

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS WORKING GROUP (EPWG)
Quarterly Meeting
Video Teleconference (VTC)
Carson City Location: Division of Emergency Management
Las Vegas Location: Clark County Office of Emergency Management & Homeland Security
April 17, 2013 at 1:30 p.m.

Members Present -Clark County via Video Teleconference (VTC) to Carson City: Diana Blake – Clark County, Rick Stever, Lincoln County; Vance Payne, Nye County, and Russel Peacock, White Pine County; Ken Small, Department of Energy (DOE), National Nuclear Security Administration Nevada Site Office (NNSA/NSO), Sophia Long, Nevada Attorney General’s Office, Rick Martin, NDEM

In Carson City: Jeff Knudtson, Elko County/City of West Wendover;

Members Not Present: Ken Elgan, Esmeralda County.

Others Present: (Las Vegas): Bud Marshall, NDEM, Kelli Anderson, NDEM, Barb Ulmer, ?? (Carson City): Chris Smith, Chief, NDEM, Loretta Smith, NDEM, Valerie Sumner, NDEM, Joyce Garrett, NDEM, Connie Lucido, NDEM, Elaine Zimmerman, Lincoln County (Did we miss any others, I did not do introductions?)

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Loretta Smith Calls Roll - Esmeralda(not in attendance), Nye (came in late) – all other counties present. Quorum established

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: (Discussion only) Rick Martin: No action may be taken upon matter raised under the item of the agenda, until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda, as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments earn the right to complete 3 minutes per person, at the discretion of the chair. Comments will not be restricted based on view points. Are there any public comments in the North? No. Any public comments in the South? No. Very good.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (Discussion/For Possible Action) Rick Martin: Let’s move on to the approval of the minutes. Any corrections or additions and I’d like to start that with two of these, actually the first one is I’d like to add up where it says quarterly meetings to include meeting minutes, so you can understand what this document is, because it does look strangely similar to the agenda itself. And also Ken sent me an email, and Rob Mignard from DOE was present and I’d like to make sure that he’s included. Other than that were there any inclusions, any changes?

Diana Blake: “Before we start location, I do want to ask, is my name placed under the others present without being mentioned as a member due to the fact that you did not have the letter on file for me until after this meeting? Rick Martin: Uh, that’s a good question and uh... Diana Blake: Because prior to this it was an assumption that I was a member, not an “other”. Ken Small: So is she a member or not? Rick Martin: She is officially a member. Ken Small: I’d like to mention, I’d like to mention that there are some other comments I had on the minutes and I’d like those to be included. Rick Martin: Ken what specifically, we’ll go over those as well because I think some of those were asking for updates from our agency and I don’t know if we can include those in the minutes so can you please tell me specifically

which ones you want to be included? Ken Small: Under Item #4. Rick Martin: Okay. Ken Small: “end of the paragraph, words say in the amount of 600K, I’d like to “add or less depending on volumes received at the NNSS for disposal.” The NDEM/DOE will make a general recommendation on the distribution of the funds as required under paragraph 3 of the NNSA NSO Responsibility section of the bylaws that were attached and adopted by the EPWG. The 6 counties may then concur change, the recommendation is also in paragraph 3 actually, Paragraph 4, Section 4.

Chris Smith: This is Chris Smith...Are we adding information to events that weren’t discussed at the meeting? Ken Small: No, it wasn’t included in the documentation. Chris Smith: It was discussed; it just wasn’t reflected in the minutes?

Ken Small: Correct. DOE is not interested in conforming to Federal Emergency Management, FEMA or Homeland security requirements for the application process but rather by the application process outlined in the adopted bylaws dated July 2003 approved by the 6 EPGW counties. A copy of those bylaws are.... (People talking, could not hear where the copies are) Rick Martin: Ken, where are you now? Ken: I’m at the top of the 2nd page, 2nd paragraph of the 2nd page. I submitted these to you and everybody on the EPGW got a copy as well. Section 5, 1st paragraph, EPWG bylaws revision, I also wanted to add a copy of these bylaws were attached, last paragraph the old bylaws were discussed in the meeting. Said specifically that a copy is attached. Section 5, last paragraph and Russ correct me if I’m wrong, or Rick, if your recollection is different, Diana Blake will hold a separate special meeting to discuss the bylaws seconded by Russ peacock, in favor, none opposed, motion passed. Diana requests we conduct next meeting in the same format with VTC and teleconference capability. And I wanted to add there was no follow up action on this item and there needs to begin an action item list and follow through with these recommendations. Rick Martin: Was that included? You cannot add that. Chris Smith: You can’t add that to the minutes. Ken Small: As long as I’m on record as wanting to add these to the minutes, that’s fine. Chris Smith: You’ll be added to today’s minutes, without a doubt. Ken: 3rd page last paragraph, returning to discuss quarterly meetings, it’s agreed the next meeting of the EPWG will be held February 20th and I’d like to add after the field visits, a special meeting will be set for bylaws, I think that was in there but no action on a follow up meeting has taken place. Last page 1st paragraph, there was some discussion here about Rick Martin was going to speak to Samantha Ladich the Deputy AG for an official opinion; I’d like to add there was no information offered by NDEM or the AG’s office on the use of proxies by the counties. Rick Martin: That was not actually in the minutes. Ken Small: It should be added to the minutes, it was discussed. Rick Martin: It will be added to these minutes. Ken Small: At the time, yeah you said you were going to follow up with her and I’m saying there’s nothing happened. Rick Martin: Okay, so it will be added to these minutes and actually I did follow through with Sam, also had followed through with Sophia as well on that opinion and we’ll get to that very shortly. Chris Smith: Rick Martin, I’d like to make a comment. I understand, in terms of meeting minutes, it is to reflect or transpire to previous meetings, not to add additional agenda items for a current meeting. That’s the time to.. I would recommend to any members of the body that if they would like to add agenda items about things that were not covered or were covered or items that they want to be addressed that they should add them to the agenda, we can’t add minutes that have already transpired. Rick Martin: Thank you Chief, I agree with that. So, what Mr. Small has brought to our attention, Chief I think on the bottom of page 4, since it was discussed in that meeting, and this is his recollection, I think we should add that statement at the bottom of page 4 to the current minutes. And the statement on the back of page 2 to the best of his recollection that was discussed in the minutes, that should be added to these minutes under the EPWG

laws revision #5 , the statement that there was no follow up action to this item I don't think should be included in these minutes. Chris Smith: I don't believe we can, is there a DAG in the house? Rick Martin: She is sitting right here. Sophia Long: Yeah he said it was not going to be added. Rick Martin: Is not going to be included. Also there was another statement, that I haven't read that was also included on page 3 with no other comments from the group, at the very bottom of it that states there has been no follow up by DEM on this item. I am recommending that that will not be included in these minutes. Ken Small: Is it going to be placed on this agenda then? Rick martin: Placed on the next agenda? Ken Small: Placed on this agenda. Rick Martin: No we cannot place anything on this agenda that hasn't been placed already. Ken Small: Could we request that NDEM start an action item list and follow up items? Chris Smith: Lets work through approving these minutes first, and then well go through additional agenda items. Rick Martin: Correct, thank you. Ok, and on the bottom of page 3 returning to the discussion of quarterly meetings there was an addition after the field visits that a special meeting will be set for bylaws, no action or follow up. Meeting has taken place, I don't believe those should be included or will not be included in these minutes. Russ Peacock: Comment on that, I think we did discuss that and I think the first part of that is appropriate where you said after the field visit a special meeting will be set up by the bylaws and I think that's okay. The rest of it, I wouldn't. Rick Martin: Okay, no action or follow up? Russ Peacock: Yeah. Rick martin: Okay good. Thank you, Russ. So that will not be included in the minutes. And the last thing on page 4, there has been no information offered by NDEM or the AG office on the use of proxies by the counties. In the DOE's opinion, the county may appoint any representative to EPWG they find appropriate that will not be included in the minutes. Okay, so are there any other additions or corrections to the minutes. Bud Marshall: Yes. Item #6 Titled Group membership, 2nd paragraph last sentence, my address is 215, not 2215. Rick Martin: I'm sorry 215? Bud Marshall: Yes. Rick martin: Thank you. Russ Peacock: 215, just 3 digits? Okay. East Bonanza. Rick Martin: Okay so are there any other discussions on the minutes? Yes Ma'am... Loretta Smith: The last comment was about a change in address? Rick Martin: Yes change in address from 2215 Bonanza drive to 215 E. Bonanza Drive. Rick Stever: I have a question on special bylaws meeting that said Diana will hold. Diana Blake: The minutes will actually say that I will hold, just so I made the motion to hold a separate, so I wasn't suggesting that I would specifically hold it, just put the group. I think he was just clarifying for me that it doesn't necessarily say that I will hold a special meeting but the motion was made to hold a special meeting. Rick Stever: right. Rick Martin: So I have here a motion from Diana to hold a special meeting to discuss bylaws. Diana Blake: Correct. Rick martin: is that correct? Diana Blake: Yes, that is correct, but the intention wasn't that I specifically would hold the meeting; it was that the group would discuss the meeting to be held. Russ Peacock: I don't think that needs to be changed in the minutes, it was just clarification. Rick Martin: Clarification? Okay, so are there any more changes or corrections to the minutes? Yes sir. Russ Peacock: I move that we accept the minutes with changes under Rob Mignard, DOE Nevada Site Office, also that the change in paragraph 4 where we add at the end of that first paragraph, or less dependent on volume received on the NNSA for disposal the NDEM and DOE would make a general recommendation for the distribution of funds in accordance with paragraph 3. And the last sentence too, the 6 counties could concur recommendation as outlined in paragraph 3, that would be the 2nd change. And then in paragraph 4 also at the end of Ken Small at the end of his Homeland Security requirements add "for the application process" but rather "by the application process outlined in the adopted bylaws dated July 2, 2003 and approved by the EPWG counties". And then the 4th change was on the 3rd page near the last paragraph at the bottom where we start out with returning to discussion according to meetings we would add after the 1:30pm, after the field visits a special meeting would be set

