



Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

March 19, 2026 10 A.M.

Regional Emergency Operations Center

5195 Spectrum Boulevard, Reno, Nevada

1. CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Noah Boyer called the meeting to order at 10 a.m. A quorum was established.

PRESENT: Chair Noah Boyer - WCS; Zebulon Nomura – TMFPD; and Nathan Goins - WCEM;

ABSENT:

Also Present: Katherine Hoffman - Legal; Kelly Echeverria - WCEM; Kelsey Zaski - Secretary; and Francisco Ceballos - Treasurer.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT –

Noah Boyer explained that public comment can be called in using the TEAMS number, 775-325-0620.

There was no public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 29, 2026, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) - Noah Boyer, Chair

It was moved by Zebulon Nomura, seconded by Noah Boyer to approve the minutes as presented.

There was no public comment.

The motion passed unanimously.

- 4. LEPC MEMBERSHIP REVIEW (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)** – A review of new members, members unable to attend and possible actions regarding absences. – Kelsey Zaski, LEPC Secretary

Kelsey Zaski reported on membership attendance, noting that the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony and the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority had each missed the last two general membership meetings. She stated that she had sent a follow-up email reminding both entities of the attendance requirements outlined in the bylaws and requested their participation at the next meeting. Zaski added that she would continue to monitor their attendance and would return to the committee if a third consecutive absence occurred.

Francisco Ceballos added that the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority had recently hired a new Emergency Manager who would likely assume responsibility for attending future meetings in place of the previous representative. He also noted that the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony had experienced staff changes and had recently reached out regarding participation. Ceballos explained that coordination was underway to ensure the appropriate representative was added to the membership roster.

- 5. LEPC GENERAL MEMBERSHIP AGENDA REVIEW (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)** - A review and approval of the agenda for the next General Membership Meeting. - Kelsey Zaski, LEPC Secretary

Kelsey Zaski presented the draft agenda for the April 16th General Membership meeting and asked the group to review it and share any changes or questions, noting that it should be a fairly standard meeting.

Kelly Echeverria asked for clarification on whether the group had previously discussed making LEPC meetings more hazard- or theme-based.

Noah Boyer reflected on a previous discussion about grant funding challenges and regional impacts. He noted that after that conversation, related concerns had surfaced in other meetings, including discussions with leadership. He explained that the broader issue is that agencies tend not to openly discuss weaknesses or gaps, instead often presenting that everything is functioning well.

Boyer suggested that LEPC meetings could be structured around specific disciplines, such as fire, law enforcement, EMS, or utilities. He explained that each group could

present on what they do well, where their gaps are, and what could be improved. He emphasized that this would help align funding decisions with actual needs rather than supporting requests that may not address clearly identified gaps.

Echeverria agreed and suggested structuring discussions around lifeline sectors, since LEPC already includes those partners. She proposed introducing the concept at the next meeting and then using it as an ongoing framework.

Boyer agreed and suggested that the idea should be formally introduced as an agenda item. He explained that the goal would be to give more structure and purpose to meetings, moving away from brief updates where agencies simply report that things are going well.

Zaski added that after-action reports from exercises could be incorporated into this structure. She explained that this would allow the group to reference documented outcomes from trainings and exercises to identify needs, support funding requests, and highlight both strengths and areas for improvement.

Boyer agreed and added that tying LEPC more closely to exercises could also encourage participation. He noted that regional exercises are often driven by a small number of individuals and that connecting them more directly to LEPC discussions could strengthen engagement and decision-making.

Zeb Nomura stated that he supported the idea but emphasized the importance of ensuring that funding decisions reflect a regional approach rather than siloed agency requests. He acknowledged that some purchases, including his own, may appear repetitive but are still necessary, while also noting that better coordination could improve how limited funds are used. He expressed interest in seeing more collaboration across agencies, especially when equipment or capabilities could be shared.

Boyer responded that providing agencies with consistent opportunities to communicate their needs would reduce last-minute funding requests. He explained that if agencies present their needs throughout the year, those needs will not come as a surprise during the grant process. He also noted that this could support collaborative purchasing, such as multiple agencies requesting similar equipment and combining efforts to improve pricing and distribution.

Echeverria added that this approach aligns with the Integrated Preparedness Planning process, where capability gaps are identified and prioritized. She emphasized that once a gap is addressed, the region can shift focus to the next priority.

Zaski confirmed that a similar structured approach is already used within the IHCC, where identified gaps are incorporated into grant proposals ahead of time. She noted that this reduces variability and prevents last-minute requests because needs have already been discussed and prioritized.

Francisco Ceballos added that the application process itself could reflect this structure by asking whether a request is tied to an identified capability gap and whether multiple agencies are involved. He suggested that agencies could be listed as co-sponsors to demonstrate regional coordination.

Bringing the discussion back to the agenda, Boyer proposed adding a new agenda item to introduce the structure of LEPC meetings moving forward and outline expectations for participation. He explained that the intent would be to present the concept at the next meeting and begin implementing it in future meetings, potentially starting with one discipline to set the tone.

Katherine Hoffman offered to work with Zaski offline to refine the language for the agenda item.

Zaski asked whether the updated agenda could be circulated to the group before posting, and Hoffman confirmed that it could be recirculated for review. Zaski then asked who would present the item.

Boyer responded that it could be presented collectively by the executive committee, noting that the structure would apply beyond any single individual's leadership.

Ceballos noted that one agenda item referenced the wrong month and should be corrected to reflect the February meeting.

Zaski acknowledged the correction and stated it would be updated.

Boyer then made a motion to approve the proposed agenda with the discussed changes, including the addition of the new agenda item and the corrected date.

It was moved by Noah Boyer, seconded by Zeb Nomura to approve the proposed agenda with the discussed changes, including the addition of the new agenda item and the corrected date.

There was no public comment.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. LEPC CHAIR/BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS/ITEMS AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS. No discussion among committee members will take place on this item.

Francisco Ceballos raised the topic of revisiting the bylaws, noting that the group had discussed this previously and may want to bring it back for updates. He explained that bylaws are typically reviewed in the fall but recalled that there had been interest in making potential changes sooner, particularly related to grants and adding more structure to the process.

Ceballos reflected that the group had discussed incorporating expectations around aligning grant requests with identified capability gaps.

Noah Boyer questioned whether those changes should be formally added to the bylaws at this time or if the group should first observe how the new expectations function in practice. He asked whether it would be more appropriate to allow the process to play out before formalizing it.

Kelly Echeverria responded that it would be best to see how the process works before making changes to the bylaws.

Boyer agreed and stated that the group could revisit the bylaws later if the process reveals areas where additional structure is needed. He added that any necessary adjustments could be incorporated during a future bylaws review.

Kelly Echeverria noted that since the grant cycle had just been completed, there is time to evaluate how the changes progress before the next scheduled bylaws review later in the year.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT –

There was no public comment.

8. Noah Boyer adjourned meeting at 10:27 am.