



NEVADA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORDINATING COUNCIL (EMCC)
State of Nevada
Regular Meeting Minutes – March 10, 2010

The regular EMCC meeting was called to order by EMCC Chairman O'Brien at 9:00 am. Chairman O'Brien noted that the meeting was posted and noted as required.

Stacy Gogo conducted roll call. Seven voting EMCC members were present:

Terry Bohl, Joe Curtis, Mike Cyphers, Carolyn Levering, Jim O'Brien, Jeffery Page, Russell Peacock.

A quorum was declared by Chairman O'Brien

EMCC members Stacey Giomi and Craig Nixon came in attendance after the roll call was performed.

EMCC members not present: Aaron Kenneston, Pat Jim.

DEM staff present: Kelli Baratti, Kamala Carmazzi, Elaine Fisher, Lawanda Fred, Stacy Gogo, Shelley Horton, Bud Marshall, Rick Martin, Pete Reinschmidt, Kiersten Sherve, Frank Siracusa, Valerie Sumner,

Co- Chair Page informed the participant of the meeting that a change to the agenda had been requested by DEM staff resulting in moving agenda item number five up to number one. There were no objections to the change.

AGENDA ITEMS

5) Work plan requirement for the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG), what are they and who sets them –Mike Cyphers (Discussion/Action)

M. Cyphers expressed his view that the work plan required for the EMPG had grown substantially from the original intent that it would address federal requirements, basic NIMS requirements and basic requirements of the EMPG program. He wanted to introduce the need for the work plan to be scaled back from its current state into something more reasonable. He referred to the requirement under point 4.3.2, on the current work plan, "Consequence Analysis", as well as 4.3.1 "Continuity of Operations" and noted that he had no intentions of taking this plan to his council and ask for the studies needed to be done to cover those points as there is no money available to do this.

On point 2.8.1 “Resource Management” he asked clear information on the usage of WebEOC Resource Manager or the IRIS, and whether the two systems are compatible.

C. Levering recalled that each Emergency Manager was asked to submit up to ten potential work plan items. When the work plan was returned back a couple of things she requested were on there and a whole lot of things that she was not prepared for were on there as well. C. Levering questioned how she was supposed to identify accomplishments against a work plan dated back to October 1, 2009 when she did not see the actual plan before February 2010? She raised the question: “When I need to get reimbursed for quarter October through December and I am supposed to submit what I accomplished in the work plan that I was unaware of until February, how am I supposed to reconcile that? Am I supposed to submit a quarterly report that shows expenditure against the program but zero progress against the work plan?”

C. Levering recognized the need to complete work against the work plan to meet the Federal Grant Requirements, but noted that it is not possible to spend the grant money linked to the grant program if a work plan does not exist until months after the fact. The present situation is putting everyone at a real disadvantage.

Chairman O’Brien commented that the present situation was hard to explain to an auditor. He suggested that there may be a need to make the program independent of the funding stream, and then figure out where the funding stream comes in to support the program in the calendar.

P. Reinschmidt agreed with comments made by the EMCC members about the first quarter. He suggested starting the process a lot earlier in the future. He drew the attention to the decision at the EM conference in 2007 that the local jurisdiction wanted to be able to choose what was on their work plan. That is the decision DEM has been trying to follow since then. He pointed out that DEM is open to offers on to better methods on how to do this, to avoid confusion in the future.

Frank Siracusa agreed with the need to simplify the work plan and reporting and make it user friendly. He encouraged the EMCC to put together a process to develop a work plan that works for all. There are reporting requirements that DEM has to abide by but he believed the process could be streamlined and made easier.

C. Levering recalled that work plans used to be individual to the program. You sent in work plans items that were work plan items from your jurisdiction and everybody else had their own work plans. She was not expecting that when she submitted the projected needs for this year that the needs from her jurisdiction would end up on a statewide plan and be imposed on everyone else.

C. Levering asked some clarification: “Do we get our own individual work plan as we go back in time and say this is what I accomplished quarter one **that is** on the work plan, this is what I accomplished quarter one that **is not** on the work plan and moving forward making sure that the work plan is individual meeting the needs of my community?”