for bylaws. And I move that we make the approval of minutes with those changes. Correction, one other thing is we did change that address on the top of page 4 and 3 also that the 2215 Bonanza is correct as 215 E Bonanza Road. Rick martin: Okay so I have a motion, a first motion to approve the minutes. Loretta Smith: Rick, I have a question, I was wondering if Russ could clarify paragraph 4, DOE, can you clarify that sentence? Russ Peacock: Is that the first paragraph or the 2nd. First change was the presence; the 2nd was after the 600,000k in the first paragraph in #4, is that what you're talking about or the third one? After homeland security requirement? Loretta Smith: After HS Russ Peacock: In #4, 4th paragraph it starts out with, , Ken small added the DOE and it was ending with the Homeland Security requirements, at that time we would add for the application process but rather by the application process outlined in the adopted bylaws dated July 2, 2003 and approved by the 6 EPWG counties. Loretta Smith: Okay. Rick Martin: Okay, we have a motion to approve with all of the corrections and additions as stated by Russ, do I have a 2nd? Diana Blake: 2nd. Jeff Knudtson: 2nd. Rick Martin: All those in favor of approving minutes, please indicate by saying "Aye". All: I. Rick martin: All Opposed. (none). Motion passed. Thank you so much.

4. COMMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN: (Discussion Only) Rick Martin: Okay comments by the chair, we have other items that we have to get into, but I do want to thank the counties for being so flexible in the moving of the date of this meeting. It's been a very challenging time for us, especially , to accommodate, with the legislature, we've had to move around a lot of priorities and we appreciate your flexibility. With that said, I think I'm going to keep it short and to the point and well move on to agenda item #5.

5. UPDATE ON THE 2013 FEDERAL/STATE SITE VISIT: (Discussion Only) Rick Martin: Update of the federal 2013 Site Visit from Ken Small and myself and we've passed out a 2013 EPWG funding priority sheet that has a grey area of the top 3 priorities that are listed from each of the counties. Actually all of the priorities that are listed in orders of the counties. Does everyone have that? In collecting this information I really appreciate coming to each of the counties to do that. Jeff I appreciate you coming down to White Pine to visit us, I know that was a long trip but we appreciate that. And same with Ken Elgen and his group in Nye county. We really appreciate the visit and it gave me a good perspective of what we're looking at in each of the counties. And some of them, I've never been to those locations so it was a great visit, and next year I hope we can make the areas, such as up in Jeff's area, over in the Sheriff's area as well. Ken do you have anything to add to that? This spreadsheet we're also going to use on agenda item #7 so please keep this close by as well. Ken Small: The only thing I have to add is that I appreciate all of the county guys being here all the time and having paperwork organized and knowing what projects you want makes this job a whole lot easier. So, thank you, I appreciate it. Rick Martin: Absolutely, so if there aren't any questions or comments, well finish item 5 and move on with 6.

6. RESOLUTION OF THE FFY2011 and FFY2012 FUNDING Rick Martin: So Item 6 we wanted to do a reconciliation of 11 and 12 funding cycle, as you know Kelli Anderson is now going to be involved, I really appreciate the work that she has put into this, as well as Loretta, and I'm going to turn this over to those ladies and let them explain some of the good news that they've discovered. Kelli Anderson: Kelli Anderson for the record, Department of Emergency Management, for all of you that are sitting with us today, my title is Grants and Project Analyst Supervisor , I handle several grants for the Division, I've been working with Loretta Smith in the transition process, and will continue to work with her to ensure consistency and cooperation within our own Division, as well as trying to service the counties and ensure the grant work gets out timely, efficiently, payments are made, and that you have the correct contact information, just the normal stuff that we've all talked about offline, such as phone calls and emails. I wanted to start out with that. I want to start with the spreadsheet marked Federal Fiscal year or Federal year 2012 EPWG Funding, Prioritize Activities Matrix, which shows your priorities 1-6.

As you may know I am not familiar, coming in so this will be a learning curve, I'm going to have to learn from each one of you what your needs are, however on that spreadsheet, I don't believe it is printed out in color but the dark areas in the first priority 1, you'll see Elko, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Nye and White Pine, those areas we've actually pushed out those awards already. The one that we have not pushed out is Clark Counties equipment \$40,175.20. So today we just wanted to go over the amounts of trying to prioritize where we are going to fund the rest of these items. So I just want to present this spreadsheet and make sure there are no corrections or issues and if there's anything else you want to input on the spreadsheet so we can make those suggestions and hash it out here in this meeting.

Russ Peacock: Excuse me; are you keeping minutes this time? Kelli: They are being recorded right now. Vance Payne: just for the record Nye County did just show up. Kelli Anderson: So with the spreadsheet you're looking at with priority 1-6 and then again the 7-14, are there any comments, changes, issues? So at this time, when we're talking about the actual funding for 2012, I want to put on the record that we did receive a modification, #42 and 43 which is the incremental funding for \$226,412. However right now we have a small issue, a paperwork issue that we're working with the DOE and we cannot actually push the funding out until the paperwork is complete. Because of the way our accounting system works, we rely upon something called the CFDA number, has to be the correct one on the documents or we're not actually allowed to award the funds. We realize that this is an issue and I have been working with Loretta and DOE to have this fixed. With that, I don't know on the agenda, were we going to talk about potentially prioritizing some of these other funds? Rick Martin: I would like to prioritize. Kelli Anderson: So looking at the spreadsheet what is the next phase that they would like to see funded with the priorities that you have in mind. So I guess I'd like to open it up for discussion. Russ Peacock: Clark County is 40,000 in the process, is it ready to go or is it part of the supplemental? Rick Martin: We had some conflicts on that, we heard that it wasn't approved at one time and then it was approved so we'd like a motion from the group to approve it or not approve it, so that's what we're looking at. Kelli Anderson: So we could take that vote right away if you'd like, if that's okay, someone could put out a motion so we can issue that order. Russ: Just for the record I move that we make a motion to approve the next priority item as the equipment for \$40, 175.20 be approved and processed. Rick Martin: Was there a motion here? Thank you Russ, I have a 2nd from Rick, all in favor please indicate by saying "Aye". All: I. All opposed. (none). Loretta Smith: Who was that that 2nd it? Rick Martin: That was Rick Stevens Lincoln County. Loretta Smith: Thank you. Rick Martin: Thank you.

Kelli Anderson: Okay, we'd like to continue, and prioritize the majority of these other funds to indicate how you would like them pushed out. Although, as we know, the incremental funding, we only have so much money, I would like to prioritize as much as we can, so that we don't hold up the issuance of grant awards. So if you want to continue with priority #2, or however you see fit. Russ Peacock: Question, so are we talking 226 in supplemental or minus the 40? Kelli Anderson: It would be minus the 40. Russ Peacock: So were looking 186 to do.? Rick Martin: Were looking about 186,000 approximately. Kelli Anderson: And I would actually like to go a little bit higher, it doesn't hurt to prioritize I would like to cover all bases if possible that way there's no hold ups at the end in the event that we do have the funding. So would you like to start with the line item #2 priority and go across or however you'd like to see it. Rick Martin: So based on the information that you all provided us, is this still your #2 priority or would you like to see the whole line? Russ Peacock: I still have a problem with that okay, you start making us do gamesmanship when you do that. If I have a high priority stuff that's a low value then I'm penalizing myself if you do that by line item like that. And I've brought that up numerous times, and instead of gamesmanship and putting my highest thing as #1, cause I've been penalized like that in the past doing that. Rick Martin: Ok. Loretta Smith: Any suggestion on how to prioritize? Russ Peacock: Looking at most people's things, like Esmeralda county, their next 2 items are pretty much operational and travel, and travels like to come to these meetings, same thing you're seeing for Lincoln county, you see that same thing for me, Nye county was looking at a contract employee, and as was Elko county. Vance Payne: On #2, negative, that was for a contractor to do manuals. Russ Peacock: That's still your #2 priority right?

Vance Payne: Yeah. Rick Martin: Now this is for FY12? Russ: Yes. Rick Martin: Okay. Russ Peacock: I'm going to make a motion then, just like that, we've fulfilled as we go with the #2 priority for all 5 counties that still had a number 2 priority, look at that total which is 38,000 and then add in the third priority which is travel for Esmeralda, Lincoln, and operating for white pine and see what that total is and make that the next priority, I think that's going to be a different one. Vance Payne: That is a different one; I was looking at the wrong one. Russ Peacock: the latest one is right up there. Jeff Knudsen: We can actually go in to 2, 3 and 4 and still be under 186,000 Rick Martin: You're correct these would still be your priorities for FY12; would you like to do that Russ? Is that your suggestion? Russ Peacock: Yeah, because the next one just like Esmeralda has a vehicle and Nye had a vehicle which could penalize us, we could do that then see what's left. Kelli Anderson: So would you call off what your suggestion is one more time? Russ Peacock: I would move that the next priority then is that we prioritize 2, 3 and 4 for each of the counties there, come up with the figure, and see what we have left. Because the 5th and 6th priorities even though most of it is high prices, Nye County isn't but everybody else's is. Rick Martin: So that's your suggestion and if it comes out below then you'll make a motion to... Russ Peacock: Yeah, the only one I would suspect on that is 17,000 for his but we'll see what it comes out to. Ken Small: Can I bring up the amount of funding we have available for this? You'll see there on the bottom line and we've been through this a number of times, probably 2 or 3 times before this and FY 12, we went through and prioritized them and we had a grand total of 509,000 based on the projections at the time. Turns out the last truck that crossed over at the test site for disposal gave us a total of 413,000 in available funding. So that needs to be taken into consideration. Russ Peacock: So that means it drops to about 96,000 from what you're looking at. Kelli Anderson: So if we take the 413,554 and we subtract 222,569 which is the priority #1, which includes Clark counties approval in this meeting, because we've already pushed out the remainder of the funds without Clark County, and then wed push out the 40,175 so that equals that line item #1...222,569...the total amount that Ken stated is the 413,554 and if we subtract those items, the 222 minus the 413,554, we have 190,984.80 so we're still right there. So if we take the total of #2, 3, 4 that is 181,650 which would be covered under the remainder of the 190,984. Leaving approximately 80,000 give or take. Russ Peacock: Okay, so that won't fund either Esmeralda or my counties' vehicles, it would fund probably the HAZMAT stuff for Nye county and maybe some limited SCBA stuff for me. And that would take care of every body's priorities wouldn't it. We don't get our 2 vehicles for the 2 counties and I don't get all of my SCBA but I get some. Vance Payne (?): do you want to re-prioritize and move some of those up? Russ Peacock: that's the catch 22 we'd get caught in but not this year I don't want to. Unless you want to. Esmeraldas not here and they're the other one that has a vehicle so... Vance Payne: 2 and 3 would be great. That's what we've been holding off for. It would make a huge difference on what I went through this morning.

Rick Martin: Can you identify yourself because we're going to type up the minutes? Vance Payne: Yes, Vance Payne, Director of Nye county Emergency Management. Loretta Smith: Rick, can I ask something here? Rick Martin: Please do. Loretta Smith: In the past if we had any priorities that were not funded in one fiscal year the counties were encouraged to put it at the top of their list for the following year so if Esmeralda county is interested in ensuring that's funded, and not be covered by the incremental funding that we have they should, put that as their #1 or 2 priority for FY13 and I believe that's on the agenda for discussion to reprioritize. Rick Martin: Yeah, but I think we can leave it to the pleasure of the group how they'd like to reprioritize but I'd like to get through these first 4 items first and kind of do this incrementally if we can. So it looks like we've got, does someone want to make a motion to approve the first 4 or the additional 3 items and is someone going to speak on behalf of Esmeralda? Ken Small: you might want to run through all that before and summarize that so everyone knows exactly what's happened with the amounts and which priority. Kelli Anderson: I can read it into the record if that will help. From the spreadsheet, priority 2 for Elko is consulting and contracting for 14,760. Moving on to Esmeralda supplies and operating for 6,666. For Lincoln County, supplies and operating 2500 dollars even. For Nye County, contract employee for 12,500. For White Pine County, travel at 2500, and that totals 38,926. Moving on to priority #3, Clark county has no priority #3, Elko has no priority #3, Esmeralda has travel at

1500, Lincoln has travel at 1500, Nye county has – I don't know if I am missing a word – it has benefits at 32,524, I'm assuming its maybe personnel, White pine County has operating at 2000 dollars even, total is 37,524. And then do we want to go down or? Russ Peacock: One more. Kelli: Okay, priority #4, Clark County has none, Elko does not have a priority either, Esmeralda county at turnouts at 15,000 even, Lincoln county communications at 64,000, Nye county truck chase amount dog box at 17,000, White Pine county computers at 9200 even, totals 105,200. Ken Small: so what's the total then if that includes everything priority 1 for all 6 counties correct? So what's the grand total on that? Those 4 lines? Kelli Anderson: Those 4 lines the grand total is 404,219.20. Ken Small: so there's 413, and some change available. Rick Martin: So based on that information... Russ Peacock: I just have a question on Lincoln counties communication, is 64,000 completing a project or can you widdle that down because our next 2 priorities are 2 vehicles for Esmeralda and Nye so I just want to know what were competing against. Rick Stever: that could be...I don't know if it's ever going to be completed because they keep changing some of the requirements and stuff, so, I think at this point that that could be adjusted. Vance Payne: This is Vance, and to help our neighbors, if I can get 1, 2 and 3 covered, with anything that is left I commit to you guys. Russ Peacock: So that frees up 17 that we're looking at with that particular motion right? Vance Payne: Yes, sir. Russ Peacock: ok. Vance Payne: That'll get you guys a little closer. Russ Peacock: 17 and 9 is 26 so neither one of us could still get the vehicles, but that's just kind of what we're looking at.

Kelli Anderson: Rick, Kelli Anderson for the record, can you explain all of the communications just so I understand as well because I'm new to this?, so what is the 64,000 for? Rick Stever: that would be to upgrade or update some of our repeaters. The recommending or suggesting that all of this is required yet to go narrow banding or we still have a couple of those that need to be completed. Kelli Anderson: So, it's like repeaters, it's not like hand held radios; it's the actual repeaters themselves? Rick Stever: Yes, the dispatch repeaters and antennas and stuff. I think at this point we could probably lose a portion of that. The last information I got from our radio tech, he said if we could get, he said we had to get 20, it was just under 19 something, so if we could maintain that and swing the rest over to White Pine or Esmeralda. Kelli Anderson: If we could reduce the communication repeaters by 28,000 we would have the 45,000 for the vehicles. I'm just throwing that out there. Russ Peacock: you'd have 45,000 for one vehicle right? Kelli Anderson: It just says vehicle 45,000. Russ Peacock: You see we're looking at the same line, Lund has a vehicle too. Kelli Anderson: I'm sorry? Russ Peacock: If you look at the same line, priority line, you're talking two vehicles, so I was supporting doing the whole thing right now, the 64,000, I can do without that vehicle for a year if I have to. Diana Blake: Can I ask what the use of the vehicle is specifically? Russ Peacock: That particular one is a rescue vehicle for one of the volunteer fire departments. We have like 8 volunteer fire departments. Diana Blake: So what are you using right now? Russ Peacock: He has an old one that's there, but we've made the transition to our own fire district from NDF, so were in the process of changing all the old stuff. Diana Blake: What's the risk factor right now with the vehicle you use? Russ: right off I don't know what it is, there one of the ones that are out at the edge of Lincoln county response so. Rick Stever: This is Rick with Lincoln County, I think that is a priority because we get a lot of calls out there and the time frame and the response is extremely critical. Diana Blake: Well, whatever the cost is that's left on the table then Clark county will reduce their award by that amount to make sure that that vehicle is funded so that we can get both vehicles funded, those seem to be the priority. Ken Small: I don't think you're going to get both of them funded. Diana Blake (?): Well if we reduce the communication then we absolutely will. Kelli Anderson: How much did you say you needed for the communications, Rick? Rick Stever: We'll work with what we have. Russ Peacock: He's looking around 20 but I think if we got the other 9,000, so if he got 30,000 out of that, so let's go with, I'll go with what they're saying is if we reduce his to about 30,000, but we'll look at the actual numbers when we do it, fund the #1 priority of vehicle for Lund and the vehicle for Esmeralda, we are proven priorities 1 2 and 3, and everything in line 4 except for Nye counties 17,000? Vance Payne: Correct. Russ Peacock: And then were adding in line 5 priority Esmeraldas 45,000 vehicle, and Lund, 32,000 vehicle, only thing not funded then is the HAZMAT stuff and the fire and supplies for Nye county.

But we'll take that balance whatever is there, and reduce that communications to make it so he's getting around 30,000 for communications. Clark County can keep theirs. Ken Small: Can Clark County keep their... Russ Peacock: Unless we see what...let's see what the number comes up as first. Ken Small: So do we have a grand total there? Russ Peacock: That's what she's working on so we'll see. Chris Smith: Can I throw an idea out there from the North? This is Chris Smith for the record. The grand total of 2 vehicles is roughly 77,500 and if you take the truck chase that was offered up by Nye county for 17,000 and you add that to the remaining 8,000 that we have that was left over, then you take Lincoln county with 20,000, were still short like 7,000 that could potentially be collected by Clark Counties offering and reduce them potentially by 7,000 and everybody gets vehicles, as needed and we're still walking away with the ability to do these projects in Lincoln county. Kelli Anderson: Okay well, Kelli Anderson for the record, so by subtracting Nye counties truck chase the 17,000 adding in the 45,000 vehicle for Esmeralda, and the Lund vehicle for White Pine, were at 430,719 that's where we're at so tell me where you wanted to subtract the rest. Russ Peacock: That was 64 for Lincoln, so if we do 27,000 from that were okay? Kelli Anderson: No, we're about 17,000 off. That's leaving Clark County whole and minusing the 17,000 for the truck chase that leaves the communications at 30.

Russ Peacock: And we're still 17 short? Kelli Anderson: Yes, 17,165. Rick Stever: Rick Stever Lincoln County, if we take that 17 out of the cut the communications down to cut it down to 6817. Diana Blake: Well, no, Rick communications is far more important than the equipment were looking to get not to say that it's not important but your communications are far more important, you need to be able to communicate. Vance Payne: I agree. Diana Blake (?): Yeah, absolutely so take that off. Kelli Anderson: So you want the 17,165.20 taken out of yours? Diana Blake: Yes. Kelli Anderson: Okay, so let's just go over this just to make sure if anyone's going to make a motion for this. This would be reducing Clark counties request from 40,175.20 to 23,010.00 it would be removing the 17,000 truck chase, adding in the vehicle for Esmeralda at 45,000, and adding the Lund vehicle for White Pine at 32,500. Is that correct? That brings us to 413,554 and that nets zero. Communication is left at 30,000. Vance Payne: I'd make a motion that we accept this as stated. Ken Small: Could you Kelli, please line by line review all of that so we don't have to go back next month and revisit this again? Kelli Anderson: I'd be happy to. So, Kelli Anderson for the record. Priority #1, equipment for Clark County 23,010, Priority #2 for Elko, consulting contracting 14,760. Ken Small: I'm sorry Kelli, this is Ken, does that include the equipment defibrillator for Elko? Kelli Anderson: Line 1 is already pushed out. Would you like me to read that in? Ken Small: As long as everybody's clear that the grey areas here from this particular spreadsheet have been paid for. Loretta Smith: Funded. Kelli Anderson: That's fine; with the exception of Clark County.

Kelli Anderson: Let me just start over. Priority 1, Clark county equipment 23,010, everything else on that line item has been pushed out and what I mean by that is the grants have been issued. Priority #2, consulting contracting 14,760, Esmeralda supplies and operating 6,666, Lincoln county supplies and operating 2500, Nye county contract employee 12,500, White Pine travel 2500, that line item should total 38,926. Priority #3, Clark County 0, Elko 0, Esmeralda travel 1500, Lincoln travel 1500, Nye county benefits 32,524, White Pine operating 2,000. That line item equals 37,524. Priority #4, turnouts for Esmeralda county 15,000, Lincoln County communication repeaters 30,000, the removal of Nye Counties' truck chase at 17,000, computers for White Pine 9200, total now for that line item is 54,200. Going down to priority #5, Esmeralda vehicle 45,000, we did not fund Nye County, HM fire, tactical supplies that'd be 0 at this time, and White Pine County, Lund vehicle funded at 32,500. And that line item would equal 77,500. For a grand total of with grant awards already issued and the items that I just read off 413,554. Rick Martin: So would someone like to make a motion? Russ Peacock: So moved. Vance Payne: 2nd. Rick Martin: Who 2nd? Russ Peacock: Vance. Rick Martin: Okay, we have a 1st and 2nd, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". All: Rick Martin: All opposed? Seems that the motion carries. Thank you. Rick Stever: Rick, Lincoln County, question on that. Any idea when that funding may be available? Kelli Anderson: Currently, past conversation today we have a paperwork issue that were working towards so I'll have to defer to Loretta to see if we have any kind of dates that that would be

fixed. Loretta Smith: there has been a problem with increments 42 and 43 due to CFDA. This needs to be handled by DOE, so we have been in discussion on this and need to follow up for clarification. Ken, do you know or have you spoken to any of your folks on when you might expect that to be addressed?

Ken Small: I approved 3 mods yesterday; you're going to have to talk to the folks in Albuquerque. That contract funding document number, DOE Nevada has no control over. So I would suggest you talk to Erwin. Loretta Smith: I do believe that has been addressed up to and through him. Rick Martin: Can we follow up with that please? As an action item for you I will follow through with that okay? Loretta Smith: Certainly. Rick Martin: Okay so that handles FY12. Kelli Anderson: Rick, hold on just a second. So when discussing these line items, Bud just brought it to my attention that we didn't add 23,010 dollars of equipment into that first line item. So the total of that first line item was 205,405. So I actually need to put that back in which actually kind of skews the numbers by the 23,010. So, all of the giving that we just did, we're still off the 23 grand. Rick Martin: So we're off by 23,010 dollars. Kelli Anderson: Correct. Rick Martin: Okay Kelli Anderson: And thank you Bud for bringing that to my attention Russ Peacock: And see I don't know what Esmeraldas vehicle is, sometimes it's under state purchasing, you know it's been well over a year since we put these applications in so there could be some savings there depending on what they're getting. And I might run into the same thing with Lund's when they buy their vehicle, I mean I don't know how much it's probably close but I don't know what they're actually getting, I know what Lunds is but I don't know what Esmeraldas is. Rick Martin: Okay so what's the solution? Do we need to do further reductions or are we looking to the group for suggestions.

Vance Payne: How much do we need? Rick Martin: 23,010 dollars. Vance Payne: I can make half of it. Vance: This is Vance Payne and... Rick Martin: Vance, which project? Vance Payne: From Benefits. Jeff Knudson: Rick, to carry over from 2011, have you looked at that or done anything? Rick Martin: No sir, not to my knowledge, no. Jeff Knudson: I'll go ahead and drop my consulting thing. Because if that money ever does get carried forward I can use it to cover this. So I'll go ahead and take my 14,760 off, #2 priority. Rick Martin: Jeff could you refresh my memory on the FY11 issue? Jeff Knudson: I gave you a change request form for 2011 carryover about 16,000 and you said you needed to check with Loretta and verify the amounts and then you were going to get back to me. Kelli Anderson: So, that would leave us 8,250 if Nye wanted to deduct it from the benefits instead of deducting the amount that you stated. Russ Peacock: did you confirm those figures, totals across? Kelli Anderson: Yes. Diana Blake: I'm coming up with something totally different. Kelli Anderson: line item #1 is the 23,010, the 17,000, the 36,000, the 35,000, 58,594 and the 35,800 unless my cell is absolutely wrong and I just ran them again 228,414. Elaine Zimmerman: That's not what I have. Diana Blake: I got 205 and some change. Kelli Anderson: so it wasn't calculating right, its 205. Let me just run it one more time here. Chris Smith: Rick while Kelli is doing that can we get verification on Kevins requests that he knows those funds are going to be carried over. That is Jeff. (Too many people talking at once to understand). Vance Payne: Hey, Jeff if you gave up half of your consulting and I gave up half of the benefits we made it. And that still keeps you and me in the ballgame. Jeff Knudsen: well that other money I know it's coming so let's just go ahead and use all of mine. That way you're not short on your benefits. Rick Martin: Loretta could you answer the Chiefs question? Loretta Smith: Yes. All monies will be carried forward and we have received documentation from DOE on that. It's simply a matter of approving the Project Change Request as long as they don't have a change in the project. Elko has, I want to say 17,6 but I don't have that figure in front of me.

Kelli Anderson: Kelli Anderson for the record, so taking the equipment, priority #1, the 23,010 that Clark county reused for 40,175 and taking the line item for the 17,000, 36000, 35000, 58,594, and then white pines 35,800 it totals 205,404 dollars, so it does equal the 413,554. It just wasn't carrying over correctly. So we're at 0 balance. And that's without touching the benefits. We net zero with your request and your money. Russ Peacock: And that's with not touching Elko. Kelli Anderson: That's with touching nothing. That's leaving it as is. Unknown: discussion among the group. Rick Martin: the first motion still stands.

Are we ok? Russ Peacock: I think we're good. Kelli Anderson: I caught everyone off guard, sorry about that.

RESOLUTION OF THE FFY2011 and FFY2012 FUNDING: The second part of this agenda item is talking about 2012, or 2011 excuse me, I studied up pretty good on 2011 and 2013 so I want to kind of open it up and talk about 2011 and see if there's issues or comments or problems or if Loretta wants to add anything to it on the carryovers. I have one of the spreadsheets in front of me; don't know much about your projects, so I don't have a lot to add. Jeff Knudsen: Did we second a motion on 2012? Kelli Anderson: Yes. Rick Martin: Yes, Jeff we did and we took a vote as well on the first motion to approve as stated the 413,554 dollars. Vance Payne: So you keep your consulting. Jeff Knudsen: Okay. It's hard to understand what you're doing through the TV. You guys need to be professional actors. Rick Martin: So are there any concerns with 11 that we can address? Russ Peacock: The thumb drive I got I haven't had a chance to go through it but I don't know of any real issues. I know at one point we were looking at reports not being received for some reason. Right now I don't know of any issues. Rick Martin: No issues at this time, on this side of the house. We'll have a full report on that at the next meeting as well. In the meantime, if you have any questions on that, please forward those to Loretta and Kelli when you request a financial split. Okay, does that cover agenda item #6? Any questions or comments on item #6? Alright so let's move on to agenda item #7.

7. UPDATE AND APPROVAL OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTED FUNDS FROM THE FFY13 FUNDING CYCLE Rick Martin: Let's talk about the FY13 process and priorities. Kelli Anderson: Okay, so Kelli Anderson for the record. It's the same spreadsheet that we discussed previous, its labeled FY2013/2013 EPWG funding, and I guess at this point we would need to discuss priorities 1-3 with the members as well as with DOE, with Ken Small and Rick Martin so I guess I'll just open this up for discussion on how you want to prioritize the site visits and the amount of money and the categories that you would like funded. Russ Peacock: Any changes in the projections? Oh yeah. Ken Small: Should I tell him the news now? Rick Martin: Please do. Ken Small: Can you folks in Carson City hear me okay? Jeff Knudsen: As of right now, April, about $\frac{3}{4}$ through the fiscal year, the amount of waste received out at the test site has only been about 340,000 cubic feet, that's about 170,000 dollars. Things aren't looking up for a lot of the 29 generators that we have throughout the complex. You guys have all been on tours out there and have seen the times where there are 20 and 25 trucks backed up at the gate. Last couple of weeks, month or so there have been no trucks in the parking lot because of the sequestration and continuing resolution. A lot of the DOE generator sites are shuffling their money and are trying to save their peoples jobs rather than sending waste. I don't know that it's going to get much better as the federal fiscal year closes. Russ Peacock: So is that 170 to date? Ken Small: Yes. Russ Peacock: Do you have an annual projection out of that? Ken Small: The annual projection for 13 was 850K. Russ Peacock: But I mean, with what you're at now, what is that going to reduce it to? Ken Small: Oh, half. Russ Peacock: Okay. Just so we have something to work on for priorities. Ken Small: You can go through and prioritize all of this but you know, it's not looking good. Russ Peacock: Well we appreciate every bit we get I know that. I do. Kelli Anderson: So Kelli Anderson for the record, the past spreadsheet that we put out, well – I didn't, the folks here projected 600,000. Was speaking with Ken over email the last couple days, the projection is approximately 425,000 and again is a projection. So it's just my suggestion but if we could possibly prioritize at least that amount going forward it wouldn't hurt, that way we don't have to come back and beat it up again and again. Russ Peacock: What amount? Kelli Anderson: 425,000 is the projection. And that's just a suggestion. Ken Small: Russ, you can see, and the rest of the committee members, you can see, we said we appreciate your time, we figured the first 3 priorities brought us down to 322,000 after that Rick and I talked and it gets to the point where it's really hard to say which of the next sets of priorities are supreme among the 6 counties. We couldn't make any kind of suggestion there. And that's where it stands. Russ Peacock: The only problem I've got again is, just like my priorities penalized me, if you look at my top 3 priorities are less than most people's #1 priority. So that makes me do gamesmanship on my applications, but just knowing what's there and the

realistic that it's probably going to be half, I would make a motion that we take and keep these priorities 1, 2 and 3 as they are, fund up to the level that is received during the year and make our award projection at least priority 1 which is about half of what is projected. Priority 1 takes us to 211,000 according to our figures and that's where Ken thinks were realistically going to be, so we will fund that or put that down as a thing because he's basically saying we're almost there with what's been at the site now, but then in addition to that we prioritize #2 and #3 as funds become available for the year. And then approve up to that amount. Rick Stever: Do we take into consideration the priorities that were bumped off the 12? Vance Payne: This is Vance, real quick question; I've got curiosity if anyone wants to adjust anything because I can eliminate a couple stuff right now. I've had some major operational changes in the last 40 days. As an example the trucking system, you can take that one completely off, that one is dead in the water. Rus Peacock: That was your last priority? Vance Payne: Yeah, I had a change on number 4 even. That one can be reduced literally to 60,000. Kelli Anderson: The 2 vehicles? Vance Payne: Uh huh, what they have to look like has completely changed. Rus Peacock: Looking at my things, the radios and the PPE Equipment and that's an ongoing thing all the time with my new fire district anyways, so to me it's not that big of a deal, the EOC still we're looking at standardizing those and we haven't got a standardized thing out of the state yet, for rural vs. the urban where we've been working on that with Emergency Management Coordination Committee, so for me I'm not going to prioritize any different than what's there, I'd be happy, I get a lot less than the rest of them across the board but I still go with my original motion. Top 3 priorities. Rick Martin: Okay I have a motion for the top 3 priorities? Do I have a 2nd? Diana Blake: Second. Rick Martin: Seconded by Diana. All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying "Aye". All. Rick Martin: All opposed? None. Motion carried. Is there any other discussion on FY13 at the moment? Okay, well move on to agenda item #8. Mr. Small.

8. SCHEDULE FOR THE FFY2014 APPLICATION PROCESS Ken Small: Oh, #8 has to do with the FY2014 application process. And that's subject to debate I suppose. We have some projections for next year but you know those things do change. We can set up a schedule in terms of when the application package can be sent out if you'd like to do that, if the EPWG would like to do that, start getting your paperwork in order, start prioritizing for 2014, get the applications submitted, back to NDEM, they can combine the information from each of the counties, get it into DOE and hopefully we can have it reviewed and tentatively approved by the end of the fiscal year as we did in past years. Russ Peacock: And with that is that starting off in May? Ken Small: Yeah, it was. Rick Martin: is there a specific date in May? Ken Small: Well, I'm going to refer to the old schedule that was in the bylaws unless, if you prefer I not do that. Rick Martin: No, if it's still valid I'd love to hear it. Ken Small: Okay, typically DOE would get their projections and send them out to the counties in the state, in past years DOE in cooperation with NDEM would send out joint application package with about 20 different forms. You guys have them all in a computerized format, don't know if you still have them or not, but you'd submit your applications to NDEM, NDEM would go ahead combine them and send them into DOE. The first date you're looking for is that we get our projections and send them out to the state by May 15th; by May 30th the counties would submit their applications to NDEM. By July 1st, NDEM would send it in to DOE and then we would start the site review after that. Russ Peacock: Question. With the reduced amount going on right now, do you anticipate any differences or some carryover from this year with the sequestration and all that, or are you just kind of using the same figures that you've projected for let's say the next 5 years? Ken Small: Same volume projection? Russ Peacock: Yeah, because what I'm looking at is the funding becoming available what figures are you kind of going to use for next year with this year being so different. All I'm trying to do is make sure we're not doing more work than we need to. Ken Small: I understand completely Russ, for next year I think the dollar figure is 700,000 cubic feet which would be 350,000 dollars. Russ Peacock: Yeah, that sounds good to me. I would recommend that we do follow the schedule and that we do start on the next process. Vance Payne: Sounds good to me; would still give us a target date. Ken Small: Do you have all of the applications and forms and all of that readily available? Russ Peacock: I think so. Unless they change them again this year. Ken Small: That's you Jeff, you got them? Jeff Knudsen: I've got them on my computer for every year but can you send them

again? Rick Martin: We will send them again. We want to look at those as well and we will send them, with updates attached. Ken Small: So looking at that schedule, were looking at, if I can get my calendar out here, by May 1st I'll send out the numbers to y'all, by the 15th you can get your applications together, tell me if this is objectionable by anybody and we can adjust it real easily. Kelli Anderson: Ken, can you say the 2nd date one more time? Ken Small: May 1st DOE will get you the projections, May 15th the state can send out the application packages, and what'd we say, by July 1st the counties could get them into, or middle of June get them into NDEM. Russ Peacock: That sounds workable. Ken Small: Okay, that's not too much. Vance Payne: Wait, let's set a date: June 15th? Ken Small: That's a Saturday. 17th? Vance Payne: Sure. Ken Small: Rick, does that work with you guys? Rick Martin: Which one the 17th? Ken Small: Yeah, June 17th they would get bumped to you. Rick Martin: Absolutely, 15th is fine, we just won't answer them. (Discussion among the group, inaudible). Ken Small: just to give a schedule float how about by August 1st NDEM gets it to DOE and then we can start the field reviews shortly after that so were not up in Ely. Does that sound reasonable? Kelli Anderson: Field reviews in what September? Ken Small: Yeah, September's fine. We have to get together another spreadsheet, that will give you time to adjust your priorities again if you'd like. Is that acceptable Rick? Rick Martin: Yes sir. Ken Small: Anything that was missing out of the schedule there? Rick Martin: The agenda were you asking if there's anything missing, no we're good. Any questions? Russ Peacock: Nope, sounds good. Rick Martin: Okay let's move on to agenda item #9.

9. EPWG BY-LAWS REVISION Rick Martin: This is the bylaws provided to you. They are the bylaws that we are proposing and they have been proposed for the last 3 meetings, also provided are the discussions that took place with those bylaws to refresh everybody's memory. I know, the last couple of meetings, the counties, you've asked for verbiage that you'd like to see included into the minutes. We haven't seen any of those with this but some of the concerns, actually, the three concerns that I kept seeing occurring within those minutes from the past was that you were concerned with article item #3 under the Chief shall appoint all membership, that was a concern, and looking for verbiage if anyone's interested in providing that to us. Whatever you'd be comfortable with. The 2nd issue, Russ, I think you brought up was under proxies. You wanted an opinion on proxies. Russ Peacock: Has the state AG issued an opinion yet? I've never seen anything in writing. Sophia Long: No, we would not issue an opinion. Russ Peacock: Then I don't think we have to change it. Chris Smith: There is an assembly bill moving through the legislature right now and I'd be glad to read to you what that is. So you understand what the intents of the Attorney General's Office was. I'd be glad to read it into the record. Russ: I think for our benefit we need it. Chris Smith: Assembly bill 65 presently moving through the legislature. Chris Smith, for the record. Assembly Bill 65, in section 3, a member of public body, to attend a meeting of the public body in the place of the member unless the members of the public body are structurally authorized to do so by the constitutional provision statutes, coordinates, revolutions or other legal authority that created the public body. Section 3 also requires that any such designation be made in writing or made on the record at the meeting of the public body any such person, so designated to be a member of the body, for the purpose of determining quorum. So the long and short of that is in the event that this is simply a bill moved into law you will be prohibited from any type of proxy activity because we are not granted the authority to grant such proxies at the Division of Emergency Management or the Department of Public Safety. Russ Peacock: My concern all along, did we lose him? (Call dropped) Vance Payne: I guess that is the end of that. Russ Peacock: So our bylaws will be the next agenda. (group discussion, inaudible). Diana Blake: Well, hopefully they will call back. Russ Peacock: Again this is a law proposed it's not in effect. That's the problem we have with the state AGs office, they won't put it in writing and we're such a small group, none of us have any depth and so there will be a time when we aren't able to do any actions, because we won't have the quorum. Rick Martin: Rick, I would like you to state that again. Russ Peacock: But that's the kind of stuff people need to be thinking about. Vance Payne: I got some input on that as well. I'll hold it. Rick Martin: This is completely different than what I'm accustomed to. Group discussion/ phone disconnect/reconnected.

Rick Martin: Okay, we held all conversation until we got you back live. Ken Small: Where's our note taker? Kelli Anderson: We've got it recorded. Rick Martin: We're having everything recorded. Kelli Anderson: Our notes are going to be verbatim. Chris Smith: Alright, so right before the freeze frame I was just finishing up, so currently that is the intent of the law for the assembly bill and that was proposed by the Attorney General's office. They sponsored that bill to go through. Rick Martin: Okay, Russ, I think you had some concerns? Russ Peacock: Are they getting any opposition? What's the likelihood that it'll pass? Chris Smith: It's moved to the other house. Russ Peacock: It has passed one house? Chris Smith: It's passed one house. Russ Peacock: Senate. My only concern all along has been that we never, we've been told that in meetings but we never had it in writing, the opinion. And we're such a small group that none of us have any depth in the rural areas especially, so if you want, you know there's going to be times, just like we almost didn't have a quorum today. Chris Smith: I appreciate that, I certainly do know that we don't have to be meeting in person for these meetings, we can host teleconference for information and to get folks involved or video teleconference. Video teleconference is available in Elko, in Carson and in Las Vegas. So we do have options that if we can't get together in person, we can certainly see each other and talk to one another on the telephone. Russ Peacock: It's just as far for me to go to Elko as coming to Vegas. You guys keep forgetting how big this state is. But the other thing is, I lost my track with that... Vance Payne: This is Vance, I agree... We need alternates. We can't function without alternates. The membership should include alternates for each. We should have a primary for the Chief, I don't have a problem with the Chief appointing it, I truly believe it should be their emergency management manager or their or their designee but from either county. However, I think it's very important that we have alternates available to carry our boat, because we can't be here all the time. Chris Smith: I hear your point and for your information I also have the great pleasure of sitting on the SERC. In that surf SERC meeting that issue was also raised and it's also a concern for the LEPC's that they are going to not be allowed to use proxies at the LEPC's as well. And that is also coming down if this bill does pass. Even if it doesn't, the intent of the attorney Generals who are advising us is that proxies are not acceptable under this open meeting law. Vance Payne: But, the expansion of membership is permitted. Chris Smith: Expansion of membership certainly is permitted. Vance Payne: And by our bylaws we can still assign a single vote for any individual county ir-regardless of who's in attendance, as long as one person is representing that particular county. Chris Smith: I don't believe that we can vary that bylaw but I'm going to have to check with the Attorney General on that one. Do you have an opinion on that? Sophia Long: Yeah, I think I'm going to agree with you. That the member can't change. That you can appoint a person from that county, but I'm not sure if your problem is meeting a quorum so if you want to appoint 2 people from a county. Ken Small: I don't think it's a matter of meeting in a quorum, it's like NDM is dictating to the counties who can be on this committee and who can't. Chris Smith: No, I don't believe were dictating who's on the committee and who's not, it's a quorum issue. We just can't do proxy memberships of this committee. Ken Small: The first sentence, and not to be argumentative Chief, but the first sentence in paragraph 3 says you're going to appoint one member from each county. Chris Smith: Okay Ken, but we're talking about another issue right now, we're talking about the proxies. So I'll be glad to address that once were done with proxies. Diana Blake: Someone just made the mention of having 2 or more people, that may be a better idea than having proxies or alternates, you just have multiple people from the county, if that's something that we can entertain. Rick Martin: Chief I'll defer to you on that. Chris Smith: If we're going to have 2 members from each county? And appoint 2 members per county? Russ Peacock: Yeah, that was the suggestion. Diana Blake: Is that possible? Chris Smith: That means every county has 2 votes and could potentially split votes and have one sided voting. Diana Blake: Alright never mind. Ken Small: Not each county would have one vote. Diana Blake: No if there's a member at the table you get a vote. Okay never mind. Russ Peacock: Just a comment, I'm the one that brought up the LEPC's about them changing because all of their bylaws have them operating under proxies and the alternates and all of that stuff all along and Karen was surprised and what brought all of this up was DEM trying to standardize their committees. I think, that's not an official opinion from their office. And that's why it's important that if this bill gets passed, then that gives us the direction of what we have to do, but our, the concerns are that we have no depth, we may not have any representation if

we're not there and people can railroad or take advantage of but right now this group works really well together. But there will come a time where they don't and somebody can be railroaded and be completely wiped out of the system or the process or the benefits, and that's what we're trying to avoid with the intent of the legislature, no, that doesn't apply to them, they like putting stuff on us but they don't like doing it themselves. But that's been my question all along and I can never get a straight answer out of the state. I think. That's why I've always pushed, give us a written opinion and then we have to live by it. Chris Smith: Well, and I believe there has been some other like you, Sir that have asked that same question and that's why AB65 has been developed and the way that it has to clarify that issue. I do not think that's the reason why... (Call drops) Russ Peacock: We lost him again. Group Discussion. Kelli Anderson: Ok, I'll call him back. Kelli: I don't know what's going on so were calling him back right now. Reconnected. Russ Peacock: We lost you just as you started to talk Mr. Smith. Chris Smith: I know, I was just getting ready to get on my soap box. (very short group dialog too many to hear what was said) So I guess the long and the short is, and I do appreciate the concern about not having very deep representation on the team and that certainly is not our intent to have any unfair advantage for a county that doesn't show up for a very important meeting and they are railroaded, that's certainly not what we're looking to do. I don't think we need all of that off and is terribly a burdensome committee. Although I do know that things pop up and it is difficult and especially when you're the only person representing a county that you want to be there. That is why we do have the opportunity to bring in video conferencing and Russ just so you know, we can teleconference you, you don't have to drive to Vegas or to Elko. You can be on the phone just as easily and hear the entire meeting. So I do stand steadfast with the Attorney general's office at this point that we are advocating the move away from any and all proxies; that is not acceptable under the open meeting laws and under the advice of the Attorney General provided to us as well as the SERC. That was going to be in place as well, so it's a movement that's a foot across all of our public bodies. Some of those public bodies that were using, proxies and they are all being advised the same that we are. We're just one of the many. But thank you for the credit of changing the entire state's open meeting laws. But the Division of Emergency Management; we did not do that.

Jeff Knudsen: Hello? Rick Martin: We're here. Chris Smith: I'd also like to address the concern that Mr. Small brought up at this time, if that's ok. Mr. Small brings up the concern that membership is appointed certainly by the Chief of the Division of Emergency Management, this is a committee that derived its working group, authority from the Division of Emergency Management, it makes sense to have the members of this committee... Russ Peacock: That's not true.. Chris Smith: ...appointed by such authority. Are there members of the body outside of a federal entity that have a concern about this? Vance Payne: All of the counties. Chris Smith: Then please speak up; I'd like to hear that from the counties instead of our federal partners. Jeff Knudsen: That was the biggest question I had when I brought it up... was that the county was appointing us now to represent them at the EPWG. Is it possible for the county to appoint a member and you to request it? Chris Smith: I think it is entirely possible for me to request from the county an individual to be represented on the spot and this person serves on this body at the pleasure of the Chief of the Division of Emergency Management. Ken Small: Chief it's like NDEM has taken over the whole group, has gotten to be the dictator over the whole group, and all of the sudden that's the supreme thing and that's not how it was created Chief. Chris Smith: I appreciate your concern but I'm reading item #7, in the Agreement of Principle and in Attachment A, that says the Division of Emergency Management will administer the EPWGs Grants Program. DEM will be the lead agency for all EPWG activity except for the EPWG Grant review process...Ken Small... (call drops...dialing back) Chris Smith: Hello! Rick Martin: We're back. Ken Small: Where were you at Chris? Chris Smith: I was in the agreement of principle Attachment C, describing the relationship of the EPWG Grant Administration Program that is in item #7. So, where it says that the Department of Emergency Management will be the lead agency for EPWG activity...Ken Small: Wait, wait, you're talking Appendix C? Chris Smith: I'm talking attachment C in the Agreement in Principle between the State of Nevada and the US Department of Energy. Ken Small: Okay, so I know what you're talking about, it's a 1 paragraph thing? Chris Smith: Correct, Sir. Ken Small: Okay. You need to seriously consider the rest of the

information that's under the AIP. In fact the Letter of Agreement, Appendix A completely outlines the responsibilities of NDEM and DOE, and all of that's been usurped by this un-reviewed bylaw that's put together in a vacuum by 2 people at NDEM with no input from DOE or the counties. We've been telling NDEM that for the past 4 meetings and it doesn't seem to get any response or anything, it's just no we're just going to keep going with this. If, if, if I'll tell you straight up Chief, if DOE can't agree to these bylaws, basically it would gut the letter of agreement that our two agencies have and release DOE from any responsibilities including funding this grant. Chris Smith: Because of the bylaws? Ken Small: Yeah! It's in the letter; it's in the Letter of Intent that is part of the AIP. That was a document that was signed by DOE and NDEP, your predecessor and my former supervisor. It clearly outlines all other responsibilities DOE has and NDEP including both agencies being a co-chair to this room. Now I've been patient for the last 3 to 4 meetings but NDEM does not rule the world, the counties do.

Chris Smith: With all due respect Mr. Small, I've signed as the Administrative Agent on this grant so that is not entirely correct. We serve the counties to ensure they receive the funds they need through the federal government. Our job is to advocate for those counties and ensure they receive the funding they need to conduct their mission. I am looking through the document that you referenced and in Attachment A it refers to the submission of Environmental Protection, which, that is not me. Ken Small: No, no you're looking at the Agreement in Principle; there are several other documents that are tied to that Agreement in Principle. One in particular is the Letter of Intent that is signed by Syracuse and my supervisor. A 17 page packet. Chris Smith: Ok. Well, I should take it up with your supervisor. Ken Small: I would suggest you do that. Chris Smith: But the bottom line is in the bylaws that we are currently proposing we don't mention anything in the bylaws about how to administer the grant funds. The grant funds come from a lead from the Department of Energy, which I believe is you and you work in conjunction with the Division of Emergency Management to administer the grant funds through grant guidance. The bylaws themselves are just simply how we organize our meetings and our bodies. Not how we administer the funds and it certainly has nothing to do with putting this in jeopardy of a termination. We're not cutting anybody out here, in our bylaws. We're describing how we're going to run the meetings. Ken Small: Okay, where in the documentation does it outline the schedule for the application process, the submittal of paperwork, the vouchers that the DOE does to NDEM, the expansion to other counties, beyond the 6 counties.

Chris Smith: Okay, great valid question, but those items don't belong in bylaws, those items belong in grant guidance. And that grant guidance should be developed in concert with the Department of Energy. The bylaws themselves do not dictate anything about grant guidance. Only the bylaws that are intended to organizing meetings and how we are going to proceed in our group and how we're going to have sub committees, how we're going to vote, who's going to be an officer, and who is going to provide administrative support. That is all our bylaws are intended to be. There's nothing in the bylaws that speak specifically to grant guidance. That's something we developed concurrently with the Department of Energy. Ken Small: Ok, chief. Do we have that grant guidance somewhere? Chris Smith: I believe the grant guidance we have is to be developed between you and our grants section. Rick Martin: Chief we currently have no guidance. We have the guidelines which are the attachments to the bylaws which is what we recommend we separate from the bylaws so we can work on those as right now we have several guidelines we'd like to work on those as for the grant administration. Ken Small: So that being said we have to have some kind of guidance, we have to have some protection in terms of how much we can fund, where it's going to, we have to make sure this goes to make the counties operational and it doesn't go to buy bullets for the sheriff's department or a new county courthouse. Chris Smith: So, I would charge this group to ask the Division and the Department of Energy to develop said guidance for the grant applications so that everybody can rest assured that that will not occur. But those documents and that element does not belong in bylaws.

Russ Peacock: I have a couple comments, this is a DOE program and the way the bylaws are set up all being run by you I think it should be in our bylaws that it is a shared responsibility and authority; if we go down through this, where the 1st paragraphs authority we put in there that the shared with DOE and DEM the purpose is you know, the recommendations are not just to the Chief but also to the DOE who is a co-chair of this thing is supposed to be, we spell that out in here so that it shows that they are on equal footing no one dictates to the other, it is a DOE program, you are administering it, the counties are the beneficiaries, and the membership needs to be in there just how is it the process probably it basically that it's ratified by the state and the DOE from our recommendations by you requesting, just like the citizens corp. Whatever, you say you know, county would like you to have representation on there and then you nominate then you ratify it. I think that would solve a lot of those things. Under the officers duties in that again, the appointment of the chair, I think the body should be able to vote on the chair and vice chair, annually or whatever that they spell it out, it's not necessarily you do it or you do it, and I think that is our rules and regulations for operating and I think we need to look at those kind of things for authority and the purpose and who we recommend who we make our recommendations to and who acts in the process for actually creating the membership. Chris Smith: I appreciate that and I certainly accept the change, that the body should vote on the chair. That is not an issue to me in the least. I believe it's going to require some conversations with the Department of Energy if they want to engage in a state committee bylaw because they have authority as well. Because we, actually, as State Administrative Agents are assigning us authority to administer this grant and by them becoming a member of that and having said authority would put them in another legal position that they may not want to be in. Rick Martin: Go ahead Russ. Diane's leaving, I'm sorry. Russ Peacock: I would make a motion that we table this for one more meeting, put it on the agenda, go back and look at the authorities in the original agreements with what the position is of DOE and DEM, be able to look at the authority and the purpose and the recommendations of the membership process and including the voting on the chairman, but I think that most of us county guys are comfortable, that it's either you or DEM or the co-chair that are running the meetings just because the staff and those kind of things but I think we kept pushing this off and we want to get the bylaws but we also want to make sure that's the rules we can live with and that we're all comfortable with so my motion is that we table it for one more meeting and go look at those 3 or 4 issues. Rick Martin: Can we get to Mr. Stevers concern before we get a motion on that? Sophia Long ...I'm sorry he made a motion. Rick Martin: Okay, and also to qualify that we had a member leave but we still have quorum. 4 or 5. There was a motion; would you like to restate it? - That we table it for one more the bylaws that we table until we try to come to some sort of conclusion between the Department of Energy and the Emergency Management on guidance. Chris Smith: I'd like to get clarity on the specifics of what his motion is, what he's looking for. Rick Martin: Okay, thank you. Russ Peacock: Okay, this is Russell Peacock for the record, White Pine county, I move that we table a discussion and approval for the Emergency (Preparedness) Working Group Bylaws for one more meeting that in the interim we talk that we have DOE and DEM get together, review the Agreement in Principle, the letters of intent, all the package that was created this in the first place, that we look then what the authority is, we quote that, we think that it should be a shared responsibility, because it is a DOE program, DEM does have the administrative requirement to administer drawn down to the counties right now, that then we make our, you know we look at the purpose and mission and where we are making our recommendations to the co-chairs, not just to whoever the chief designates. Also in our membership, we uh, what was that on the membership. Ken Small: Proxy. Russ Peacock: I think we kind of wait and see what happens with the law but and then the other thing was the officers duties that the committee elects annually its chair and co-chair, or vice chair. So that's my motion. Rick Martin: Okay, so we have a motion on the floor, is there a 2nd Rick Stever: 2nd. Rick Martin: Rick Stevers 2nd. All those in favor please indicate by saying "Aye". (Chris smith asked something and couldn't understand due to coughing) Rick Martin: Any comments for discussions. Rick Stevers (?) : Not on that particular motion no. Rick Martin: Okay, all in favor please say "Aye". All. Rick Martin: All opposed? None Motion carried. Mr. Stevers. Rick Stevers: I have a question on the bylaws in general. There's been a lot of discussion in the last year about the bylaws. I've never heard any determination as to why they need to be changed. The recent bylaws have the DOE scope

of the program and the table of contents in place with DOE's obligation and what they're trying to perform and DEM's obligation on what they're doing. It's already been established and I don't know why we need to change them.

Rick Martin: I'll take the first stab at that. The bylaws also have appendices in them that need to be updated, and upgraded. And also the bylaws need to be updated to accommodate changes within the state of Nevada, the meeting law as well. But it has a document attached to it, AIP that expired. I think the most current date on it is a 2007. It also is a guideline and guidance document. Personally I think those should be separated, the guidance and guidelines and the agreement between the Division of Emergency Management and the Department of Energy should be discussed as a separate document because it outlines our roles and responsibilities as the agency and how to take care of the EPWG programmatically and financially through the Division of Emergency Management. Now the bylaws are framework of this group and how it operates and those I think should be updated as well. And if you take the old bylaws and new bylaws and do a comparison, actually the new bylaws contain a lot of the information from the existing bylaws; it takes a couple of the items from there verbatim and switches it over to the new bylaws. It still has the articles in there; the basic component is the framework of this body and not the overall administration of the grant program. And I think that's why they should be separate.

Ken Small: Let me, let me clarify. DOE, there's a little bit of confusion there, not to correct Rick, there's an AIP that's Agreement in Principle between DOE and the State of Nevada, on that AIP there's 3 state agencies that are on it, Department of Health, NDEM and Division of Environmental Protection. That's the major big document that administers this. There's a tier underneath there and that little section that the chief read from is a part of that Agreement in Principle. Referenced in that AIP are the letter of intent that are part of the bylaws and the bylaws by themselves. If these bylaws go away, that Agreement in Principle isn't being fulfilled by the State or DOE so I have to deal with that document and 2 other state agencies. Now, in these bylaws there's a Letter of Intent the DEM signed and DOE signed. These are your responsibilities, these are my responsibilities. The counties need to do this; the counties need to do that. Also in these bylaws, are the appendices that make up that whole application form like here's what the scope is for, here's the equipment you can buy, here's how we're going to prioritize the projects the bylaws that NDEM has proposed gets rid of all that. Okay, so what authority does anybody in the EPWG have to prioritize to provide the funding, any of that stuff. So that's how the documents are tiered. Does that explain or help explain it all? I mean you kind of have to know the ten year history or 12 year history behind all these documents. That AIP is renegotiated every 5 years. It allows DOE to fund NDEM separately than this project too so... Was that complicated? Loretta Smith: I have a comment; if the AIP does expire every 5 years and it renews then certainly the Bylaws can be done at the same time and should probably follow the same schedule. Not only that, but we discussed the bylaws for almost as many quarters as I've been involved with the EPWG, we were near resolution, and it was pointed out by our former deputy attorney general that the appendices do not indicate or provide insight as to how we operate or work and does not belong in the bylaws. Certainly as you indicated, it does provide direction on how we want to operate and that could be handled by some guidance provided by DOE on the federal grant. Ken Small: Well, I appreciate the Attorney General but they're not DOE attorney. I mean we have our own set of attorneys we have to answer to. You are right Loretta, the AIP is renewed every 5 years, the current one we have I believe goes all the way till 2016, but it references these bylaws, letter of intent, and all of the attached appendices that make up the application process. I can't just get rid of them. Chris Smith: we're not suggesting that we do get rid of them, I don't believe anybody, I mean clearly I am not suggesting that we get rid of the application process and all of the grant guidance that comes along with it, it just does not belong in the bylaws. It belongs in grant guidance, appendix in the bylaws. Ken Small: Okay, so we put together, to try to be cooperative we put together some grant guidance and submitted it to NDEM about a year ago. Bud Marshall: It's in draft and is not complete. Ken Small: And that's where it sits.

Chris Smith: I'm sorry you guys cut out, I did not hear you. Ken Small: I said we put together a draft grant guidance at Buds request and sent it up to you about a year ago, and it's just there. Kelli Anderson: Kelli Anderson for the record. I actually read that document; I've been managing grants for years. Grant guidance is specific instructions from a federal agency on how state agencies to run their pass through and that document clearly isn't grant guidance. Ken Small: Let me clarify why that is Kelli, DOE is a completely different agency and it has no grant values to give to people like me. I've tried to find it and they go "oh whatever you want to do". It's kind of scary. Chris Smith: Which is our intent. Even though that is scary, we want to nail that down. Kelli Anderson: And also to add, you know, when the chief was kind of reflecting on the documents that is attached to those bylaws currently, you know, it is a little unnerving that we don't have a document so that when an auditor does come in, that we can prove that we followed all of the steps and intentions of the DOE. I mean we can provide the AIP, we can provide the documents that we have signed, but we don't have any grant guidance to say it's okay to buy a tower or its okay to buy these things . All we have is a document for a group that met bylaws, saying that you guys voted on it. So it's not just about, and I'm not bringing in my other grant programs but I have managed more grant programs than just Homeland Security. So I'm just saying it's extremely important for grant people and fiscal people and taking out the programmatic piece of it that we have some clear guidance from a federal agency to a state agency then forward to a local agency that says you can do all these things but you can't do these things. And it should be a separate, independent document, it should not be comingled with state practices, its federal guidance to a state agency, our names should not appear in that document. That way when an auditor, Kafoury Armstrong, the independent auditor , GAO, OIG, anyone walks into this office or stops in our office in Carson City and says we want to see this grant program , we hand it over and say this is the guidance and these are the documents we signed. It's protection for our agency as well as the federal government and as well as our local jurisdictions. Because being a pass through agency, that's our job. Our job is to ensure that our counties are safe and that when we reimburse something we can absolutely say that it's compliant and there are no issues. Because the GAO and the OIG can both come in outside of DOE and say you know what you're not following the rules. It's all about just making sure every agency is protected and that's why we want guidance and I think it would make everyone feel more comfortable especially when were heading into audits. So that's my opinion and I do not believe it should be part of bylaws it should be an independent document, I've never seen it apart and I know this is a grant program like no other but we all have to understand that we call it an agreement, an agreement, an agreement , I get that; but when you look at the document it says grant award, so it is a grant, and is covered under the Code of Federal Regulations, so I'm just putting that out there to go on the record, I would prefer a grant guidance from DOE that has the state of Nevada left out of it. And tell us what we can or cannot do. I'll take a shot at it but I can't do it alone, I have to, I'll take the document and revise it the way I think it should read but it's really about DOE telling the state of Nevada, not the State of Nevada telling DOE or the State of Nevada writing a document . It's protection on both sides of the house. And that's all.

Chris Smith: I'd like go ahead and say that we have a commitment then, we will go ahead and give it a shot , but I also, given that we have a motion and a 2nd to look at authority intent, co-chairs membership, the way that we elect the chairs , vice chairs, that we will do so, move forward, and come together with a report to identify in the next meeting but in that timeframe we will work closely with Mr. Small, and the rest of the Department of Energy to get to the bottom of this for the good of everybody. This agenda item will slowly disappear. Russ Peacock: Slowly disappear...Rick Martin: I think Bud had a comment. Bud Marshall: Just for the record Bud Marshal DEM, back in September 2009 when DOE and DEM met together in Las Vegas to address issues with EPWG, it was agreed upon then and that's where the wording came from for the current AIP that DEM would administer the program and that DOE had agreed that they'd develop a program guidance issued by them to the state. That did not happen over a period of time, that's the reason we began to movement afoot to say the current bylaws need to be split out and that's why we took that initiative underway and that over a period of time I met with Ken who helped build and develop that program guidance and although it's a draft and it was the first cut at it, it's not a

done deal; it's not completed but DOE is still supposed to provide DEM that grant guidance as Kelli has re-iterated that tells the state what we can and cannot do because if we're supposed to administer it, were supposed to follow guidelines and rules. Ken: I don't remember that being part of the conversation in terms of the meeting. Ken Small: Bud, I've never heard of that before. Bud Marshall: That's the reason why I took the approach to work with you to begin to develop that missing piece, taking all of the elements that were just as fine and working fine in the past and taking them out of the bylaws where they don't belong and putting them in a separate document. Just for the record I wanted to bring up that point to you. Rick Martin: Thank you. And that covers the guidance and that means were going to work in coordination working on guidance but what about bylaws? Is there a proposal? (Can't understand what anyone said because of coughing; is there a motion? There is already one. Rick Martin: The table of bylaws. Are you guys going to provide us input on what you'd like to see in these bylaws? (Can't understand what everyone said due to all speaking at once) Vance Payne: You can count on me. Rick Martin: Okay any other discussion on item or bylaws? Okay let's move onto agenda item #10 public comments.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT Rick Martin: Any public comments in the North? Chris Smith: No public comment in the north. Rick Martin: Any public comment in the south? Yes sir. Russ Peacock: Does DEM have a table of organization, that we know who in the counties were supposed to contact for certain projects? You guys make decisions and appoint people up there. I have no idea who your employees are, I get an email on certain things, but you know, I don't know who's in charge of what and who's the point of contact, if I have to submit a travel voucher who it goes to for which project and it's a little discerning when you're one person and we talk about being 2 places at once we can't, but at the same time I get a lot of agendas come out the day before I'm traveling or things for the meeting the next day, you know and it's frustrating and then to say oh yeah just call in and well take care of it. It bothers me. So we need to know out in the counties who you are how you're organized and who we contact. Chris Smith: You can find out who does what at the Division on our website. Russ Peacock: Oh, you have a website now huh? That's current? Ooh, that's new! Kelli Anderson: It's been out for about 6 months. It tells you the names, the contacts, what the programs are. Sophia Long: And just real quick, just for future reference, the public comments is for the public,.. Russ Peacock: ..so should I walk out the door and come back.. Sophia Long: .., if you want to ask Loretta or Kelli or so if group members have comments ... Russ Peacock: do we have a date for the next meeting? Sophia Long (?): We should put in an agenda item for group member comments, so that are separate from public comments.

Rick Stever: Rick Stever Lincoln County, I was approached with an idea or some information that more waste was going to be heading to the test site. We understand this low level program is dwindling, but an indication has been made that there is some stuff heading for the test site and DEM or the state was going to receive a substantial amount of money. I was wondering if there was any indication of that or how that's going to be handled, if it is going to be dwindled down, trickled down to the counties or what. Chris Smith: Is that an agenda item? Kelli Anderson: No, public comments. Do we have an answer for that chief? Chris Smith: I don't have any answers but I think that the request of a board member would put it on the agenda we can certainly do that and try to answer that.

Ken Small: I can just give you an answer right now if you'd like. Is that okay chief? Chris Smith: I'm not the AG. Public comment is meant for the public to make comments and that is it, but if you want to go ahead and provide an answer from Attorney General... Russ Peacock: Ah, that's gamesmanship. Kelli Anderson (?): I think that's it's either a yes or a no. and without. Ken Small: I can answer it and I respect the Attorney General, but I'll answer as a DOE person, he asked me as a regular government employee, so as the public I'll answer for you okay. There are several new waste streams that are coming to the test sites, there's certain bonds within the state of Nevada (could not hear due to coughing). The question is if the state of Nevada has the legal authority to say no, you can't take that. It's DOE's opinion yes we can take that, however we want to try to be good neighbors, such as the EPWG program, and if that waste

stream does come to the test site, that money will come through and benefit the EPWG. There have been several articles about it in the newspaper; all you have to do is read the newspaper. But this is, some of it is classified and we can't go too far with the answers, but there's possibility it could open up other waste streams and other types of waste as well. Does that help, Rick?

Rick Stevers: Yep. Ken Small: So, yes, it is being discussed, with the Governor and a number of other people. I'd like to add one other thing too Rick. Rick Martin: Is that okay, Miss Attorney General. Sophia Long: No, but... Ken Small: It's in general to the EPWG. Russ Peacock: You guys are getting wrapped around the axle here. Ken Small: Who, me? Russ Peacock: No, the AG's office. With what our purpose and what we can do. Ken Small: I'd like to add one other thing, please. Russ Peacock: To have action it's got to be on the agenda, it doesn't have to be on the agenda if its comments and information. I don't know why people get wrapped around the axle on that. Sophia Long: But the comments and information need to be an agenda item. Russ Peacock: No they don't. Sophia Long: Most of your general stuff is for discussion and action.

Chris Smith: Lets end the meeting, then Mr. Small can make a comment. Ken Small: It's not a comment it's an offer. Rick Martin: Okay Chief, and then we'll talk about dates as well because that's not on the agenda. Alright do I have a motion to adjourn? Vance Payne: I'll make the motion. Russ Peacock: I'm leaving; you don't have a quorum no more. Rick Martin: Do I have a 2nd? Vance: 2nd. Rick Martin: Vance Payne. All those in favor please say "Aye". All: I. Rick Martin: All opposed. Ken, are you opposed? Ken: No, are we done yet. Rick Martin: We are done. Ken Small: Okay, I'd like to extend an offer to everybody, Esmeralda county is not here but hopefully they'll get the word, and Chief, this is for you as well. At one time you had expressed interest in seeing a tour of the security site, I got approval from my supervisor to offer that tour again to the emergency managers, the NDEM anybody that would like to come, I just need a date from you all to, because I have to charter a bus and get a tour guide and all that other stuff. You're more than welcome to bring other county people with you within reason please, I mean I only have one bus so start thinking of a date when you'd like to come. And let me know, that's all I got. Vance Payne: you're not particular to the month? Ken Small: Would you rather go in August? Vance Payne: I'd much rather go in early May. Ken Small: Let me know ... Vance Payne: ...call me silly but. Chris Smith: I'd like to advise everybody and Madam Attorney General, correct me here if I'm wrong, but if we all attend a tour that constitutes a quorum then subsequently we would have to agendize that tour is that correct? Sophia Long: No, because if you're just taking a tour, you just put in the tour information. Chris Smith: And even though we may be discussing items that would refer to this body, we don't have to worry about that? Sophia Long: I personally don't see a problem with that, I don't see that the group members are going to discuss... Chris Smith: Thank you. Russ Peacock: Are you throwing out an approximate date and time? Rick Martin: Yeah maybe. And this is something I did forget to agendize but it's the next date, because we pushed this so late its May 15th, do you want to push that into the next quarter which is August 21st.. Russ Peacock: Lets push it into June and that's when we're starting to get all the guidance and stuff to be processed anyways. Rick Martin: Okay I'll get back to you. Ken Small: Fair enough. You said June? Rick Martin: Well that was the suggestion by Russ. So I'll send them out when I get back to the office.