21

Chair David Fogerson indicated that as this agenda item has taken significant time in past meetings, he would like to find a way to give the information to the Committee in advance, and then agendize discussion during the next meeting should a member find issue with any of the reports.

Rachel Skidmore concurred with Chair Fogerson's suggestion. Ms. Skidmore questioned when the little over half a million left on FY 2018 goes back to the treasury. Ms. Skidmore further indicated that she believed that this went back to the treasury the previous September and asked if there had been an extension.

Jon Bakkedahl explained that DEM/HS did receive an extension, so the initial two-year operational period was extended to the third year of the performance period. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that this will be the last possible extension, which will equal approximately a nine-month additional extension available to the end user.

Rachel Skidmore asked if the \$500,000 was after the re-obligation of FY '21 or if that \$563,000 was accounted for.

Jon Bakkedahl indicated his belief that the report came out before that went through, and that this was not accounted for in this.

Chair Fogerson explained that he would follow up on this when he returns to the office and will have the report updated in order to use those funds.

7. 2021 Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and State Preparedness Report (SPR)

Jon Bakkedahl explained that the priorities were imposed upon DEM/HS from FEMA in 2019, at which time DEM/HS applied for the EMPG grant for the entire state. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that the application process for that grant entailed approximately nine months of back and forth with minimal guidance. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that DEM was supposed to focus on a comprehensive analysis of the THIRA and its after-action reports and apply that information into the grant application as priorities. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that in the past THIRAs, DEM/HS chose to focus on: the logistics chain supply pre-COVID; energy; resilient communications; distribution management; disaster housing as areas that the state needed to look at, define

gaps in, pick priorities for, and then ultimately close the gaps. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that the most recently completed THIRA showed that cybersecurity, fatality management, and health and social services across the state were areas that needed addressing, in addition to: public information and warning; operational coordination; cyber, physical, protective measures; risk management for protective measures; fatality management; public health and emergencies; and health and social services. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that DEM/HS chose to pick the three that were somewhat related to COVID but that also defined other statewide issues.

Jon Bakkedahl indicated that in terms of cyber, DEM/HS chose to look at the side effects or residual impacts from cyber rather than on cyberattacks themselves. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that this encompasses the emergency management perspective and cited the example of losing power for a significant time period. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that the strategy is the document submitted in order to get the grant, and out of that document, an Integrated Preparedness Plan (IPP) needs to be put together, which includes looking at plans, training schedules, and exercise schedules with the three chosen issues mirroring those priorities, with the majority of the program focusing on the three chosen priorities. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that the preparedness program works with everyone in the agency and is then submitted to the chief for review and feedback. Mr. Bakkedahl further explained that DEM/HS does have plans in place for most of these efforts, but a couple of them were lacking. For example, Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that the state needs a solid fatality management plan, specifically when only two counties have medical examiners, and all other counties rely on Sheriff's coroners. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that the training schedule for this includes everything from FEMA Independent Study courses to FEMA-offered L and G (local or government) courses to consortium programs, which can include both seminars and workshops among other exercises. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that if there is not a plan in place for one of these, a seminar is needed to develop that planning, and that seminar does count as an exercise. Mr. Bakkedahl next offered examples two communication-type exercises that can be done, such as tabletop exercises.

Jon Bakkedahl indicated that this process is important, even for those who do not work for the state, as a priority needs to be identified by anyone applying for EMPG money this coming year, explaining that the EMPG money will allow emergency managers to use the information supplied during the THIRA and after-action reports to decide on a gap in each jurisdiction and to build a planning, training, and exercise schedule to address that identified gap. Mr. Bakkedahl further explained that the previous year DEM/HS supplied the preparedness framework for the state, which spells out the minimum requirements based on the agency/jurisdiction size. Mr. Bakkedahl informed the Committee that DEM/HS is entirely focused on the effort to define the state's gaps, closing the gaps by selecting priorities, and then focusing on those priorities with the planning, training, and exercise schedule. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that DEM/HS will be looking for constant feedback through NRAC meetings as well as Homeland Security Commission Meetings. As such, Mr. Bakkedahl reminded the Committee that part of the application process for agencies and jurisdictions will be to define their priorities. Mr. Bakkedahl assured the Committee that agencies and jurisdictions would have everything needed prior to the application as well as DEM/HS's IPPW that defines the three statewide priorities and indicated that as this is statewide funding, everything needs to be tied back into this process. Jon Bakkedahl informed the Committee that because of the painful process of the past three years, Nevada has now become the national model in this application process.

