DRAFT MEETING MINUTES – For approval at the 3/12/19 RC Meeting

Meeting Minutes
Resilience Commission

Attendance		
	DATE	February 19, 2019
	TIME	9:00 A.M.
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management State Emergency Operations Center 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701
	METHOD	Video-Teleconference
	RECORDER	Karen Hall

Commission Member Attendance

Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Caleb Cage	X	Melissa Friend	X	Connie Morton	X
John Steinbeck	X	Mike Heidemann	X	Todd Moss	X
Roy Anderson	X	Eric Holt	X	Shaun Rahmeyer	X
Solome Barton	X	David Hunkup	X	Andy Rasor	X
Bunny Bishop	X	Jeremy Hynds	X	Carlito Rayos	X
Felix Castagnola	X	Kacey KC	Abs	Misty Robinson	X
Bart Chambers	X	Aaron Kenneston	X	Jim Seebock	Abs
James Chrisley	Abs	Graham Kent	X	Rachel Skidmore	Abs
Cassandra Darrough	X	Annette Kerr	X	Corey Solferino	Abs
Craig dePolo	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Malinda Southard	X
Michael Dietrich	Abs	Chris Lake	Abs	Mike Wilson	X
Dave Fogerson	Abs	Bob Leighton	X	Stephanie Woodard	Abs
Jeanne Freeman	X	Carolyn Levering	X		

Legal Representative	Entity	Present
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney General	Nevada Attorney General's Office	X

Analyst/Support Staff	Entity	Present
Karen Hall	Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North	X
Meagan Werth-Ranson	Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North	X
Paul Burke	Nevada Division of Emergency Management – North	X
Robert Plant	Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North	X
Kendall Herzer	Nevada Division of Emergency Management - South	X

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chief Caleb Cage, Division of Emergency Management (DEM), called the meeting to order. Roll call was performed by Meagan Werth-Ranson, DEM. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chief Cage opened discussion for public comment in all venues. Public comment was not provided in the Carson City, Las Vegas, or Elko venues.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chief Cage called for a motion to approve the draft minutes from the December 11, 2018, Commission meeting. A motion to approve the minutes as presented with the clarification of the correct document reviewed was presented by Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, and a second was provided by Carlito Rayos, Las Vegas Valley Water District. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Review of Current Resilience Commission Bylaws

Chief Cage provided a review of the current Commission bylaws and opened discussion on any changes required at this time. Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas, spoke to Senate Bill (SB) 35, and should the Resilience Advisory Committee be put into statute, would these bylaws apply in that case. Per Chief Cage, if codified, substantive changes would be made if necessary. No other comments were provided, nor any changes made to existing Commission bylaws. The bylaws will be reviewed again in April 2019 per the quarterly requirement.

5. Update on Current Efforts Applied to the Emergency Management Strategic Plan and Development of Resilience Goals and Objectives

Chief Cage provided the Commission with an update to efforts being applied to the Emergency Management Strategic Plan and development of resilience goals and objectives. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion is as follows:

- Definition of Resilience, the State Resilience Goal, and Resilience Objectives;
- Next steps to be taken in the process to include incorporation of both the Governor's and the Department of Public Safety's (DPS) strategic planning frameworks, development of a resilience specific vision statement, strategies and milestones for objectives, method for implementation of the plan, a method and schedule for evaluation, maintenance, and revision of the plan, and a vote to approve these items during the March Commission meetings and afterwards; and
- Discussion on what a resilience cycle may look like, and the incorporation of the 100 Resilient Cities model.

