



Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

May 21, 2026 11:30 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 11:32 a.m. A quorum was established.

PRESENT: Chair Noah Boyer - WCSO; Zebulon Nomura – TMFPD; and Nathan Goins - RFD

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 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) -

Review and Approval of the March 19, 2026 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Nathan Goins, seconded by Zebulon Nomura 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 that several members had missed two consecutive meetings. She stated that, with the committee's approval, she would send follow-up emails to those members. She identified the affected organizations as Washoe County CERT and the 152nd Air Wing of the Nevada Air National Guard, noting that both had missed the last two meetings. She indicated that she would follow up with them that day and report back to the committee if any additional action became necessary. Kelsey Zaski also noted that there were no new membership applications for consideration.

- 5. LEPC GENERAL MEMBERSHIP AGENDA REVIEW (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)** - Review and Approval of the June 18, 2026 LEPC General Membership Agenda

Kelsey Zaski reviewed the draft agenda for the upcoming General Membership meeting and noted that she had identified an issue on Item 13, which was missing the date and time of the next General Membership meeting. She stated that she would make that correction before the agenda is posted.

Francisco Ceballos noted that Item 12 still reflected Nick Klaich's name and asked whether that had been corrected.

Kelsey Zaski confirmed that the correction had already been made but stated that she would double-check Item 12 to ensure it was updated properly.

Noah Boyer asked whether there were any additional topics to add to the agenda beyond the committee's usual items and confirmed that the agenda under review was for the June General Membership meeting.

Kelsey Zaski confirmed that it was.

Francisco Ceballos observed that several agenda sections appeared to be missing.

Noah Boyer noted that the numbering appeared to jump from Item 2 to Item 8 and asked if that was the issue being referenced.

Francisco Ceballos replied that the problem was likely related to the new Granicus system.

Kelsey Zaski acknowledged the issue, explaining that she was still learning the new system and that it does not automatically renumber agenda items. She apologized for the errors and stated that she would correct the numbering before publication.

Francisco Ceballos added that the agenda was also missing the grants update item that he typically presents.

Kelsey Zaski acknowledged the omission and indicated that it would be added.

Noah Boyer commented that this would likely be the final meeting before grant awards are announced, noting that those awards generally become available around July 1.

Francisco Ceballos agreed, noting that this is typically the timeline.

Noah Boyer then asked whether there were any additional changes to the agenda.

Katherine Hoffman noted that because the meeting would be conducted online only, she had a few Open Meeting Law comments and suggestions. She stated that she would send those notes directly to Kelsey Zaski offline.

Kelsey Zaski thanked her and agreed to review them.

Noah Boyer concluded the discussion by requesting a motion to approve the agenda with the recommended revisions, including correcting the numbering, adding the meeting date and time, and restoring the omitted grants update item from Francisco Ceballos.

It was moved by Zebulon Nomura, seconded by Nathan Goins to approve the agenda with the suggested changes.

There was no public comment.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. POTENTIAL LEPC BYLAW AMENDMENTS (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY) - Discussion about potential future bylaw amendments to support and prioritize grant requests that address identified regional response capability gaps.

Noah Boyer introduced the discussion regarding proposed amendments to the LEPC bylaws. He explained that the item stemmed from conversations held during previous Executive Committee and General Membership meetings regarding changes intended to increase participation throughout the year rather than concentrating involvement solely around the annual grant cycle. He stated that the goal was to ensure grant funding is

used to address identified capability gaps rather than supporting projects that may not align with regional needs. Noah Boyer said the discussion centered on determining what structure should be formalized and how it could be incorporated into the bylaws in an enforceable manner.

Katherine Hoffman explained that she viewed the issue as involving two separate but related strategies, both aimed at directing grant funding toward identified capability gaps. She stated that one strategy involved the structure and content of General Membership meetings. She noted that the committee has significant flexibility in developing meeting agendas and could incorporate presentations, recurring discussions, or opportunities for members to identify emerging capability gaps throughout the year. She explained that these adjustments could be made without amending the bylaws because the committee already has the authority to determine meeting agendas and facilitate those discussions. Katherine Hoffman stated that the second strategy involved determining how grant funding is prioritized and awarded. She observed that the bylaws currently contain little language addressing grant awards and suggested that changes could be made to establish criteria or priorities for future grant funding decisions. She then asked Francisco Ceballos whether the grant application forms were mandated by the State or created locally.

