

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

Minutes

Thursday, January 16, 2020 ~ 1:30 P.M.

**REGIONAL EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER
5195 SPECTRUM BOULEVARD, RENO, NEVADA**

MEMBERS

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, Chair
Blaine Beard, Washoe County, Vice Chair
Doug Campbell, City of Sparks
Gregg Deighton, City of Reno
Alexander Kukulus, Washoe County
Robert Leighton, City of Reno
Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks
Tracy Moore, School District
Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County
Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL** [Non-action item]

Members Present

City of Reno, Police
City of Reno, Municipal Court
City of Reno, At-Large
City of Sparks, Police
City of Sparks, Municipal Court
City of Sparks, At-Large
Washoe County, Sheriff
Washoe County, At-Large
Washoe County, At-Large
Washoe County School District

Mac Venzon
Gregg Deighton
Robert Leighton
Lisa Rose-Brown
Doug Campbell
Shawn McEvers
Blaine Beard
Alexander Kukulus
Jamie Rodriguez
Tracy Moore

Members Absent - none

Jennifer Gustafson, Washoe County Deputy District Attorney, was also present.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** [Non-action item] – Comment heard under this item will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee agenda.

Jennifer Gustafson, Washoe County Deputy District Attorney, provided the Committee members with the updated version of the NRS pertaining to the Committee including the 2019 Legislative Changes. She asked that they be added as an attachment to the minutes (attached).

3. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS** [For Possible Action]

- a. Chair
- b. Vice-Chair

A correction to the agenda was noted to correct the rotation of offices so that the Chair will be Washoe County representative and the Vice-Chair will be a Sparks representative.

Jaime Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to nominate Blaine Beard, Washoe County, for Chair; Gregg Deighton provided a second. Mr. Beard accepted the nomination. There was no response to the call for further Committee or public comment. Upon the call for a vote, Blaine Beard was unanimously chosen to be Chair.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 2 of 10

Gregg Deighton, City of Reno, moved to nominate Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, for Vice-Chair; Lisa Rose-Brown provided the second. Mr. McEvers accepted the nomination. There was no response to the call for further Committee or public comment. Upon the call for a vote, Shawn McEvers was unanimously chosen to be Vice-Chair.

4. **APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 21, 2019, MINUTES** [For Possible Action]

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the November 21, 2019 minutes as written; Doug Campbell, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon the call for a vote, the minutes were approved unanimously, as written.

5. **FINANCIAL SUMMARY** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion, and possible action to accept the Financial Summary updates.

Sara DeLozier, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed the Financial Summary dated December 31, 2019. Surcharge revenue is still forecast to be 5.3% above budget. Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to accept the Financial Summary; Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon the call for a vote, the Financial Summary was accepted unanimously.

6. **FISCAL YEAR 2020/2021 BUDGET PROPOSAL** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to recommend that the Board of County Commissioners approve and/or approve with modifications the proposed FY 2020-2021 E911 budget.

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed his staff report and the proposed budget dated January 7, 2020, noting revenue was projected to be higher than planned for in the FY20 budget. The Washoe County GIS salary and benefits are incorporated into the budget for *Salaries and Wages* and *Employee Benefits* while those for the City of Reno and the City of Sparks are included in the *Payments to Other Agencies* GL. A request before the Committee is to upgrade the existing Verint Recording Solution which would increase the necessary budget for the *Service Contract* GL, if approved. The *Equipment Capital* GL is requested budget authority for unknown or yet to be requested expenditures. The noted *Starting 911 Fund Balance for Fiscal Year* budget number assumes all the *Capital Outlay* budget is spent. Any end-of-year fund balance, currently projected to be \$4.5 million, would roll-over to the next year and could potentially run up against the \$5 million cap. The CAD replacement and potential backup site are both projects on the horizon that could help alleviate this.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, indicated the City of Reno intended to purchase additional bodycams and asked if those numbers could still be incorporated into the FY21 budget. There was discussion about the options to address unknown expenses. While it is better to incorporate known expenses into the budget, it is not essential as there is the ability to use the authority provided for in *Capital Outlay*. Mr. Venzon, moved to continue the item to the March agenda; Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, provided a second. There was no further Committee discussion or response to the call for public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 3 of 10

7. **UPDATE OF 911 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE BYLAWS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to update the 2015 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee’s Bylaws and General Provisions due to legislative changes from the 2017 and 2019 sessions and current Committee policies and standard practices.