Chief Cage called for comment on this update, and if the Commission would like to move forward with the process, goals, or objectives described. Dr. Kenneston thanked Chief Cage for his efforts on this initiative noting that all local jurisdictional plans roll up to the state and federal plans, so he is eager for this product to be finished in order to update his own plan. Dr. Kenneston motioned to approve the information as presented, with Carolyn Levering seconding the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously. Additional discussion ensued revolving around the 100 Resilient Cities approach and its history through former Governor Sandoval. Deputy Chief Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, encouraged the Commission to base how the state is doing against the goals listed on the outside of the model including preparedness efforts, monitoring, and evaluation. Though there has been tremendous change in Nevada's processes this past year, the state is still achieving these goals. Legislative changes, if approved, are still a ways out in implementation. Dr. Jeanne Freeman, Carson City Health and Human Services, indicated she was pleased with some of the changes she sees, but there is overlap in what's occurring within the public health realm. Dr. Graham Kent, University of Nevada Reno, also provided comment in liking the 100 Resilient Cities strategy. Carolyn Levering spoke to appreciating the New Jersey model, and that some of the goals may be outside the ability and scope of this Commission, suggesting that the Commission looks at what affects Nevada directly and participates in stakeholder outreach to achieve the goals presented. Chief Cage spoke to looking at those goals that fit the Commission's role as a way to define the scope of this initiative. Carlito Rayos spoke to not limiting movement in identifying any gaps or partnerships. Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke to the duality of needing both political leadership and private partnerships. Chief Cage and Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke conceptually of emergency management, public health, and other quality partnerships across the state bringing expertise to the table to address these important issues.

6. Update on the Outline of the 2019 Resilience Commission report

Chief Cage provided an update on the 2019 outline for the Resilience Commission Report. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- Efforts applied to the ongoing annual assessment and methodology of the assessment outline to include:
  - Part 1 – Provision of introduction/executive summary, overview to date on 2018 and 2019 activities, strategic plan and resilience goals and objectives, and legislative changes;
  - Part 2 – Overview calendar year activities including the statewide emergency management program, combined threat/hazard assessments, grant program overview, overview of statewide planning, training, and exercise programs, and an overview of statewide response and recover efforts;
  - Part 3 – Overview of 2020 and beyond activities to include recommendations for sustainment projects, policy changes, budget changes, and operational changes; and
  - Part 4 – Administrative components to include member biographies, acronym lists, and a glossary.

Chief Cage emphasized the lack of integration for numerous threat assessments, and the need to cross reference these assessments to truly identify what the threats look like statewide. Carlito Rayos spoke to Part II's goal, with Chief Cage indicating that he wants this information in the report for December 31, 2019. Mr. Rayos also is concerned on the prioritization of threats and current limitations to address such threats. If what the goal aims to do is to come up with the framework, it needs to remain flexible. Chief Cage indicated that once threats were identified, that identification would drive the following years work. Chief Cage also spoke to the goal of the THIRA in driving grants and preparedness for the following year. Lieutenant Andy Rasor, DPS Investigation Division, spoke to the combined threat and hazard assessments and the potential assistance with that endeavor from both fusion centers.

7. Briefing on Current Legislative Efforts Affecting the Statewide Resilience Strategy

Chief Cage briefed the Commission on current legislative efforts in support of the Statewide Resilience Strategy. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- An overview of Assembly Bill (AB) 71 and Senate Bills (SB) 15, 34, 35, 66, 67, 68, and 69 to include a summary of what each AB or SB aims to provide in addition to more in depth discussion on each bill presented.
- Questions were posed in relation to several bills during discussion to include:
  - SB15 - Carolyn Levering inquired how this bill affects the ability to use volunteers as resources (such as AmeriCorps). Deputy Chief Steinbeck spoke to Team Rubicon or another team giving direct assistance to homeowners or businesses in addition to intrastate mutual aid. Concern was presented on how volunteer organizations are paid for services in the new SB language, with Chief Cage indicating that the language is limited to policy and procedures, and most likely not administrative code. Because funding isn't available to apply to this action currently, the policies need to be put in place first. Ms. Levering spoke to previous legislative sessions and the issues with intent versus implementation;
  - SB34 – Chief Cage spoke to the intent of the bill allowing for the inclusion of accountability measures that go beyond money transfers. Discussion ensued on similarities between requirements under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 239C for agencies that receive grant funding through HSGP to provide a report to the NCHS and the transparency involved in that process;
  - SB35 – Chief Cage spoke to the statutory creation of the Resilience Advisory Committee and the work done through the Legislative Counsel Bureau. This proposed legislation calls for minor changes in membership and Commission duties, monthly meetings, an annual report, and specific goals and objectives under NRS 239C. Carolyn Levering spoke to the membership, and how statewide representation is sought in light of downsizing the