Francisco Ceballos explained that he creates the application forms each year but bases them on State-required grant applications and criteria.

Katherine Hoffman suggested a process whereby, before annual grant applications are released, the Executive Committee could review discussions, incidents, and capability gaps identified during the previous year and establish priority areas for grant funding. She stated that those priorities could then be communicated to applicants in advance of the grant cycle so that projects would be aligned with regional needs.

Kelly Echeverria responded that a similar process already occurs through the Integrated Preparedness Planning Workshop (IPPW). She stated that the committee's objective was to formalize two requirements within the bylaws. First, capability gaps would need to be reported through the IPPW process and incorporated into the Integrated Preparedness Plan. Second, grant applications would need to align with strategic priorities identified through that planning process. Kelly Echeverria explained that those priorities are developed from known capability gaps identified through exercises, real-world incidents, and self-reporting by agencies. She emphasized that capability gaps should be documented and supported by evidence rather than being based solely on perceived needs.

Noah Boyer noted that current State grant applications already require applicants to identify which strategic priorities their projects support. He stated that while the

existing categories mirror State and national priorities, they are often broad enough that almost any public safety project can be justified under them. He suggested that refining those categories could help better direct funding toward specific regional needs while still allowing a variety of projects to address those priorities. Noah Boyer emphasized the importance of keeping categories broad enough to encourage multiple solutions to identified problems rather than limiting funding to a single project or agency.

Kelly Echeverria elaborated that identified capability gaps should be supported by documentation showing how those gaps affected operations during exercises or real-world incidents. She provided an example, stating that a request for additional personnel should be linked to documented instances where a lack of staffing negatively affected emergency management operations. She explained that the Integrated Preparedness Planning Workshop, after-action reports, and improvement plan tracking process provide the documentation necessary to demonstrate those needs rather than relying on subjective assessments alone.

Noah Boyer provided an example involving a previous grant request for rope rescue equipment. He recalled that the requesting agency had not experienced an actual incident where the lack of rope equipment prevented a response but instead identified the need during a competition. He contrasted that example with projects that address demonstrated operational deficiencies. Noah Boyer stated that he would like applicants to present evidence of specific incidents, exercises, or operational experiences that reveal capability gaps requiring attention. He referenced ballistic shields as an example of equipment that has repeatedly been identified as necessary through actual law enforcement operations, explaining that numerous incidents have demonstrated the operational need for such equipment.

Francisco Ceballos added that projects benefiting multiple agencies or addressing regional capabilities should receive greater consideration and prioritization.

Noah Boyer agreed and suggested that future General Membership meetings could be used to focus on specific disciplines, such as law enforcement, allowing agencies to present their challenges and identified capability gaps. He stated that creating opportunities for agencies to discuss those issues publicly could encourage collaboration and help identify solutions that may not otherwise emerge. Noah Boyer recalled instances where capability gaps were resolved through connections made during LEPC meetings and noted that bringing challenges before the broader membership often leads to unexpected solutions and partnerships. He concluded that providing agencies with a forum to identify and discuss capability gaps could help guide future grant funding decisions and strengthen regional preparedness efforts.

Zebulon Nomura asked whether there was an opportunity to prioritize projects in a manner similar to the process used by the IHCC. He explained that IHCC develops a list of vulnerabilities, assigns weights and priorities to those vulnerabilities, and distributes funding based on identified needs. He noted that IHCC also incorporates findings from mass casualty incident drills and other exercises into that prioritization process. Zebulon Nomura stated that many capability gaps cross organizational boundaries and suggested that a regional approach could help ensure funding is distributed appropriately. He reflected on his own experience applying for Cyanokit funding over multiple years, noting that the project had been only partially funded each year. He questioned whether some recurring requests are necessarily the best use of grant funding, explaining that while the kits are important, their actual utilization rate is relatively low and many expire before being used.

Noah Boyer asked whether there was an alternative solution and whether the absence of the equipment would create a life-safety issue.

Zebulon Nomura replied that the equipment is critical and that lives could be lost without it.

Kelly Echeverria suggested that rather than amending the bylaws, the committee could modify the grant application itself. She proposed adding questions requiring applicants to indicate whether the requested project had been reported as an identified capability gap through the Integrated Preparedness Planning Workshop or Emergency Management process, whether the gap had been documented in an after-action report or improvement plan, and whether the requested resource would serve as a regional asset that could be shared among agencies. Kelly Echeverria stated that these additions could function as objective criteria for evaluating projects and would provide a framework for prioritization. She further suggested that projects not identified through the planning process or lacking regional applicability should receive lower priority. She noted that LEPC members have already been informed that these expectations are being considered and would not come as a surprise to future applicants. Kelly Echeverria stated that projects failing to meet those requirements could potentially be excluded from consideration altogether.

Katherine Hoffman agreed that the issues under discussion appeared to be more appropriately addressed through revisions to the application process rather than through bylaw amendments. She stated that modifying the application would ensure decision-makers have the information necessary to evaluate whether projects align with regional priorities and documented capability gaps. She then asked whether there were any State restrictions that would prevent LEPC from establishing such requirements as prerequisites for funding consideration.

Francisco Ceballos responded that there were no such restrictions. He explained that the local applications are ultimately consolidated into a single submission to the State and that LEPC has the authority to determine which projects move forward. He stated that incorporating additional requirements into the application process and allowing the Grants and Finance Committee to evaluate projects against those standards would be an appropriate approach.

Kelsey Zaski asked whether project scopes of work submitted to the State require specific descriptions of purchases and activities and whether proposed projects could be rejected by the State if they are not adequately documented.

Francisco Ceballos confirmed that detailed project information is required and explained that the local application forms are structured to mirror State requirements to ensure applicants provide all necessary information.

Kelly Echeverria commented that State review processes are generally flexible but agreed that establishing additional local standards for projects being advanced to the State would be beneficial.

Katherine Hoffman concurred, noting that it appeared the committee had the authority to implement such standards.

Zebulon Nomura asked whether the proposed changes should be developed through a separate subcommittee or whether the process could be established collectively by the committee.

Noah Boyer responded that the existing Grants and Finance Committee already serves that role and includes the voting members responsible for evaluating projects. He suggested developing a revised application form that would require applicants to document whether the project addresses an identified capability gap, aligns with regional priorities, and demonstrates participation in relevant planning activities. Noah Boyer stated that requiring applicants to formally document those connections would encourage more thoughtful project development and provide better information for funding decisions. He emphasized that projects addressing identified regional needs and involving collaboration among agencies should receive greater consideration. He also supported providing opportunities throughout the year for agencies to discuss their needs and challenges so that capability gaps can be identified before the grant cycle begins. Noah Boyer stated that combining improved application requirements with ongoing discussions at LEPC meetings would help ensure funding is directed toward the most significant regional priorities. He cautioned, however, that the process should not become so restrictive that participation is limited only to traditional public safety agencies. He noted that LEPC includes a broad range of members, including hospitals,

media organizations, and other partners, and stated that the committee should continue to provide opportunities for all members to identify needs and seek solutions. Noah Boyer concluded that balancing accountability, participation, and regional collaboration would lead to more effective use of available grant funding.

Katherine Hoffman stated that she liked the idea of creating themed General Membership meetings focused on specific disciplines. She suggested assigning topics such as law enforcement, fire services, healthcare, or other sectors to particular meetings and notifying members in advance so they could prepare presentations, identify concerns, and bring forward issues for discussion. She stated that rotating responsibility among the different sectors would encourage participation and help identify capability gaps across the region.

Noah Boyer asked whether committee members supported adjusting the grant application form and incorporating discipline-specific discussions into future meeting agendas. He asked if anyone had concerns or wished to propose modifications to the concept.

Francisco Ceballos responded that he supported the idea and suggested including an agenda item at the next General Membership meeting to provide an overview of the proposed changes and explain the new process to members.

Kelsey Zaski suggested adding an agenda item related to updates to the grants and finance process.

Noah Boyer noted that a similar item had appeared on a previous General Membership agenda and suggested using comparable language to continue the discussion and gather additional feedback. He observed that public participation often requires direct encouragement and stated that providing advance notice would help members prepare. Noah Boyer proposed notifying a specific discipline in advance when it would be the focus of an upcoming meeting, giving participants sufficient time to identify concerns and prepare remarks.

Francisco Ceballos shared language from a previous meeting in the chat for reference.

Noah Boyer then asked Katherine Hoffman whether the committee would need to formally reopen the agenda item to add the discussion topic.

Katherine Hoffman replied that the Chair generally has discretion to add such discussion items and suggested using language similar to prior agenda items concerning membership meeting structure. She stated that she would work with Kelsey Zaski on the wording.

Noah Boyer emphasized that he wanted the discussion to remain open so that all members would have an opportunity to provide input and voice concerns before any changes were implemented.

Katherine Hoffman agreed that allowing for discussion was appropriate.

Francisco Ceballos agreed, noting the importance of providing members the opportunity to comment.

Kelsey Zaski then proposed a tentative schedule of discipline-focused meetings, suggesting law enforcement in August, fire services in October, and healthcare-related disciplines in December.

Noah Boyer asked whether healthcare would include public health, EMS, hospitals, and related organizations, noting that the category encompasses a broad range of participants.

Kelsey Zaski asked Zebulon Nomura whether it would make sense to combine fire and EMS into a single category while grouping public health and healthcare organizations separately.

Zebulon Nomura expressed concern that combining fire and healthcare disciplines could create challenges because healthcare projects often involve significantly larger funding requests than those typically pursued by fire agencies.

Francisco Ceballos suggested organizing discussions according to the existing membership categories already established within LEPC.

Noah Boyer agreed, noting that the membership roster already groups organizations by discipline and could provide a straightforward framework for future discussions. He acknowledged that some categories are larger than others but stated that using the existing structure would be the easiest approach. Noah Boyer further noted that while some disciplines may have needs exceeding the scope of LEPC grant funding, providing members the opportunity to present those needs remains valuable because it helps agencies document efforts to seek regional assistance and may support future funding requests through other sources.

Kelsey Zaski reviewed the membership categories, noting that law enforcement, fire services, environmental organizations, TRIAD, and emergency management each contain several members, while other categories include health, hospitals, transportation, media, and community organizations.

Francisco Ceballos explained that the annual grant cycle generally begins with outreach in December, with funding recommendations typically considered in January to ensure sufficient time for State review.

Kelly Echeverria reminded the committee that the Integrated Preparedness Planning Workshop occurs in August and could serve as an important venue for discussing capability gaps and regional priorities.

Noah Boyer suggested introducing the concept during the June General Membership meeting so agencies could begin considering capability gaps, training needs, and other concerns before the August workshop. He proposed maintaining ongoing discussions throughout the year and using discipline-specific presentations to supplement the planning process. Noah Boyer noted that some agenda items, such as radiological task force updates, are often presented by the same individuals rather than representatives of the discipline itself. He suggested replacing some recurring reports with opportunities for membership categories to discuss current needs, capability gaps, accomplishments, and funding priorities.

Francisco Ceballos noted that the Integrated Preparedness Planning Workshop is typically scheduled close to LEPC activities because LEPC represents one of the region's largest stakeholder groups and that attendance is often required in person to maximize participation.

Noah Boyer recalled that previous discussions had included requests for agencies that received LEPC funding to provide updates on how those resources were used. He suggested incorporating that expectation into the discipline-focused presentations. He stated that agencies could discuss previously funded projects, explain how equipment or resources have been used, identify remaining capability gaps, and describe current needs. Noah Boyer stated that this approach would improve accountability and allow members to see the practical benefits of grant-funded projects. He gave examples of agencies reporting on equipment usage, operational outcomes, and the impact of prior funding decisions. He noted that even projects with infrequent use may provide significant value when they prevent loss of life or improve emergency response capabilities.

Kelsey Zaski stated that she would work with Katherine Hoffman to develop agenda language for the August meeting and would circulate a draft for review.

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

There was no comment.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT –

There was no public comment.

9. Noah Boyer adjourned meeting at 12:16 pm.