P. Reinschmidt agreed to go ahead with individual work plans.

Co-Chair Page raised questions about the idea of the jurisdiction's work plan being tied to the EMAP standards? He expressed concern that if the jurisdiction could not meet the work plan they could get in trouble with the auditors.

P. Reinschmidt commented that the work plan is between the local government and the State. The work plan is what the jurisdiction can accomplish with the funding that DEM is providing .DEM is required by guidance on its work plan as a state to the federal authority to follow those standards. The guidance suggests that an assessment be conducted, and if that assessment is independent, to use the EMAP standards. The State uses the EMAP standards in order to work towards accreditation.

He suggested to the EMCC members that if they are running a program, to have some kind of guidance on how to assess themselves in what they need to accomplish. They could then use that assessment to tell the state if it fits the criteria of building or sustaining their emergency management program.

Chairman O'Brien suggested that since there has been a consolidation of the Homeland Security function into the Department of Public safety and Division of Emergency Management it would be reasonable for the two to follow the same processes. He noted that there is a Homeland Security Working Group process for doing capability assessment and doing the development of project identification to close gaps against capabilities. He suggested rolling all the issues into one consolidated process just like it was done organizationally. He encouraged all to look at where the capabilities are and find out where to attach those to the EMAP standards. That would result in an Integrated Emergency Management System that is not doing something different than the Homeland Security working group progress.

P. Reinschmidt suggested to the emergency managers to write down what they worked on in October through December. Based on that, DEM will negotiate with each emergency manager individually to put a number of the activities that they plan to work on for the remainder of the year on the work plan. Those activities can then be related to the EMAP standards and document where possible.

C. Levering noted that EMPG is moving more towards EMAP standards in general and it may one day become a grant requirement, so it would be a good exercise to start laying the groundwork now.

R. Peacock requested that DEM let the jurisdictions know if they have certain priorities and are targeting specific EMAP standards that they would like to see the jurisdictions' support n their work plans.

P. Reinschmidt commented that DEM used to ask a planning event, a training activity and an exercise activity; standard things that emergency management does every year. However for this year it would be up to the emergency managers if they want to put those activities on their plan. He suggested the possibility to work on a process for next year collectively thought out by the EMCC with clear guidance on how to work in the future years on putting together a work plan.

Co-Chair Page motioned to recommend that the chief of DEM for the existing work plan process for 2010 – 2011 let each jurisdiction be allowed to develop their own work plan for submittal to and approval of NDEM for 2010/ 2011

EMCC will in 2010 /2011 develop a work plan process to be followed

C. Levering seconded the motion

Chairman O'Brien called for further discussions, no further discussion.

Chairman O'Brien called for the members to cast their vote, all voted in favor none opposed, the motion carried.

1) Consideration of the minutes for approval from the EMCC Regular Meeting –October 13, 2009, (Discussion/Action)

Motioned by C. Levering, seconded by M. Cyphers and J. Page no discussion, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

2) Consideration of the minutes for approval from the EMCC Special Meeting – January 13, 2010 (Discussion/Action)

Motioned by C. Levering, seconded by Joe Curtis, no discussion, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

3) Credentialing Plan implementation progress report from NDEM - Kelli Baratti (Discussion/Action)

Kelli Baratti explained that she had recently been directed by F. Siracusa and K. Carmazzi to take the work that the EMCC had done on the Nevada Credentialing Plan and move forward. Based upon that direction Bruce Van Cleemput was hired on to assist in the implementation of the plan. B. Van Cleemput has extensive experience in the area of credentialing and was instrumental in helping the Nevada Fire Chiefs' Association develop the Fire Mutual Aid Plan and the coordination of fire based resources across the state.

K. Baratti noted that the Credentialing Project was at phase one, a research phase during which also the NIMS Technical Advisory Committee was put together
K Baratti encouraged the EMCC to take a look at the distributed list of suggested NIMS Technical Advisory Committee members, a group of subject matter experts, and contact her if they knew of additional names that would be important to add to the list.

She explained that once the first phase of the project has been accomplished, then phase two and three will receive funding from the Homeland Security Commission if they feel that the progress made is acceptable.

K. Baratti also wanted to notify the EMCC that DEM has become a coordination center through the National Interagency Coordination Center System for Wild Land Fire.