Chair David Fogerson reiterated the fact that Nevada is now the national model and commended DEM/HS for this. Chair Fogerson further indicated that the state is at the cutting edge of technology and that is one of the reasons why each agency or jurisdiction is being asked to choose one priority.

A committee member asked when there are overlapping grant years, how does DEM/HS anticipate or expect the local jurisdictions to apply resources toward to different and possibly competing priorities.

Jon Bakkedahl explained that DEM/HS has created a matrix consisting of priorities and training and exercise schedules from year to year, indicating that keeping everything in a single document helps to show the growth and development from year to year. Mr. Bakkedahl informed the Committee that the matrix would be distributed to help each agency or jurisdiction with their reporting. Mr. Bakkedahl further explained that at this point, this is a smartsheet-type document and does not know yet the format for how this matrix will be distributed.

Chair Fogerson explained that Public Health Preparedness uses this same logic model in their grant system.

Andrea Esp explained that the model has been a challenge, particularly because the federal government has been behind on grant years. As such, Ms. Esp indicated that she finds herself sending in her overdue quarterly program reports and tweaking them to match what she is being told now money should be spent on versus what money might have actually been spent on. Ms. Esp indicated her belief that this is not a healthy way to move forward and informed the Committee that for this reason she is looking forward to seeing some of the tools come online in order for agencies and jurisdictions to be more aligned with where they are supposed to be on their past-due reporting processes.

Jon Bakkedahl concurred with Ms. Esp.

Chair Fogerson explained that this is also part of the transparent nature toward which DEM/HS is trying to move into collectively working together. Chair Fogerson indicated that the documents for the Committee include a study called staff system questions about HSGP. Chair Fogerson indicated that the study found that when a dollar is given to the state for HSGP, the federal governments use \$1.72 return on it, but when the same dollar is given to local government, only a \$0.97 return is seen. Chair Fogerson indicated his belief that this discrepancy is the result of the way the state is reporting things and explained the need to clean up that reporting to address that discrepancy.

Jeremy Hynds asked how EMPG dollars used for salaries translates to the priority breakdowns. Mr. Hynds gave examples, including: the IT team not funded by EMPG that will handle cybersecurity; the coroner's office not funded by EMPG that will handle fatality management; and public health through the health district that is not funded by EMPG.

Jon Bakkedahl explained that the feedback they received was that all FEMA requires is for DEM/HS to define how they close the gap, and although FEMA is aware that EMPG money goes to salaries, this is not information they wish to bring before the US Congress. As such, Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that agencies and jurisdictions should define the efforts in planning, training, and exercise to close the defined gap. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that therefore, reports should not be done based upon people's salaries. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated his hope that if the state can continue to show that the money is being used in a positive way and reporting out on the reduced gaps, the end result will be continuation and potentially escalation of EMPG money from the federal government.

Jeremy Hynds questioned if there are plans to make improvements to the currently flawed process of THIRA coming down from CBG to DEM/HS to the agencies and jurisdictions.

Jon Bakkedahl indicated that there is a plan in place, and that the THIRA takes place next year as a new cycle for three years, providing DEM/HS the opportunity to write better, more appropriate, and potentially higher-risk scenarios to find gaps and priorities. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that FEMA only required 17 out of the 32, and that DEM/HS is looking to adjust that to allow for two or three core capabilities in the same scenario, allowing jurisdictions to focus on multiple things rather than just being tied down to one.

