

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

Minutes

Thursday, October 28, 2021

1:30 p.m.

**Regional Emergency Operations Center
5195 Spectrum Boulevard, Reno, NV
89512**

Also held via teleconference.

MEMBERS

Shawn McEvers, City of Sparks, Chair
Doug Campbell, City of Sparks
Jennifer Felter, Washoe County
Alexander Kukulus, Washoe County
Robert Larson, City of Reno
Jesus Lopez-Torres, City of Reno
Tracy Moore, Washoe County School District
Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County
Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks
Jeff Voskamp, City of Reno

AGENDA

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

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

PRESENT

Doug Campbell	City of Sparks (Municipal Court)
Jenn Felter	Washoe County (Sheriff)
Alexander Kukulus	Washoe County (At-Large)
Robert Larson	City of Reno (Police)
Shawn McEvers	City of Sparks (At-Large)
Jamie Rodriguez	Washoe County (At-Large)
Lisa Rose-Brown	City of Sparks (Police)
Jeff Voskamp	City of Reno (At-Large)

ABSENT

Tracy Moore	Washoe County School District
Jesus Lopez-Torres	City of Reno (Municipal Court)

Mike Large, Washoe County Deputy District Attorney, was also in attendance

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.

There was no response to the call for public comment; no emails had been submitted prior to the meeting.



QUALITY
PUBLIC SERVICE



INTEGRITY



EFFECTIVE
COMMUNICATION

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

Minutes

October 28, 2021

Page 2 of 5

- 3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 23, 2021, MINUTES** [For Possible Action] – Committee members may identify any additions or corrections to the draft minutes as transcribed.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to approve the September 23, 2021, meeting minutes as written; Jenn Felter, Washoe County, 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.

- 4. 911 FIVE-YEAR MASTER PLAN UPDATE** [For Possible Action] (Continued from September 23, 2021) – Review and discussion of the E911 Five-Year Master Plan update and possible action to approve or approve with modification the plan as presented and recommend that the Board of County Commissioners also approve the plan. *Quinn Korbulic, Washoe County Technology Services*

Quinn Korbulic, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed his staff report and presentation for the item including preliminary recommendations shared at the September 2021 meeting but focused on updates to items in response to Committee feedback. Language relative to legislative changes, had been softened to provide suggestions for the Board of County Commission's consideration and what items may be considered to be taken forward for legislative action.

Language had been modified to acknowledge the County Code's language relating to personnel costs. The FCC Strikeforce Report has been added to the Master Plan document. The report addresses 911 surcharge diversion and does note that the FCC may engage in enforcement of fee diversion. It is anticipated any enforcement would be addressed at the state level as it is NRS that enables Washoe County's use.

A new table entitled "FY21 through FY26 Revenues, Expenditures, & Fund Balance" has also been added to provide a 5-year projection of both known approvals and the fund impact of other items that may be under consideration by the Committee such as the Regional CAD, NG911 Technology Assessment, a Mobile Data Terminal (MDT) Replacement Program, and identified needs for Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District/Fire & Rescue. Even if all known and discussed items were to be approved, there would still be approximately \$3 million at the end of FY26.

For FY22, it will require spending \$6.5 million to get the fund under the NRS maximum. The projections will be updated regularly to account for new approvals and inquiries; agencies are invited to bring forward items once they are being considered by the member agencies.

Jeff Voskamp, City of Reno, asked about the possibility of adding in the cost to conduct an audit. Mr. Korbulic shared a number could be added but it would be a complete guess. Washoe County had gone through the RFP process about two years ago until the issue with a lack of the authority to use funding for the audit or consultant costs which would have been a minimum of \$200,000. At that time, the consultants responded with a range of three fee structures, two of which involved payment based on a percentage of the missing remittances found by the audit. Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, added that her recollection of the process was the cost was more than \$200,000 and would have needed to be absorbed entirely by Washoe County (not the 911 Fund). When the issue of collecting past surcharges that may

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

****Minutes****

October 28, 2021

Page 3 of 5

be found by the audit but not remitted, the Board of County Commissions was not in favor of collecting past due surcharge revenue as that cost may be passed onto the citizens. If an audit were to be conducted, it would be necessary for the 911 Fund to cover the consultant cost for whatever amount of surcharge revenue they uncover. Mr. Voskamp spoke in favor of moving forward with an audit even if the consultant fees based on missing surcharge revenue would need to be paid from the fund rather than being sought from the telecommunication companies, especially considering there would be new incoming revenue as an offset.

Ms. Rodriguez spoke in favor of providing some “guardrails” around the MDT replacements to limit replacement to no more than twenty percent of an agencies fleet per fiscal year beginning in FY26. She voiced concern with the impact to the fund and the ability to fund other needs (depending on prioritization) if all agencies were to seek replacement in the same year; Chair McEvers voiced agreement with the idea.

Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, noted that the mobile command center had been included in the recommendations but was not listed as part of the budget forecast.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, moved to approve the 911 Five-Year Master Plan as prepared with the addition of language limiting Mobile Data Terminal replacement to a maximum of twenty percent of an agencies fleet per fiscal year, and adding a projection for the costs associated with an audit. She further moved to recommend that the Board of County Commissioners approve and adopt the Master Plan. Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, seconded the motion.

Mr. Voskamp shared that while he was in support of the goal in adding the twenty percent cap on MDTs he was concerned adding the provisions to the Master Plan would restrict the decision-making ability of the Committee. Alex Kukulus, Washoe County, suggested an alternate approach of setting aside a predetermined amount of money each year with the ability to roll it forward to a new fiscal year if not used. He voiced concern that setting the twenty percent cap may cause agencies to replace equipment prematurely.

Ms. Rodriguez spoke in favor of a cap to allow for better budgeting and forecasting to prevent overspending. Ms. Rose-Brown added that it would also encourage agencies to maintain responsibility in planning for and budgeting for their own equipment.

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, spoke to the possibility of creating an asset management system to track the age of equipment to better anticipate the replacement schedule, and be used as a check against individual requests.

There was discussion of amending the motion to capture additional changes and continuing the item to the next meeting to allow for further refinement. Mr. Voskamp noted that given the Committee’s ability to make decisions based on budget availability he could support the motion and was not in favor of continuing the item.

There was no response to the call for further Committee comment or public comment. Upon a call for a vote on the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

Minutes

October 28, 2021

Page 4 of 5

5. **911 FUND PRIORITIZATION OF EXPENDITURES** [For Possible Action] (Continued from September 23, 2021) – Review, discussion, and possible action to approve, or approve with modification, and adopt the 911 Fund Prioritization of Expenditures as presented. *Quinn Korbulic, Washoe County Technology Services*

Quinn Korbulic, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed his staff report and draft prioritization document with Category One providing the prioritization provided by NRS 244A.7645(4), and Category Two addressing priorities related to the enhanced telephone system (Category One, Priority Three) for reporting emergencies but not specifically defined within NRS. Category Two expenses are expected to be one-time, non-annual expenses with any annual maintenance or warranties being the responsibility of the purchasing agency.

There was discussion of the categories, priorities, and examples, specifically radio consoles, paging systems, data, emerging technologies, and handheld and mobile radios. Also discussed was the possible need to clarify which agencies were eligible for certain items, such as radios. Further refinement was suggested to prioritize the needs of a Primary PSAP versus a Secondary PSAP versus an ancillary agency, for example.

Several members expressed appreciation for the general categories and overall descriptions but agreed further refinement was necessary. Concerns were raised with being overly restrictive, trying to include every item or possible request, and with the possibility of an FCC Strikeforce provision being in conflict with NRS provisions or County Code.

Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County, suggested a review and comparison of the NRS provisions and the FCC Strikeforce Report may be helpful to create a defined roadmap for the future and ensure avoidance of conflict with NRS provisions. She added it would continue to be appropriate to ask for the District Attorney's office for an opinion when the Committee is considering new requests for funding to ensure permissiveness. DDA Large agreed with the ability to review items on a case-by-case basis and not needing specificity in the document so long as there is legal review.

Alex Kukulus, Washoe County, suggested changing "PSAP" to "Dispatch Center" to account for Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's use of a Secondary PSAP. Robert Larson, City of Reno, spoke in favor of maintaining "PSAP" for prioritization purposes.

Lisa Rose-Brown, City of Sparks, suggested it may be helpful to have Committee members draft their own ideas for prioritization for submittal to staff for the next meeting, and to bring forward any specific examples to consider for expansion. Chair McEvers agreed and asked that Committee members prepare drafts and forward those to Mr. Korbulic so the Committee could review and consider at the next meeting.

6. **FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 911 FUND BALANCE** [For Possible Action] (Continued from September 23, 2021) – Review, discussion and possible action regarding the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 ending fund balance being over the statutory maximum by \$518,255; review and discussion of the ending 911 Fund balance overage and possible action to direct staff to address the overage. *Quinn Korbulic, Washoe County Technology Services*

This item was continued to next meeting.

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

****Minutes****

October 28, 2021

Page 5 of 5

7. **911 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER AND/OR STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS** [Non-action item] - No discussion among Committee members will take place on this item. The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 18, 2021, 1:30 p.m.

None

8. **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.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Approved as written in session November 18, 2021.