Chairman O'Brien respectfully requested K Baratti to talk about the progress of the Credentialing Plan as described under the agenda item .He noted that the credentialing plan which was developed by the EMCC and adopted in September 2009 by the Homeland Security Commission, set a two year time frame. Six months, 25% of the timeframe, has elapsed. Chairman O'Brien requested to know whether a 25% progress was accomplished towards what the plan described. He expressed his concerns that it was probably not the case.

Chairman O'Brien noted that one of the first steps that were explicitly discussed in the Credentialing Plan was an assessment of each county's progress towards meeting various levels of ICS. So far he had not seen any progress towards that direction.

C Levering Commented on the technical advisory committee, and the need to add some expertise on the committee to research and decide upon the credentialing for the Nevada Broadcaster Association, and broadcasters as first responders. The credentialing efforts should include not only the reporters but also the technical personnel involved during and incident.

K. Baratti agreed to the importance of adding expertise in the area of broadcasters as first responders to the committee. To address Chairman O'Brien's concerns K. Baratti agreed to add on to phase one of the credentialing implementation plan an assessment of where the counties are currently at towards meeting various levels of ICS.

Chairman O'Brien commented that the EMCC has the oversight over the Credentialing Plan, and want it to be implemented according to the timeline established by the committee. In order to get there, he considered it important to look at the two year mark and work backwards to look at deliverables that need to be accomplished.

Co-Chair Page recommended the EMCC to look at the list of the NIMS Technical Advisory Committee members and make sure that all the disciplines and agencies were properly represented. In regards to Search and Rescue he pointed out that the sheriffs are the ones charged with Search and Rescue. He clarified the need for some local law enforcement Search and Rescue sheriffs to be on the list. J. Page recommended that either Washoe County or Clark County dedicated staff from their Search and Rescue teams to the committee. He also noted that the EMCC needs to provide K. Baratti with some names for the emergency management position on the committee.

Chairman O'Brien insisted that it will be essential to bring in people that represent the private sector to the committee.

4) Operations points of contact with counties –Jim O'Brien (Discussion/Action)

Chairman O'Brien reported that there has been an issue with the National Guard setting up exercises and going to individual agencies within counties to get their buy in. "The National Guard," he said, "is a state agency and as such needs to be working through DEM before they start arranging exercises in the local jurisdictions." He explained that it had caused big problems for the County Commissionaires, as they had have to respond to citizens' complaints about those activities, when the County Emergency Manager was not informed about the activities and could not answer the Commissionaires' questions.

Chairman O'Brien went on to refer to the Moapa Valley incident where individuals from DEM staff contacted the Incident Commander and supplemental agencies directly without contacting J. O'Brien. While he understood DEM trying to be helpful and needing to create visibility for the governor, he stressed that the purpose of the Emergency Management Office is to facilitate the coordination. He mentioned that some of the things that were being derived from the direct conversations DEM staff had with the people in the Moapa Valley incident

were just plain wrong, and there was no way for J. O'Brien to intercede and make them correct before the bad information was already passed around.

"The point is," he said, "to reemphasize the fact that you need to be contacting the Emergency Management Offices in the county if something is going on in the county. The County Emergency Managers do have visibility with the City Emergency Managers and Special District Emergency Managers. There is a coordination element and information management that needs to go on. We need to focus on the process of communication from emergency management to emergency management and not to Incident Commanders and incident command posts."

R. Peacock noted that he had had the same issues with the State Health Division and the Point of Distributions (POD) for H1N1 vaccine. They did not introduce the PODs through DEM, and they did not work through R. Peacock but went straight to the Incident Commander. Even after the H1N1 incident was over and they are looking at setting up annual PODs they are still going directly to the incident Commander without involving R. Peacock. Similar experience, where the proper channel through the emergency management was not followed happened with the Nevada Broadcaster Association.

J. Curtis reported that in Storey County they had experienced that the Silver shield Program was bypassing the County Emergency Management in doing the critical infrastructure surveys. He noted that such failure to make contact with the emergency management would not be accepted in the future.

P. Reinschmidt noted that for years there has been a collective operational issue in Nevada. Most recently an incident took place in a school in Elko County where, had the state DEM not held a conference call to cool everybody down; there would have been resources that were going to be self deployed. The communication links, which were up during the incident stated that no resources were needed. Yet, a number of resources from various counties/cities throughout the state including Clark County were pushing to deploy to Elko.