Commission to 34 members. Currently, the Commission bylaws indicate not more than 40 members are to be appointed to the Commission. Chief Cage spoke to the challenge of this issue, and working to find a solution to address this possible limitation. There is no issue raising the number of members through the amendment process moving forward. Ms. Levering also indicated that specific agencies are not called out as representatives on the body, with Chief Cage indicating that his preference is to keep the membership general in specific disciplines to provide maximum flexibility;

- SB66 – Chief Cage spoke to name change to the Disaster ID Coordination Committee. What this represents is essentially an EMAC function. Currently, DEM doesn't have such resources internally, but there are Duty Officers that coordinate resource needs. Jeremy Hynds, City of Henderson, inquired on clarifying if this committee is a deployable team or just a coordinating body. Per Chief Cage, it is both in concept, as a deployable asset through EMAC through a team that can work remotely. An example was given that should there be a mass casualty incident in Clark County, this committee could be activated, along with the plan, and can coordinate on the jurisdiction's behalf. Dr. Malinda Southard, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, presented concern if public health would participate in this at all as there are public health considerations. Currently, public health is not indicated as a member of the committee; however, Chief Cage indicated he is open to amending the membership to include public health;
- SB67 – Chief Cage spoke to including public health in the Nevada Tribal Emergency Coordinating Council as well. Eric Holt, Lincoln County, asked for clarification of counties to create the emergency management program, with Chief Cage indicating this could be placed under a subdivision of the county as an example;
- SB68 – Chief Cage spoke to his need to provide an update to Dr. Southard on this bill through NRS 415A. This bill allows for the provision of expedited granting of certain provisional registrations to volunteer providers of medical or veterinary services during an emergency declaration. There are significant changes that would need to happen to make this possible. What is current written in NRS 415A would need to be addressed, and is a minor change to that language; and
- SB69 – Chief Cage spoke to this bill formalizing October as Cybersecurity Awareness Month. Carlito Rayos inquired if any work was being done on the definition of a cyber event. Currently, Chief Cage indicated that he does not know if that definition is worked out in the bill or if any action is being undertaken to sort that out at this time. Mike Wilson, Clark County School District, spoke to several bills addressing similar plans.

**** Meeting break taken for 15 minutes at 11:00 a.m.; meeting resumed at 11:15 a.m. ****

8. Update on Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Project Proposals Requesting Use of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 Deobligated Funding

Kelli Anderson, DEM, briefed the Commission on the current deobligations for FFY 2016 in addition to the existing reobligation guidelines used by DEM in the management of grant funding. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- A presentation of FFY 2016 deobligations to include funding source, subgrantee, project name, original grant amount, deobligated amount, and pertinent information regarding each deobligation. The total original grant award for the 22 projects noted totaled $4,338,276, and total deobligations totaled $846,401.06. Additional discussion was presented on another deobligation that hasn't been reviewed yet resulting from a small deobligation from the CBRNE project for approximately $20,000. The remaining deobligations have been voted on and recommended for approval. Currently, federal approval is still pending;

- Chief Cage spoke to giving context to the deobligations including deobligation background, reasons for the deobligation, what percentage of the project funding was deobligated, and if the project deobligating funding was complete. Ms. Anderson indicated that those are complicated answers to provide in immediate fashion due to the lack of an automated grants management system and the necessity to pull manual files for historical background;
- Inquiry on the process of approval by Carolyn Levering to include possible Nevada Commission on Homeland Security approval in addition to federal approval. Ms. Anderson indicated that she is hopeful the federal approval will be granted within the week as the grant awards have already been uploaded preliminarily. Ms. Anderson indicated her preference to push out grant awards no, and push approval through the Finance Committee and recap the information for the NCHS. Additional concern was presented on the performance period requirements, with Ms. Anderson indicating that she would be asking for a 6-month extension but hoping for at least a 3-month extension granted to help out with the process; and
- Deputy Chief Steinbeck asked if this information could be provided on a regular basis for visibility, with Ms. Anderson indicating that she can provide this information as requested

9. Briefing on the Division of Emergency Management Reobligation Guidelines and Lessons Learned from the December 11, 2018, Resilience Commission Meeting on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Deobligation Requests

Chief Cage spoke to the lessons learned from the deobligation process this year, and a summary of the topics covered in that discussion are as follows:

- Kelli Anderson spoke to the current reobligation guidelines as they exist and were accepted by the NCHS in 2011. These guidelines are designed for the State Administrative Agent to follow in addressing grant funding issues and gives the SAA authority to maneuver through processes necessary for identification of deobligation, reobligation, and change requests as necessary;
- Overview of grant administration through DEM, advice received from historical and numerous advisory bodies, and challenges associated in complying with federal guidelines. Prior to the creation of this Commission, the Finance Committee would vet and approve funding requests based on merit, compliance, goals, gaps, and issues, and then it was pushed to NCHS for approval. This is the first time that another body will have advisory input in addition to Finance. Ms. Anderson emphasized her staff's work in collecting historical knowledge regarding their respective grant programs, and then went through the reobligation guidelines for visibility to the Commission.

Chief Cage instructed that the Commission review the existing reobligation guidelines and bring back to the next meeting any advisory comments or changes to the document.

10. UPDATE ON THE 2018 HAZARD MITIGATION ASSISTANCE (HMA) GRANT CYCLE

Janell Woodward, DEM, provided an update on the 2018 HMA grant cycle in addition to the Commission being presented with an example of a local mitigation project. A summary of the topics covered in this agenda item are as follows:

- Discussion on the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) Post Fire application ranking that was due to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) by January 24, 2019;
- Discussion on the Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Application presentations due to FEMA by January 31, 2019. As of January 16, 2019, 14 projects were submitted and ranked totaling $3,576,474.72 which exceeded the available grant funding allotment of $3,400.062. The overage in

requests was included in the ranking to account for possible FEMA revisions or downgrades in acceptable project funding requests.

- A presentation by Brian Heller, Assistant Director, City of Reno Public Works, on the Reno City Hall Seismic Upgrade Project led by Miyamoto International to include the project's background, seismic history, analysis of three scenarios to include existing building, addition of seismic dampers at and above the 8th floor, and adding dampers to all floors. Additional information provided included preliminary analysis in each scenario involving life safety and immediate occupancy, and estimated costs of the project totaling $5,300,000.

Carolyn Levering inquired on the ranking process this year, with Ms. Woodward indicating the process involved the 5% initiative and putting those projects at the top in addition to then using FEMA's form process to rank each application according to how the information was presented. Opportunity was given to ask questions and provide additional information. The decision on ranking was based on what is considered the best project for the funding presented as sometimes there is a difference in what is considered versus what is allowable when it reached the federal level. Ms. Levering inquired if the decision was consensus based, with Ms. Woodward indicating that was the case. Annette Kerr, Elko County, inquired on when to expect hearing back from FEMA on their decision, with Ms. Woodward indicating that there may be a delay due to the recent government shutdown. FEMA has been looking through the applications, but PDM is currently the priority at the federal level. Ms. Woodward will let stakeholders know the status of the applications. Dr. Kenneston inquired on how the process will work moving forward, and Kelli Anderson indicated that this process should be handled the same way as the previous Homeland Security Working Group reviews HSGP project requests, whether that process entails a subcommittee of the Commission or at the purview of the full Commission during the next cycle.

Due to time constraints, a planned presentation by the State Public Works Division on the Marlette Lake Dam Resilient Infrastructure Project, Hobart Reservoir Dam Advance Assistance, and Reno Purchasing Warehouse Emergency Generator Project was not heard with the apologies of the Co-Chairs.

11. Overview of the Nevada Earthquake Safety Council (NESC) Historical Roles and Responsibilities

Dr. Craig dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, presented an overview of the NESC's historical roles and responsibilities. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- An overview of Nevada's earthquake threats, occurrence and magnitude, and historical data involving more than 25 communities as well as 15 out of 17 Nevada counties with documented earthquake damage;
- Emphasis on the fact that earthquakes are about consequences more than probability of occurrence;
- The history behind the creation of NESC and important initiatives throughout the early history entwined in that history including the 1996 Planning Scenario for a Major Earthquake in Western Nevada, the 1996 Proceedings of a Conference on Seismic Hazards in the Las Vegas Region, and the 1997 Basin and Range Province Seismic Hazards Summit;
- Emphasis on earthquake preparation and structural hazards;
- Discussion on NESC Awards in Excellence, accomplishments, and significant historical events including the 2000 Nevada Earthquake Calendar, 2001 Post-Earthquake media scripts, Nevada Earthquake Safety Act of 2003, and a joint meeting with the Utah Seismic Safety Commission in 2007;
- Publication examples surrounding earthquake preparedness including the Living with Earthquakes in Nevada guide, the 2004 Effective Nonstructural Mitigation Strategies for Earthquakes in Nevada, the 2007 Western States Seismic Policy Council Annual Conference addressing the future of earthquake safety in the United States;

- Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology compendium of earthquake-related investigations surrounding the 2008 Wells, Nevada earthquake and lessons learned;
- Unreinforced Masonry building inventory in Nevada in 2011-2012 including residential, commercial, and State assets in addition to information on the draft Final Report of the Committee on Unreinforced Masonry Buildings of the NESC;
- Headwind changes that have diminished the NESC's ability to address earthquake-related necessities for the state;
- Dr. Kent emphasized concern over the importance of operational resiliency and the ability to perform outreach. Earthquakes are difficult to mitigate, and without necessary camera and seismic networks in addition to reliance on California facility's equipment, the system is fundamentally non-resilient. Discussion ensued on the loss of funding, difficulties of obtaining funding through the university, and with obtaining legislative support;
- Discussion on the Department of Energy (DOE) and California utilities funding seismic projects in Nevada, and Dr. Kent urging that ongoing funding for any earthquake initiatives in Nevada is threatened by the loss of this support. Dr. Kent pointed out that Oregon funds earthquake initiatives at approximately $12M, and California funds it's initiatives at approximately $15M in addition to utilities funding. Nevada's seismic lab received $0 in funding from the Legislature;
- Discussion on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) request for the need of earthquake early warning initiatives in large urban areas, and should Nevada be able to participate in that request, could make the state the 4th in the nation for earthquake early warning adaptation resulting in resilience; and
- Possible state partnerships to provide additional funding as the previous structure of NESC was not able to make that happen.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired on the federal desire to have large urban areas in Nevada participate in earthquake early warning, and what is being asked of these counties in supporting that initiative. Dr. Kent spoke to several reports involving planning for implementation of earthquake early warning to include where seismic gear should be placed, data flow, customer messaging for citizens and visitors, and inclusion of costs. Historically, the federal government has borne much of the cost of implementation, but other states have put forth large blocks of funding. Although Nevada's rural communities need this type of system, the larger urban centers may be more of an interest with this type of initiative. Additional discussion ensued on timelines and the heavy lift involved in such a project.

12. Overview of the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) Roles and Responsibilities

Chief Bart Chambers, Nevada State Fire Marshal's Office, provided an overview of the SERC including its historical roles and responsibilities. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- An overview of SERC's mission statement to protect the citizens of Nevada against negative effects of hazardous materials and terrorism thru efforts in planning, training, hazardous chemical inventory reporting, and toxic chemical release reporting and notification;
- The Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (SARA) signed into law in 1986 establishing requirements for federal, state and local governments, and industry regarding emergency planning and community right to know reporting regarding hazardous chemicals. This Act required the governors of each state to designate a SERC, and in 1987, the Commission on Hazardous Materials was designated as the Nevada SERC;
- Grants associated with the SERC to include Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP), SERC Operational, Planning, Training, and Equipment (OPTE), and United We Stand (UWS).