Jeremy Hynds asked if there will be grant dollars that will fund the THIRA process or if the jurisdictions themselves need to find the money.

Jon Bakkedahl indicated that this process has been funded every year with Homeland Security grant money. Mr. Bakkedahl further explained that the THIRA process can be adapted to be a more affordable, more effective process.

Chair Fogerson indicated the importance of having a global document for this, which would be discussed under agenda item number 9.

Mary Ann Laffoon asked if the plan moving forward for the THIRA process still included bringing together multiple counties to work together.

Chair Fogerson explained that this process is all about communication, collaboration, and partnership, and commended the work done in Elko.

Jon Bakkedahl added that the regional approach is a fantastic one and the ability to hire in a regional emergency manager has been added to statute. Mr. Bakkedahl discussed the importance of collaboration and coordination so that people with different titles are not just rehashing the same information. Mr. Bakkedahl also discussed the importance of communication, citing the challenges regarding communications for some of the tribal nations.

8. State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program

Chair David Fogerson explained that the federal government will be providing money to start a new cybersecurity program and will allow state and local governments to provide more money for cybersecurity. Chair Fogerson explained that this is essentially all the information that DEM/HS has at this time and that the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) will have all the details of this around the same time as the Homeland Security Grant, the Emergency Management Program Grant, and the Nonprofit Security Grant programs come out so that all information will be dispersed at once. Chair Fogerson explained that the crux of this is that the federal government wants most of the money to go to local government for their cybersecurity plans, and that the state can only take a certain percentage of it. Chair Fogerson further indicated that DEM/HS is trying to discourage having specific carve-outs in HSGP and just make this a new cyber grant program in order to open up HSGP for other potential new programs that require funding. Chair Fogerson further explained that this will come with a sliding scale of percentages.

Misty Robinson explained that State Local Tribal Territorial Government Coordinating Council that works with CISA (Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency) out of the Department of Homeland Security has created a workgroup called the External Stakeholder Working Group that has indicated that this particular grant will be for \$1 billion and will extend over five years. Ms. Robinson explained that breakdown as such: 3 percent goes to tribes; 5 percent goes to federal; 5 percent goes to states; and 5 percent goes to rural. Ms. Robinson indicated that applications should include all projects in the state, so multiple projects would go under one application. Ms. Robinson further explained that imminent threats are supposed to be addressed and there is a precondition of having a prepared cybersecurity plan. Ms. Robinson further explained that the legislation requires a cybersecurity committee. Ms. Robinson indicated that multi-state projects are no cost share, so if the state wishes to partner with another state or an entire region, there is no match required, and there is the capability of using in-kind cost share. Ms. Robinson reiterated Chair Fogerson's point that this is still a work in progress and explained that she will be attending a series of stakeholder meetings will be taking place and will likely have more information following those meetings.

Chair Fogerson explained that the original plan was for the cybersecurity information officer for the state to run the grant program, and through discussions with the Governor's office, that plan was nixed. As such, Chair Fogerson explained that DEM/HS is looking to run the grant program through DEM/HS and then using a subcommittee to review the projects with the approval process still running through NRAC, Homeland Security Finance, and Homeland Security Commission.

9. Review and Approval of the Emergency Management and Homeland Security Priorities

Chair Fogerson explained that in the past Caleb Cage had come up with the idea of strategic capacities to be maintained with working with Chief Steinbeck and that DEM/HS then put those strategic capacities to be maintained as a list of projects to be funded in order to maintain resilience in Nevada. Chair Fogerson explained that this includes things like the fusion centers and NIMS trainings but indicated that the problem is that these are programs and not capabilities. Chair Fogerson further explained that throughout the year, he has been having sidebar conversations with a lot of people about how to make things better so as not to simply have a list of programs that need to be funded. Chair Fogerson indicated that this document now takes those programs and capabilities and calls them strategic programs to ensure that they stay at their funding levels. In addition, Chair Fogerson noted that the goals that come from THIRA are listed in this document.