Jen Gustafson, Washoe County Deputy District Attorney, provided an overview the updated draft Bylaws. It was also requested that Article 5 be amended to expand the role of Technology Services staff to include not only fiscal support but also contract management and research.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, asked about the need for the Chair to have a designee (Article 8c) to present to the Board of County Commissioners. It was clarified that the reliance on a designee was not intended to be the normal approach but to provide coverage in the event the Chair wasn’t able to attend the scheduled meeting.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to approve the updated Bylaw document; Alex Kukulus, Washoe County, seconded the motion. There was no additional Committee discussion or response to the call for public comment. Upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Gustafson indicated she would finalize the draft and forward it to the Chair for signature, after which it would be posted and distributed.

8. **911 FIVE YEAR MASTER PLAN REVIEW INCLUDING DISCUSSION OF BACKUP FACILITY AND UPGRADES TO EXISTING FACILITIES** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to direct staff to take action on the Five-Year Master Plan recommendations and/or to direct staff to update the Five-Year Master Plan. Specifically, staff requests direction on initiation of the 911 Backup Site implementation, including but not limited to whether to contract with consultants to conduct a site selection study, define the Backup Site space and equipment requirements, and recommend resource allocation.

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed the 5-year Master Plan recommendations which included increasing the surcharge, establishing metrics, modifying the mission and vision statements, implementing a fund policy, developing a process for review of Master Plan, and evaluating the need for a backup site. The number of cell and land lines has continued to increase while the number of trunk lines has decreased. Once the trunk lines bottom out, it is expected to see a gradual increase in revenue. 2019 will provide the new baseline and will likely be a proxy for population growth. Since the creation of the Master Plan, the City of Sparks has begun work to expand its PSAP and the City of Reno has plans to relocate to the former Reno Gazette Journal building which will provide for three separate PSAP locations. Given this, the question of whether or not a separate backup site is still necessary arose.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, agreed with the need to question whether an independent site, that will likely sit empty, was the best use of taxpayer funds. He questioned the ability to incorporate changes into the RGJ building redesign that would meet this need and to what extent the E911 fund could be utilized for the portion that would serve as a backup site.

Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, expressed frustration and shared her experience with the City of Sparks expansion, with trying to design to absorb influx capacity, if necessary, from the

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 4 of 10

other jurisdictions. She shared there were considerable infrastructure and technical challenges to integrating the PSAPs, as well as the challenges with the allowable uses of the surcharge.

Mr. Korbolic noted the Committee could ask for direction or recommendations from the Board of County Commissioners when presenting the annual review of the Master Plan. Such considerations might include requesting an update to the Master Plan that would provide direction on the best approach for a backup site, or the CAD replacement project, which are not currently addressed in the Master Plan. This direction might also help with project prioritization. Additional considerations for inclusion in an updated Master Plan include Washoe County School District body camera expenses, potential use of the surcharge for staffing for portable event recording device maintenance and redaction, a surcharge audit, and updated mission and vision statements. The update could also potentially provide for a site study for a backup site, and the build-out of scenarios that could be used in the decision-making process.

Stu Cronin, Galena Group, agreed that it would be beneficial to revisit the options for the backup site and add the CAD replacement project. Mr. Venzon spoke in favor of pursuing an update to the Master Plan to include new options and costs.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, questioned the ability to use surcharge funds to hire a consultant for the backup site survey. In response, Deputy District Attorney Gustafson asked the Committee to refer to her email of November 21, 2019, in which she provided general advice and guidance around the ability to hire a consultant for a backup site survey, or the ability to incorporate that into the 5-year Master Plan.

Ms. Rose-Brown suggested the PSAPs, as subject-matter experts, begin the investigation into what a site would require and would be best for operations. Jen Felter, Washoe County, was in agreement noting the PSAPs have already begun that work and have a good idea of what that would look like; she added, it would be helpful if the Master Plan provided for the potential for multiple sites.

There was discussion of the NRS prioritization for Fund spending and the potential impact of spending on one area and not being able to cover the commitments of a lower-prioritized area.

Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, agreed funding stability was a concern but believed having the PSAPs work together could provide a starting point for determining what would be required for a backup site.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to accept the report; Lisa Rose-Brown provided the second. There was no further Committee discussion and no response to the call for public comment. Upon a call for a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

[The meeting was in recess 2:25 – 2:33 p.m.]

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 5 of 10

Funding Requests – Bodyworn Camera Related

9. **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF SPARKS FLEET CAMERA YEAR TWO HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE COSTS NOT TO EXCEED \$63,120** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with the City of Sparks fleet camera system, year two, in an amount not to exceed \$63,120.

Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with the City of Sparks fleet camera system, year two, in an amount not to exceed \$63,120. Gregg Deighton, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

10. **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT AXON BODY CAMERA YEAR ONE HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE COSTS NOT TO EXCEED \$54,984** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with the Washoe County School District's body camera system, year one, in an amount not to exceed \$54,984.

Gregg Deighton, City of Reno, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with the Washoe County School District's body camera system, year one, in an amount not to exceed \$54,984. Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

11. **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE FLEET POWER SUPPLIES NOT TO EXCEED \$6,984.22** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office fleet power supplies (60) in an amount not to exceed \$6,984.22.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office fleet power supplies (60) in an amount not to exceed \$6,984.22. Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Funding Requests – Training and Travel

12. **REQUEST FOR TRAINING AND TRAVEL FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – CENTRAL SQUARE 2020** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with sending two attendees to the Central Square 2020 Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, March 17-20, in an amount not to exceed \$6,000.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with sending two Washoe County attendees to the Central Square 2020 Conference in

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 6 of 10

Las Vegas, Nevada, March 17-20, in an amount not to exceed \$6,000. Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

13. **REQUEST FOR TRAINING AND TRAVEL FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – NAVIGATOR 2020** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with sending two attendees to the IAED Navigator 2020 Pre-Conference and Conference in Orlando, Florida, April 26-May 1, 2020, in an amount not to exceed \$6,000.

Gregg Deighton, City of Reno, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with sending two Washoe County attendees to the IAED Navigator 2020 Pre-Conference and Conference in Orlando, Florida, April 26-May 1, 2020, in an amount not to exceed \$6,000. Mac Venzon, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

14. **REQUEST FOR TRAINING AND TRAVEL FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – IAED EMD/EPD/EFD CERTIFICATIONS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with International Academy of Emergency Dispatching EMD/EPD/EFD call taking online software training and certification or recertification for Washoe County Communications staff members in an amount not to exceed \$3,500.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with International Academy of Emergency Dispatching EMD/EPD/EFD call taking online software training and certification or recertification for Washoe County Communications staff members in an amount not to exceed \$3,500. Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Funding Requests – Other

15. **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – MONITORS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with fitting two new call talking consoles with 43" Dell Ultra HD 4K Monitors to include HDMI cables, in an amount not to exceed \$2,500.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with fitting two new call talking consoles with 43" Dell Ultra HD 4K Monitors to include HDMI cables, in an amount not to exceed \$2,500. Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

16. **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – KEYBOARDS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with replacement of 20 Rosewill electronic keyboards and 20 cables in an amount not to exceed \$1,620.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 7 of 10

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to approve the request for reimburse the costs associated with replacement of 20 Rosewill electronic keyboards and 20 cables in an amount not to exceed \$1,620. Gregg Deighton, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

17. **REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – POWER911 WORKSTATIONS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to modify the existing West Contract to add two new Power911 workstations (\$1,590 each per month) at a cost not to exceed \$3,180 per month.

It was clarified that the request was for two workstations, not four.

Doug Campbell, City of Sparks, moved to approve the request to modify the existing West Contract to add two new Power911 workstations (\$1,590 each per month) at a cost not to exceed \$3,180 per month Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, provided the second, There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

18. **REQUEST FOR FUNDING AND REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF SPARKS PSAP – POWER911 WORKSTATIONS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to:

- a. Modify the existing West Contract to add four new Power911 workstations (\$1,590 each per month) and additional bandwidth (\$2,000 per month) at a total cost not to exceed \$8,360 per month, and,
- b. Reimburse the purchase of four new monitors, not to exceed a one-time cost of \$3,656.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the request to modify the existing West Contract to add four new Power911 workstations (\$1,590 each per month) and additional bandwidth (\$2,000 per month) at a total cost not to exceed \$8,360 per month, and, reimburse the purchase of four new monitors, not to exceed a one-time cost of \$3,656. Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

19. **REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMUNICATION PSAP – ProQA** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to fund the costs associated with additional licensing for International Academy of Emergency Dispatching EMD/EPD/EFD program utilizing ProQA call talking software and associated costs for service and support for Washoe County Communication's two new call taking positions, and one existing positions (not licensed) with a one-time cost not to exceed \$44,550, and an additional annual increase not to exceed \$10,800 per year.

Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, moved to approve the request to fund the costs associated with additional licensing for International Academy of Emergency Dispatching EMD/EPD/EFD program utilizing ProQA call talking software and associated costs for service and support for Washoe County Communication's two new call taking positions, and one existing positions (not licensed) with a one-time cost not to exceed \$44,550, and an additional annual increase not to exceed \$10,800 per year. Gregg Deighton, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 8 of 10

response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 9 of 10

- 20. SALARY REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS, GIS DATABASE UPDATE AND MAINTENANCE** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny or otherwise modify a requests for reimbursement of staff salary supporting E911 GIS Database update and maintenance services for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 – City of Reno (\$187,193.00), City of Sparks (\$122,006.00), and Washoe County (\$177,418.00); for a total not to exceed (\$486,617.00).

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County, noted that the request was for FY21 not FY20. Members noted staff reports were missing for the City of Reno and Washoe County as required by the Committee Bylaws to take action on an item requesting funding. In accordance, Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to reschedule the item for the next meeting; Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, provided a second. There was no response to the call for public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

- 21. REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SPARKS PSAP – HARRIS SYMPHONY RADIO WORKSTATIONS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated with the purchase and installation of four (4) Harris Symphony Radio Workstations under the Washoe County/NSRS Contract in an amount not to exceed \$182,000.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to approve the request to reimburse the costs associated with the purchase and installation of four (4) Harris Symphony Radio Workstations under the Washoe County/NSRS Contract in an amount not to exceed \$182,000. Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

- 22. REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SPARKS – CAD WORKSTATIONS** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny, or otherwise modify a request to reimburse the costs associated four Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) workstations in an amount not to exceed \$6,100.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the request to reimburse the costs associated four Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) workstations in an amount not to exceed \$6,100. Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

- 23. REGIONAL COMPUTER AIDED-DISPATCH (CAD) SYSTEM REPLACEMENT UPDATE** [For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to direct staff to take action on the Regional CAD System Replacement Project.

- a. Presentation
- b. Update on RFP process
- c. Potential Budget Impacts

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County, indicated the three jurisdictions had been meeting to prepare and review the RFP and that a January release date was targeted. Based on an initial figure of \$5 million, it was recommended that the costs could be best absorbed if split over two years. There was no response to the call for public comment; no action was taken on this item.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

January 16, 2020

Minutes

Page 10 of 10

24. **INTRADO/WEST RECORDING SOLUTION UPGRADE AND CHANGE ORDER FOR SERVICES**

[For Possible Action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve the Change Order for Services between Washoe County and Intrado, Inc., for the upgrade of the current Verint Recording Solution to Verint's v15.2 Recording Solution for the three Public Safety Answering Points ("PSAPs"), Reno, Sparks and Washoe County; not to exceed \$633,600 (\$10,560 per month for 60 months).

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County, indicated most of the monthly charge (\$8,448) is already being paid as part of the monthly service. This request was for a new contract for the existing service and an increase of \$2,112 per month for 60 months.

Mac Venzon, City of Reno, moved to approve the Change Order for Services between Washoe County and Intrado, Inc., for the upgrade of the current Verint Recording Solution to Verint's v15.2 Recording Solution for the three Public Safety Answering Points ("PSAPs"), Reno, Sparks and Washoe County; not to exceed \$633,600 (\$10,560 per month for 60 months) with total expenditures to be funded within the adopted operating budget of the E911 Fund. Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, seconded the motion. There was no further Committee discussion or response to the call for public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

25. **911 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER AND/OR STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS** [For Possible Action]

a. Selection of March meeting date and time [For Possible Action]

Doug Campbell, City of Sparks, noted the regularly scheduled date of March 19, 2020, conflicts with the Central Square Conference and suggested moving the meeting to one week earlier.

Mr. Cambell moved to schedule the next meeting for March 12, 2020, 1:30 p.m., with the location to be determined. Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, seconded the motion. There was no further Committee discussion or response to the call for public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

26. **PUBLIC COMMENT** [Non-action item] – Comment heard under this item will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee agenda.

Jen Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, noted she had been asked if it would be possible to consider agenda items in block or have consent items. She indicated she would investigate the options.

27. **ADJOURNMENT** [Non-action item]

Approved as written in session March 12, 2020.

any proceedings taken or acts done pursuant to those sections, except for laws to which reference is expressly made in those sections or by necessary implication of those sections.

3. The provisions of no other law, either general or local, except as provided in NRS 244A.669 to 244A.763, inclusive, apply to the doing of the things authorized in those sections to be done, and no board, agency, bureau, commission or official not designated in those sections has any authority or jurisdiction over the doing of any of the acts authorized in those sections to be done, except:

(a) As otherwise provided in those sections.

(b) That a project for the generation and transmission of electricity is subject to review and approval by the state regulatory agencies which have jurisdiction of the matters involved, including, without limitation, the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada, the State Environmental Commission and the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

4. No notice, consent or approval by any public body or officer thereof may be required as a prerequisite to the sale or issuance of any bonds, the making of any contract or lease, or the exercise of any other power under NRS 244A.669 to 244A.763, inclusive, except as provided in those sections.

5. A project is not subject to any requirements relating to public buildings, structures, ground works or improvements imposed by the statutes of this State or any other similar requirements which may be lawfully waived by this section, and any requirement of competitive bidding or other restriction imposed on the procedure for award of contracts for such purpose or the lease, sale or other disposition of property of the counties is not applicable to any action taken pursuant to NRS 244A.669 to 244A.763, inclusive, except that the provisions of NRS 338.013 to 338.090, inclusive, apply to any contract for new construction, repair or reconstruction for which tentative approval for financing is granted on or after January 1, 1992, by the county for work to be done in a project. The board of county commissioners, the lessee, purchaser or obligor or designee thereof, any contractor who is awarded a contract or entered into an agreement to perform the construction, repair or reconstruction and any subcontractor who performs any portion of the construction, repair or reconstruction shall comply with the provisions of NRS 338.013 to 338.090, inclusive, in the same manner as if the board of county commissioners had undertaken the project or had awarded the contract.

6. Any bank or trust company located within or without this State may be appointed and act as a trustee with respect to bonds issued and projects financed pursuant to NRS 244A.669 to 244A.763, inclusive, without the necessity of associating with any other person or entity as cofiduciary except that such association is not prohibited.

7. The powers conferred by NRS 244A.669 to 244A.763, inclusive, are in addition and supplemental to, and not in substitution for, and the limitations imposed by those sections do not affect the powers conferred by any other law.

8. No part of NRS 244A.669 to 244A.763, inclusive, repeals or affects any other law or part thereof, except to the extent that those sections are inconsistent with any other law, it being intended that those sections provide a separate method of accomplishing its objectives, and not an exclusive one.

(Added to NRS by 1967, 1751; A 1973, 972; 1975, 434; 1979, 691; 1987, 707; 1991, 2346; 1997, 1977; 2019, 706)

SURCHARGE FOR ENHANCEMENT OF TELEPHONE SYSTEM USED FOR REPORTING EMERGENCY AND PURCHASE AND MAINTENANCE OF EVENT RECORDING DEVICES

NRS 244A.7641 Definitions. As used in NRS 244A.7641 to 244A.7648, inclusive, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Mobile telephone service" means cellular or other service to a telephone installed in a vehicle or which is otherwise portable.

2. "Place of primary use" has the meaning ascribed to it in 4 U.S.C. § 124(8), as that section existed on August 1, 2002.

3. "Portable event recording device" has the meaning ascribed to it in NRS 289.830.

4. "Supplier" means a person authorized by the Federal Communications Commission to provide mobile telephone service.

5. "Telephone system" means a system for transmitting information between or among points specified by the user that does not change the form or content of the information regardless of the technology, facilities or equipment used. A telephone system may include, without limitation:

(a) Wireless or Internet technology, facilities or equipment; and

(b) Technology, facilities or equipment used for transmitting information from an emergency responder to the user or from the user to an emergency responder.

6. "Vehicular event recording device" means a device which is affixed to a marked vehicle of a law enforcement agency, as defined in NRS 289.830, and which records both audio and visual events.

(Added to NRS by 1995, 1056; A 1999, 1686, 2715; 2001, 621, 622, 1642, 2124; 2003, 69; 2009, 639; 2017, 591)

NRS 244A.7643 Surcharge: Imposition; master plan required; amount; collection; penalties for delinquent payment.

1. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the board of county commissioners of a county may by ordinance, for the enhancement of the telephone system for reporting an emergency in the county and for the purpose of purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices, impose a surcharge on:

(a) Each access line or trunk line of each customer to the local exchange of any telecommunications provider providing those lines in the county; and

(b) The mobile telephone service provided to each customer of that service whose place of primary use is in the county.

2. A board of county commissioners may not impose a surcharge pursuant to this section unless the board first adopts a 5-year master plan for the enhancement of the telephone system for reporting emergencies in the county or for the purpose of purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices, as applicable. The master plan must include an estimate of the cost of the enhancement of the telephone system or of the cost of purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices, as applicable, and all proposed sources of money for funding those costs. For the duration of the imposition of the surcharge, the board shall, at least annually, review and, if necessary, update the master plan.

3. The surcharge imposed by a board of county commissioners pursuant to this section:

(a) For each access line to the local exchange of a telecommunications provider, must not exceed \$1 each month;

(b) For each trunk line to the local exchange of a telecommunications provider, must equal 10 times the amount of the surcharge imposed for each access line to the local exchange of a telecommunications provider pursuant to paragraph (a); and

(c) For each telephone number assigned to a customer by a supplier of mobile telephone service, must equal the amount of the surcharge imposed for each access line to the local exchange of a telecommunications provider pursuant to paragraph (a).

4. A telecommunications provider which provides access lines or trunk lines in a county which imposes a surcharge pursuant to this section or a supplier which provides mobile telephone service to a customer in such a county shall collect the surcharge from its customers each month. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 244A.7647, the telecommunications provider or supplier shall remit the surcharge it collects to the treasurer of the county in which the surcharge is imposed not later than the 15th day of the month after the month it receives payment of the surcharge from its customers.

5. An ordinance adopted pursuant to this section may include a schedule of penalties for the delinquent payment of amounts due from telecommunications providers or suppliers pursuant to this section. Such a schedule:

(a) Must provide for a grace period of not less than 90 days after the date on which the telecommunications provider or supplier must otherwise remit the surcharge to the county treasurer; and

(b) Must not provide for a penalty that exceeds 5 percent of the cumulative amount of surcharges owed by a telecommunications provider or a supplier.

6. As used in this section, "trunk line" means a line which provides a channel between a switchboard owned by a customer of a telecommunications provider and the local exchange of the telecommunications provider.

(Added to NRS by 1995, 1056; A 1997, 2212; 1999, 1686; 2001, 621, 1643, 2124; 2003, 152, 153; 2007, 559; 2009, 640; 2011, 1122; 2017, 591)

NRS 244A.7645 Establishment of advisory committee to develop plan to enhance or improve telephone system; creation of special revenue fund; use of money in fund.

1. If a surcharge is imposed pursuant to NRS 244A.7643 in a county whose population is 100,000 or more, the board of county commissioners of that county shall establish by ordinance an advisory committee to develop a plan to enhance the telephone system for reporting an emergency in that county and to oversee any money allocated for that purpose. The advisory committee must:

(a) Consist of not less than five members who:

(1) Are residents of the county;

(2) Possess knowledge concerning telephone systems for reporting emergencies; and

(3) Are not elected public officers.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (3) of paragraph (a), include the chief law enforcement officer or his or her designee from each office of the county sheriff, metropolitan police department, police department of an incorporated city within the county and department, division or municipal court of a city or town that employs marshals within the county, as applicable.

2. If a surcharge is imposed pursuant to NRS 244A.7643 in a county whose population is less than 100,000, the board of county commissioners of that county shall establish by ordinance an advisory committee to develop a plan to enhance or improve the telephone system for reporting an emergency in that county and to oversee any money allocated for that purpose. The advisory committee must:

(a) Consist of not less than five members who:

(1) Are residents of the county;

(2) Possess knowledge concerning telephone systems for reporting emergencies; and

(3) Are not elected public officers.

(b) Include a representative of an incumbent local exchange carrier which provides service to persons in that county. As used in this paragraph, "incumbent local exchange carrier" has the meaning ascribed to it in 47 U.S.C. § 251(h)(1), as that section existed on October 1, 1999, and includes a local exchange carrier that is treated as an incumbent local exchange carrier pursuant to that section.

(c) Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (3) of paragraph (a), include the chief law enforcement officer or his or her designee from each office of the county sheriff, metropolitan police department, police department of an incorporated city within the county and department, division or municipal court of a city or town that employs marshals within the county, as applicable.

3. If a surcharge is imposed in a county pursuant to NRS 244A.7643, the board of county commissioners of that county shall create a special revenue fund of the county for the deposit of the money collected pursuant to NRS 244A.7643. The money in the fund must be used only:

(a) To pay the costs of adopting and reviewing the 5-year master plan for the enhancement of the telephone system for reporting emergencies in the county that is required pursuant to NRS 244A.7643.

(b) With respect to the telephone system for reporting an emergency:

(1) In a county whose population is 45,000 or more, to enhance the telephone system for reporting an emergency, including only:

(I) Paying recurring and nonrecurring charges for telecommunication services necessary for the operation of the enhanced telephone system;

(II) Paying costs for personnel and training associated with the routine maintenance and updating of the database for the system;

(III) Purchasing, leasing or renting the equipment and software necessary to operate the enhanced telephone system, including, without limitation, equipment and software that identify the number or location from which a call is made; and

(IV) Paying costs associated with any maintenance, upgrade and replacement of equipment and software necessary for the operation of the enhanced telephone system.

(2) In a county whose population is less than 45,000, to improve the telephone system for reporting an emergency in the county.

(c) With respect to purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices, to pay:

(1) By an entity described in this subparagraph, costs associated with the acquisition, maintenance, storage of data, upgrade and replacement of equipment and software necessary for the operation of portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices or systems that consist of both portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices. Money may be expended pursuant to this subparagraph for the purchase and maintenance of portable event recording devices or vehicular event recording devices only by:

(I) The sheriff's office of a county;

(II) A metropolitan police department;

(III) A police department of an incorporated city;

(IV) A department, division or municipal court of a city or town that employs marshals;

(V) A department of alternative sentencing; or

(VI) A county school district that employs school police officers.

(2) Costs for personnel and training associated with maintaining, updating and operating the equipment, hardware and software necessary for portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices or systems that consist of both portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices.

(3) Costs for personnel and training associated with the maintenance, retention and redaction of audio and video events recorded on portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices or systems that consist of both portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices.

(d) To pay any costs associated with performing an analysis or audit pursuant to NRS 244A.7648 of the surcharges collected by telecommunications providers.

4. For the purposes described in subsection 3, money in the fund must be expended in the following order of priority:
 - (a) Paying the costs authorized pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection 3 to adopt and review the 5-year master plan.
 - (b) If the county performs an analysis or audit described in NRS 244A.7648, paying the costs associated authorized pursuant to paragraph (d) of subsection 3.
 - (c) Paying the costs authorized pursuant to paragraph (b) of subsection 3.
 - (d) If the county has imposed a portion of the surcharge for purposes of purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices:
 - (1) Paying the costs authorized pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 3 other than costs related to personnel and training.
 - (2) Paying the costs authorized pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 3 related to personnel.
 - (3) Paying the costs authorized pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 3 related to training.
5. If money in the fund is distributed to a recipient and:
 - (a) The recipient has not used the money for any purpose authorized pursuant to subsection 3 within 6 months, the recipient must:
 - (1) Notify the board of county commissioners and the advisory committee; and
 - (2) Return the unused money.
 - (b) The recipient used any portion of the money for a purpose that is not authorized pursuant to subsection 3, the recipient must:
 - (1) Notify the board of county commissioners and the advisory committee; and
 - (2) Repay the portion of the money that was used for a purpose not authorized pursuant to subsection 3.
 - (c) The recipient was not entitled to receive all or a portion of the money, the recipient must:
 - (1) Notify the board of county commissioners and the advisory committee; and
 - (2) Repay all money to which the recipient was not entitled to receive.
6. If the balance in the fund created in a county whose population is 100,000 or more pursuant to subsection 3 which has not been committed for expenditure exceeds \$5,000,000 at the end of any fiscal year, the board of county commissioners shall reduce the amount of the surcharge imposed during the next fiscal year by the amount necessary to ensure that the unencumbered balance in the fund at the end of the next fiscal year does not exceed \$5,000,000.
7. If the balance in the fund created in a county whose population is 45,000 or more but less than 100,000 pursuant to subsection 3 which has not been committed for expenditure exceeds \$1,000,000 at the end of any fiscal year, the board of county commissioners shall reduce the amount of the surcharge imposed during the next fiscal year by the amount necessary to ensure that the unencumbered balance in the fund at the end of the next fiscal year does not exceed \$1,000,000.
8. If the balance in the fund created in a county whose population is less than 45,000 pursuant to subsection 3 which has not been committed for expenditure exceeds \$500,000 at the end of any fiscal year, the board of county commissioners shall reduce the amount of the surcharge imposed during the next fiscal year by the amount necessary to ensure that the unencumbered balance in the fund at the end of the next fiscal year does not exceed \$500,000.

(Added to NRS by 1995, 1056; A 1999, 1686; 2001, 621, 2125; 2007, 561; 2009, 641; 2011, 1124; 2017, 592; 2019, 1562, 3253)

NRS 244A.7646 Dispute of amount of surcharge or designation of place of primary use by customer of supplier of mobile telephone service: Notice by customer; review by supplier; refund, credit or explanation.

1. If a customer of a supplier of mobile telephone service believes that the amount of a surcharge imposed pursuant to NRS 244A.7643 or the designation of a place of primary use is incorrect, the customer may notify the supplier of mobile telephone service in writing of the alleged error. The notice must include:
 - (a) The street address for the place of primary use of the customer;
 - (b) The account number and name shown on the billing statement of the account for which the customer alleges the error;
 - (c) A description of the alleged error; and
 - (d) Any other information which the supplier of mobile telephone service may reasonably require to investigate the alleged error.
 2. Within 60 days after receiving a notice sent pursuant to subsection 1, the supplier of mobile telephone service shall review the records that the supplier of mobile telephone service uses to determine the place of primary use of its customers.
 3. If the review indicates:
 - (a) That the alleged error exists, the supplier of mobile telephone service shall correct the error and refund or credit the customer for the amount which was erroneously collected for the applicable period, not to exceed the 24 months immediately preceding the date on which the customer notified the supplier of mobile telephone service of the alleged error.
 - (b) That no error exists, the supplier of mobile service shall provide a written explanation to the customer who alleged the error.
 4. A customer may not bring a cause of action against a supplier of mobile telephone service for surcharges incorrectly imposed pursuant to NRS 244A.7643 unless the customer first complies with this section.
- (Added to NRS by 2001, 1642)

NRS 244A.7647 Recovering cost of collecting surcharge. A telecommunications provider or supplier which collects the surcharge imposed pursuant to NRS 244A.7643 is entitled to retain an amount of the surcharge collected which is equal to the cost to collect the surcharge.

(Added to NRS by 1995, 1057; A 1999, 1686; 2001, 621; 2007, 562)

NRS 244A.7648 Engagement of auditor to analyze or audit surcharge.

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, if a surcharge is imposed in a county pursuant to NRS 244A.7643, the board of county commissioners of that county may, as part of its review of the 5-year master plan adopted pursuant to NRS 244A.7643 for the enhancement of the telephone system for reporting emergencies in the county or for the purpose of purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices and vehicular event recording devices, as applicable, engage a qualified independent auditor to perform an analysis or audit of the surcharges collected by telecommunications providers in the county.
 2. An auditor that performs an analysis or audit pursuant to this section:
 - (a) Shall not charge a fee exceeding the actual costs of performing the analysis or audit.
 - (b) Shall submit a report of his or her findings to the advisory committee of the county established pursuant to NRS 244A.7645.
 3. If an auditor performing an analysis or audit of the surcharges collected by telecommunications providers finds in the course of conducting the analysis or audit evidence of a violation of the provisions of NRS 244A.7643, with respect to the amount of money collected or remitted to the county treasurer by a telecommunications provider, the board of county commissioners may engage a qualified independent auditor to perform an additional analysis or audit of the surcharges collected by the telecommunications provider before the next review of the 5-year master plan is conducted.
- (Added to NRS by 2019, 1562)