Chief Chambers spoke to an upcoming conference in Reno from May 6th through 9th as an excellent opportunity for Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPC) and other stakeholders regarding hazardous materials training. Kelli Anderson, DEM, inquired on how funds obtained through UWS are leveraged against other funding sources such as the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) to ensure visibility on dual-funding. In light of ongoing resilience activities and ensuring there is consistency and continuity on the funding map, Ms. Anderson indicated that she would like to work with Chief Chambers to coordinate this information between DEM and SERC. Carolyn Levering spoke to her current position as the Chair of the Clark County LEPC, and her interest in understanding how funds have been historically distributed in addition to the ongoing challenges and limitations with the current process. Emphasis was placed on funding cycles and urban community size and the resulting funding dilemma to effectively put forth significant and meaningful projects. Mr. Chambers indicated that there have been discussions in SERC to increase allocations, and ongoing concerns of oversight efforts applied to individuals or companies that have not paid fees. Ms. Levering inquired on the possibility of flat funding instead of fee generation, with Chief Chambers indicating that would be up to SERC, but there is the potential of rural communities not getting funding in lieu of larger urban areas. Additional discussion ensued on the fact that larger counties with more resources require more training, and in the same fashion, smaller counties are now booming with large technology areas or mining leading to the possibility of moving to a scenario-based need structure. Dr. Kenneston spoke in agreeance that oversight on fee payments presented additional stress on the system. Additional inquiry was presented on the revenue status of the UWS license plates, with Chief Chambers indicating that the revenue stream for this particular grant ebbs and flows, but overall the proceeds have declined over the course of the last 5-7 years. Annette Kerr, Elko County Emergency Manager, spoke to mining and infrastructure, and if there is any consideration that SERC grants be managed by DEM. Chief Chambers indicated that there has been dialog regarding that issue, and the current opinion is that SERC resides under the Department of Public Safety and sits with the Fire Marshal's office. Last year, staff was directed to audit SERC, HMEP and UWS. Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired on the appetite to consolidate administration and reporting requirements should funding allocations not be addressed. Chief Chambers indicated that this type of initiative would have to come from SERC. Currently, SERC is awarded $365,000 statewide, and only $102,000 is expended. Similarly, with UWS, $430,000 is awarded, and $117,000 expended. If the goal is to increase funding, and there is a hazardous materials incident where agencies can use contingency funds, the grant funds go away.

13. Presentation on the Drug Threat Assessment Involving Statewide Opioid Issues

Lieutenant Andy Rasor, DPS Investigations Division, presented the Commission with information pertaining to recent drug threat assessment findings involving statewide opioid issues. A summary of the topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- Opioid-related overdose deaths by drug category for Nevada residents from 2010-2018;
- Top drug threats in 2018 to include heroin, fentanyl, and methamphetamines;
- Data and information exchange between law enforcement, first responders, healthcare providers, and public health;
- Community preparedness plans to include emergency management and public health preparedness, release of plans, funding for opioid overdose community preparedness for all Nevada counties, and data and information sharing between public health and law enforcement. Additionally, the identification of real-time overdose mapping system to track pre-spike, during-spike, and post-spike overdose trends, stakeholder identification, selections of leaders to drive the process, and a clear definition of a spike entails; and
- An overview of the Overdose Detection Mapping Application Program (ODMap) process developed by the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) to track overdoses and spikes, provide surveillance of known or suspected drug overdose events in nearly real-time, and allowing participating agencies to collect and store suspected overdose events in a geocode format.

Dr. Freeman presented concern on Assembly Bill (AB) 38 penalties to first responder information reporting. Preparedness plans indicate primary entry responsibility for ODMap, and the concern on which person that duty would be allocated. Lt. Rasor added additional concern that if a misdemeanor is applied, what would that process look like in the context of the discussion. Carolyn Levering inquired if this is the only mechanism in which this information is being reported, and spoke to First Watch as an example of another avenue similar information may be collected. Additional discussion ensued regarding the lack of legislative requirement to use ODMap, and that not all agencies are currently using that platform.

14. Overview of Nevada Preparedness Efforts

Jim Walker, DEM, provided an overview on state level goals for planning, training, and exercise efforts. A summary of topics covered in this discussion are as follows:

- An overview of the 2018 Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR) process emphasizing the changes in the 2018 process and identified gaps as a result of both processes.
- For those gaps identified in the 2018 SPR, Mr. Walker requested the Commission's review of the information associated with the THIRA and SPR process with the goal of coming back to the next Commission meeting with input on the process.
- Mr. David Hunkup, Reno Sparks Indian Colony, inquired on the option for tribal communities to perform their own THIRA and SPR individually, and how the state would integrate such information. Mr. Walker indicated that if tribes did perform their own THIRA and SPR analysis, that information would be incorporated into the state's THIRA and SPR. Should tribal communities choose not to do that, the state would still perform outreach to those communities to obtain the information.

15. Public Comment

Chief Cage opened discussion for public comment. No public comment was presented in the Carson City, Las Vegas, or Elko venues.

16. ADJOURN

Chief Cage called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was presented by Carolyn Levering, and a second was presented by Carlito Rayos. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT