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

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. A quorum was established.

**PRESENT:** Mike Bassi, Doug Campbell, Greg Deighton, Jenny Hansen, Lisa Rose-Brown, and Mac Venzon. Aaron Kenneston joined the meeting via teleconference.

**ABSENT:** Shawn McEvers.

Jen Gustafson – Deputy District Attorney, was also present.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** [Non-action item]

There were no public comments.

3. **APPROVAL OF JULY 19, 2018, MINUTES** [For possible action]

There were no public comments.

*It was moved by Member Deighton, seconded by Member Meyer, to approve the July 19, 2018, minutes as submitted. The motion carried: Member McEvers absent.*

4. **REVENUE, PAYABLES AND FUND BALANCE UPDATES** [For possible action] – A review, discussion and possible action to accept the Revenue, Payables, and Fund Balance Updates.

Quinn Korbolic - Washoe County Technology Services, commented that Ms. DeLozier was not present and that he had not yet reviewed the reports.

Responding to Jen Gustafson’s inquiry about distribution, Mr. Korbolic explained that the reports had not been distributed prior to the meeting.

Mr. Korbolic provided an overview of the budget reports and commented that he believes the fund balance is about $2-million. Mr. Korbolic noted that collections are approximately running slightly lower than projected and that we are now 3-months into the fiscal 2018-2019 budget.

The budget includes body camera expenses, travel and other budgeted expenditures. Mr. Korbolic commented that the budget reports would be distributed.
It was moved by Mac Venzon, seconded by Mike Bassi, to accept the Revenue, Payables and Fund Balance Updates, as presented. The motion carried with Shawn McEvers absent.

5. NEVADA OPEN MEETING LAW PRESENTATION [Non-action item] – An informational presentation on the requirements of Nevada’s Open Meeting Law (OML), as codified in NRS Chapter 241, and ethics in government, as codified in NRS Chapter 281A.

Jen Gustafson – Deputy District Attorney, narrated a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file) on the Nevada Open Meeting Law (OML). Ms. Gustafson pointed out that the presentation on the OML is intended to provide a brief overview of the rules and how they are applied to public bodies such as the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee. Ms. Gustafson explained that the Washoe County District Attorney’s Office has a Deputy District Attorney present at public meetings to avoid potential violations of the OML. Ms. Gustafson also presented on key aspects of the OML, such as what constitutes a meeting, quorum, public notice provisions, supporting materials, minutes, and OML violations. Ms. Gustafson also provided an overview of ethics in government provisions of NRS Chapter 281A. Additionally, agenda language must be sufficient so that the public is has an understanding of what the agenda item encompasses. Ms. Gustafson then noted that Board members may ask that specific items be placed on the meeting agenda by notifying the Chair (Doug Campbell) and copy the Recording Secretary in writing two weeks before a scheduled meeting. Additionally, members of the public may also submit possible agenda items in writing to the Board Chair and recording secretary two weeks before a scheduled meeting.

Chair Campbell reordered the agenda moving Item 7 before Item 6.

7. UPDATE DEPLOYMENT AND EXPENDITURES ASSOCIATED WITH BODY WORN CAMERAS [Non-action item] – An informational report on expenditures and deployment of Body Work Cameras. [Taken out of agenda order]

Chris Crawforth – City of Sparks, explained that this is a joint presentation of the three agencies and asked Member Mac Venzon – City of Reno, to start.

Member Venzon recalled that member Kenneston has asked for an updated on the Body Cam program as it relates to the three entities (Reno, Sparks and Washoe County). Mr. Venzon noted that there had been some minor glitches in terms of upload speeds, which he believes has now been rectified. Mr. Venzon emphasized that the three entities are working collaboratively and using the same protocols so that the system works no matter which of the three jurisdiction’s you are working in. However, there are some minor differences in retention policies, officer’s ability to view video and procedures on layout and command structures. Mr. Venzon noted that oversight of the body worn cameras has been moved to professional staff rather than sworn staff. Additionally video and photos are being stored at evidence.com so that records can be tied to a specific case. Mr. Venzon then noted that officers can obtain an individual’s email address to invite them to upload video of a crime. Mr. Venzon then outlined the significant amount of data storage required for the body cam video: Reno 21.5 terabytes; Sparks 13.59 terabytes; and Washoe County 11.53 terabytes. Additionally the three jurisdictions have installed line switches, upgraded electrical service where needed along with firewalls to protect the data and fiber uplinks. Mr. Venzon then provided an update on individuals that
are assigned to certain officers in the SWAT team and others as well as administrative staff and others that have the body cams 24/7. This allows personnel to quickly respond to emergency situations without having to stop to pick up equipment.

6. REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF HARDWARE RELATED COSTS ACCRUED FOR BODY CAMERA IMPLEMENTATION AT CITY OF RENO, CITY OF SPARKS AND THE WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE [For possible action] – A review, discussion and possible action to approve, deny or otherwise modify a request for hardware/network (electrical supplies for camera docks, mounting racks, dedicated network lines to camera docks, dedicated high speed internet lines, vehicle modems, related permitting costs, network switches, internet firewall subscriptions, and Wi-Fi access points) for: City of Reno - $95,320.00; City of Sparks - $58,542.35; and Washoe County Sheriff's Office - $200,218.00 for non-Axon reimbursement costs at a total cost not to exceed $354,080.35. Axon is the vendor all three agencies utilized for Body Worn and Fleet cameras for Reno, Sparks and Washoe County. The requested reimbursements are items necessary to operate and dedicated solely to the implementation and use of Body Worn and Fleet cameras. The requested reimbursements do not include any costs related to actual camera equipment purchased from Axon Enterprises, Inc.

Chris Crawforth – City of Sparks, provided an overview of the request for reimbursement of funds expended to implement body worn cameras. Mr. Crawforth pointed out the differences in implementation issues encountered by Reno and Sparks compared to Washoe County. Mr. Crawforth noted that the City of Sparks is still in process and has thus far expended $42,366.43. To date 27 vehicles have been equipped along with the installation of IT routers, switches and cables to service the three floors at the Sparks station. Mr. Crawforth noted that the City of Sparks had been “borrowing” internet service from Washoe County. Mr. Crawforth clarified that the $4,343.00 is for expenses already paid by the City of Sparks, which is listed on the agenda as $58,542.35.

Rishma Khimji – City of Reno, noted that there was a $125.55 cost difference in what was request and actually paid for the installation of fiber and conduit at Reno City Hall and the Reno Police Department.

Ms. Gustafson noted that the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee can only take action on what is agendized and that any discrepancy would have to be addressed at the next meeting.

Quinn Korbculic – Washoe County Technology Services, outlined the cost reimbursement being sought by Washoe County to support body and vehicle camera program in the amount of $20,081.00. Mr. Korbculic explained that the cost reimbursements are included in the 911 budget.

Ms. Gustafson outlined language on expense reimbursement for portable and vehicle devices. It is her opinion that the language allows cost reimbursement associated with a segmented network.

Ms. Khimji reminded the Board that reimbursement to the member agencies has been in place since April/May 2018 to assure that the project moves forward.
There were no board or other public comments.

It was moved by Member Meyer, seconded by Member Rose-Brown, to approve the reimbursement request to: City of Reno - $95,320.00; Washoe County $200,218.00; and City of Sparks $42,366.43. The motion carried: Shawn McEvers absent.

8. EMERGENCY CONTINGENCY PLANNING [Non-action item] – An informational discussion of Emergency Contingency Planning, including the evacuation of 9-1-1 centers, establishing alternate PSAPs in collaboration with surrounding Counties in the State of Nevada. This discussion may result in a future agenda item.

Member Meyer recommended that this agenda item be removed from future agendas.

9. 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 at 1:30 p.m., November 15, 2018.

Member Hansen suggested a presentation on Emergency Fire Dispatch protocol.

Member Kenneston recommended an agenda item about the construction of an alternate dispatch center perhaps in conjunction with the UNR Police Service proposed new structure. Additionally, Mr. Kenneston suggested a discussion and possible action to improve internet service to the remote Gerlach Fire Station, noting that the E-911 Committee is currently funding Internet to the Sheriff’s Office facility less than 1/8 mile from the fire station.

Member Meyer asked that the budget reports be provided in advance of scheduled meetings.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-action item]

There were no public comments.

11. ADJOURNMENT [Non-action item]

Chair Campbell adjourned the meeting at 3:09 p.m.