He suggested that the EMCC and DEM, based on experience, collectively put together a cooperative procedure between local government and the State that depicts some of the issues where coordination would take place." There is," he said, "a lot of ambiguity throughout the state on how emergency operations and Duty Officers daily operations take place. A lot of the issues we deal with as a simple spill report, we don't know whether to call the Emergency Manager or the Sheriff. We have not sat down and defined those issues in years. It is time to get together and start discussing what we want to do."

Co-Chair Page noted that whereas DEM is one agency within DPS other agencies, such as the State Health Division, has nothing to do with DPS and they will do their own thing. Co-Chair Page felt that this issue would not be solve until the Governor of the State of Nevada issues order to those other departments that emergency preparedness response and recovery activities into the any local jurisdiction needs to be notified to DEM, so DEM can properly notify the emergency managers within the respective counties. The Governor of the State of Nevada has to decide whether emergency management is important to the State or not, and if so issue executive policies to the all State Agencies on the process to follow concerning emergency management activities and information flow.

Chairman O'Brien Suggested that DEM draft a plan on information management for discussion at the next EMCC meeting.

K. Baratti said that based on her experience as the Operations Manager, she doubted that one plan would fit everybody because there is significant differences between the Emergency Managers and the information they want to have, some want to know everything some only want to know if it is a big event that will effect resources.

She also noted on the Moapa valley incident, that because Nevada is so small and we all know each other, there were people in DEM that contacted people in Moapa just to get situational awareness. She would be happy to get directions and hear how the EMCC would like the information flow to work.

Co-Chair Page noted that situational awareness has to flow in both directions from DEM to County Emergency Managers but also the other way from Emergency Managers to DEM Duty Officer.

Public Comment:

K. Baratti introduced "Kiersten Sherve", new Operations Officer, DEM.

Chairman O'Brien referred to the last EMCC special meeting and the motion to hire a contractor to work on the EMPG funding formula. J O'Brien has contacted the International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM) and they are favorable towards working on the project so that it benefits all emergency managers across the country. Beth Armstrong the Executive Director of IAEM will seek out the scope of work they would propose to do on the funding formula development. By the next regular EMCC meeting there should be something in place to report.

Chairman O'Brien added a comment for DEM that two years ago he had submitted a proposal for the development of mobile support units. J O'Brien emphasized that he needed action to be taken on this proposal now. He argued that the mobile support units concept needs to get in place for the armor team and the civil support team. They will then have a way to respond together without having to make all the phone calls to get mission numbers. "The process can," he said, "be streamlined if we get the mobile support unit designation in place." J. O'Brien mentioned that Clark County is also getting needs expressed from hospitals to be covered under the mobile unit designation. J. O'Brien emphasized that all the draft material has been at DEM for two years and requested to DEM that somebody honor the proposal in order to get the mobile support units in place before the next legislature, in order not to be locked out of doing regulations.

M. Cyphers Informed the EMCC that the next meeting of IAEM is in San Antonio in November 2010. The IAEM meeting in 2011 is at the Rio Hotel/Casino in Las Vegas. He encouraged EMCC members to participate in activities related to the events.

J. Curtis informed the EMCC members that Emergency Managers in Washoe, Storey, Douglas and Carson City have formed a regional Emergency Managers' group and are meeting on a monthly basis. He also informed the EMCC that Storey County has opted to oversee the CIRC money for the "Fire Tech Show" in Reno in November 2010.

Co-Chair Page noted that he had received a number of calls from local emergency managers with request to have access to minutes from the EMCC meetings after they had been approved by the EMCC.

Chairman O'Brien suggested that the minutes of the EMCC meetings be posted to the DEM website and/or sent to via e mail to the emergency managers directly.

Next Scheduled Meeting: A regular EMCC meeting was scheduled for May 12, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the following site

- State Emergency Operations Center, 2478 Fairview Drive, Carson City, NV 89710

Adjournment:

Chairman O'Brien called for a motion to adjourn the meeting, Jeff page motioned, the motion was moved by Joe Curtis, Chairman O' Brien declared the meeting adjourned.