Jeremy Hynds questioned if the emerging issues included were the next list of priorities at which the state was going to start looking, and asked how they would be incorporated into already-existent capabilities.

Chair Fogerson explained that in the previous year, the NRAC Board made those three emerging issues in order to have the strategic capacity to be maintained.

Jeremy Hynds indicated that election security is very broad and wondered at its inclusion on the list of emerging issues, and questioned where the borders are when looking at this list of things given that Emergency Management is the sponge of everything.

Vice-Chair Billy Samuels explained that election security is a requirement for the list as the safety of the state relies upon secure elections and voting.

Chair Fogerson indicated that this has actually been funded for a few years through State Homeland Security grants.

Kelly Echeverria indicated her belief that election security had been removed from the list of emerging issues the previous year.

Chair Fogerson indicated that there had been significant discussion of whether or not election security should be included or not and as such, he added it into the draft document for the Committee to decide if it should remain. Chair Fogerson further indicated that after removing it the previous year, the Secretary of State's Office had contacted him and indicated that it needed to be included as it was a requirement for application of Homeland Security grants.

Jeanne Freeman asked if this was going to be an annual document.

Chair Fogerson opened discussion on how often this document should be recreated and/or updated.

Rachel Skidmore explained that historically, Homeland Security Commission has taken the FPR reports and have ranked each one of the voting members rank and the FEMA Corps capabilities by their top priority so they would always come away with five of the average ranking top priorities that were the FEMA Corps capabilities. Ms. Skidmore explained that this was the guidance from the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security to the working bodies on where funds should be pushed to that there was guidance and oversight over the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. Ms. Skidmore further indicated that the original purpose of this document was to ensure that a few critical areas were prioritized and would receive their funding. Ms. Skidmore echoed Mr. Hynds' point, explaining that the national priorities are published every February in the NOFO depending upon the guidance for funding of the DHS Secretary each year. Ms. Skidmore reiterated Chief Fogerson's point that just because something may not be included in the document does not mean that it is not a viable project to be funded, and that the original purpose of this document was to ensure that a few programs that had been agreed upon as a state could be maintained in the case of no UASI funding and limited SHSP funding.

Jeanne Freeman indicated her belief that this document was more of an informational tool than a report needing to be put out every year, explaining that this was helpful, particularly to people new to NRAC, to know that there are various funding sources available across the state. Ms. Freeman further indicated that the year is different for each granting entity, as some run calendar year, some fiscal year, and some October to September. As such, Ms. Freeman indicated her support for making this an informational document rather than an annual document.

Cary Underwood concurred with Jeanne Freeman and indicated the importance of looking at it from two different perspectives, explaining that annual reassessment of a strategic document is not actually being strategic. Mr. Underwood further indicated that the Committee needs to be open to the possibility that if the Board comes together and agrees that modifications need to be made, then that should be left open as a possibility given the possibility of dynamic changes taking place.

Chair Fogerson concurred.

Jeanne Freeman suggested that this document be more generic rather than specific regarding emergency issues.

Carolyn Levering pointed out some technical issues, indicating that CERT programs have been changed to Citizen Corps programs, and that these are not the same thing. Ms. Levering explained that CERT is a program within the body of Citizen Corps and not the other way around. Ms. Levering pointed out that City of Las Vegas Citizen Corps program should be listed as Southern Nevada CERT.

Mary Ann Laffoon explained that the listings started because initially everything was under Citizen Corps program grants and acknowledged that CERT programs are different.

Chair Fogerson reiterated the point that perhaps the document should be called Strategic Priorities rather than Annual Priorities and should be reviewed annually to ensure that the priorities still fit with what's being done. Chair Fogerson further indicated that if emergency issues are removed and emerging issues remains, the cybersecurity grant portion still remains. Chair Fogerson further indicated that cybersecurity is likely the number 1 issue.

Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas Emergency Manager, motioned that the Committee update the title of the document to state that it is Strategic Priorities for 2022 through 2024, accept the change in terminology from Strategic Capacities to Strategic Programs, that all programs listed under the Citizen Corps programs be referred to as CERT programs, and that the three bullets under Emerging Issues be removed. Kelly Echeverria, Washoe County Emergency Management and Homeland Security Program Coordinator, seconded the motion to approve. Jeanne Freeman, Cason City Health and Human Services Public Health Preparedness Manager, amended the motion to include that under the Hospital Preparedness Program, it say Local Health Authorities. Carolyn Levering and Kelly Echeverria were amenable to this amendment. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

10. Discussion on the Creation of a Cyber Grant Subcommittee

Chair David Fogerson indicated that the cyber subcommittee would be time-limited and would vet and rank projects for consideration by NRAC for HSGP funding. Chair Fogerson indicated that the Committee may vote to create two subcommittees at a time to report back to the body as a whole. The subcommittees should be time limited to six months at a time. As such, Chair Fogerson requested the Committee's permission to assign a subcommittee for cyber, time-limited to six months, to review the applications and come back to NRAC with a recommendation and/or ranking of projects. Chair Fogerson explained that he would then consult with Vice Chair Samuels regarding staffing the subcommittee, to include not only Committee members but local cybersecurity people, as well.

Rachel Skidmore indicated that prior to the time that several subcommittees were rolled into one, there was a cybersecurity committee in existence that did this same ranking and voting. Ms. Skidmore suggested two members from the previous committee to participate in this upcoming one: Bill Olsen with NV Energy and Terry Dawes with the City of Henderson.

Vice-Chair Billy Samuels indicated his belief that calling the subcommittee a working group would provide more latitude for the Committee.

Chair Fogerson explained that NRS is very clear on the fact that this has to be a subcommittee of this and subject to open-meeting laws.

Jon Bakkedahl added that the old cyber subcommittee was exempt from OML because of the subject matter being discussed and asked legal for clarification on this.

Chair Fogerson explained that in discussions with legal counsel and the cyber people at the federal level, he was informed that this committee was supposed to be an open meeting process but deferred to legal.

Samantha Ladich, DAG, explained that if a body is making a recommendation to the NRAC, that is going to have to be a public meeting and if it is going to fall under the NRAC, it is going to be a subcommittee.

Jeanne Freeman asked how a subcommittee associated with cyber projects could keep its proposals protected under open meeting law.

Samantha Ladich indicated that to be a closed meeting under the open meeting law, it must be deemed closed in the NRS and is something that could be done in the future under a potential legislative change. Ms. Ladich further indicated the inability to close a meeting without statutory approval. Ms. Ladich further explained that as the law stands right now under NRAC, she is unaware of a legal way to make it a subcommittee of NRAC and be a closed meeting.

Chair Fogerson suggested that the subcommittee could discuss grant programs without giving details upon which nefarious actors might act.

Bob Dehnhardt explained that cyber grant applications are already discussed in NRAC meetings, and it is done in such a way to provide an understanding of what's being proposed without providing a blueprint. As such, Mr. Dehnhardt indicated his belief that the subcommittee could function under open meeting laws and still perform its functions just as NRAC does.

Jeremy Hynds asked if when members of the committee are chosen and they are submitting a program within the grant, would there be enough people to abstain and would there be enough votes.

Chair Fogerson indicated that this was something that NRAC could work with the subcommittee on. Chair Fogerson further explained that the grant submissions would be scored on a scoresheet rather than ranked. Chair Fogerson indicated his belief that he and Vice-Chair Samuels could make sure the group was large enough for voting purposes.

Mike Heidemann, Churchill County Emergency Manager, motioned to direct the Chair and give him latitude to appoint a subcommittee for the cybersecurity program when the time is right, not to last more than six months. Roy Anderson, Washoe County School District Emergency Manager, seconded the motion to approve. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

11. Discussion of Potential Legislative Requests for the 2023 Session

Chair David Fogerson explained that DEM/HS does have four agency bills as well as influence on other items. Chair Fogerson explained that he and the general and staff are having conversations and looking at going back into NRS 414 and seeing what else needs cleaning up after the change from DPS to OPS and the military. Chair Fogerson further indicated that regarding IMAT (Incident Management Assistant Teams), the language currently states that right now people have to be volunteers, and DEM/HS is looking to propose a change to that in order for the IMAT people to be paid. Chair Fogerson further explained that he would like to keep this item on the agenda for any discussion from Committee members right up until the time the bills need to be submitted.

Roy Anderson indicated his desire for the Committee to do some research regarding the possibility of reducing the number of fire drills conducted by schools, explaining that currently fire departments have to conduct a fire drill every month for several months out of the year as well as conduct a lockdown drill, which bylaws state cannot be combined drills. Mr. Anderson further indicated that middle and high schools in some other states

only do fire drills once per semester whereas elementary schools do fire drills monthly. Mr. Anderson explained that these are often difficult things for schools to do in a meaningful way.

Mike Wilson explained that NRS 292.450 is the NRS related to drills and indicates that schools right now should have a minimum of 15 drills a year, exactly a drill every two weeks.

Vice-Chair Billy Samuels explained that this incorporates a lot of cities, the counties, school districts, fire prevention, fire code, and the fire department and such, this might be a difficult issue to tackle. Vice-Chair Samuels requested an email regarding this request but indicated the likelihood that this would incorporate discussion with all the cities prior to being able to move forward.

Roy Anderson explained that legislation was put in place several legislative sessions ago to attempt to reduce the number of fire drills in order to allow emergency managers to focus on other drills.

Jon Bakkedahl asked whose authority is NRS 249.250. The answer to Mr. Bakkedahl's question was inaudible.

Chair Fogerson indicated the possibility of perhaps having a sidebar conversation with some key partners to see if this discussion could move forward.

Chair Fogerson urged Committee members to email him with any additional ideas that might arise under this agenda item.

12. Review of the 2021 Annual Report

Chair David Fogerson explained that the annual report was provided in the packet for the meeting and included discussion about grants, major incidences, legislative efforts, and a quick summary, all from the last year. Chair Fogerson requested that if any Committee members have concerns about the contents of the report to please let him know and he would make changes for next year's.

13. Public Comment

Chair David Fogerson opened discussion on the second period of public comment.

Carolyn Levering explained to those interested in how FEMA determines the funding formula for SHSP and UASI grants that a new request for feedback has appeared in inboxes. Ms. Levering indicated that she has reached out to some of the urban area working groups regarding how NRAC might answer the survey and indicated that for the sake of NRAC, there should likely be a response from the state, as well. Ms. Levering explained that one of the elements cited in previous stakeholder feedback with FEMA's utilization of GDP as a feature of the formula and explained that that particular component represents 26 percent of the consequent score, which is not insignificant. Ms. Levering explained that a lower GDP could represent a significantly lower score relative to other MSA and other states. Ms. Levering indicated that the new questionnaire is focused on economic scale and so Ms. Levering brought it to her management team for more expertise in this area. Ms. Levering indicated that there are questions about employment and about credit score. Ms. Levering thus indicated her belief that NRAC should add some feedback regarding this economic scale and how a tourism-based economy such as Nevada's could be more disproportionately affected by an incident such as a terror attack. Ms. Levering indicated the importance of finding ways that FEMA and DHS can utilize apples-to-apples scores across the nation.

14. Adjournment

Chair David Fogerson called for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was presented by Roy Anderson, Emergency Manager Washoe County School District, and second was provided by Andrea Esp, Washoe County Public Health Preparedness. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.