

911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

**Thursday, March 19, 2026
1:30 p.m.**

**Washoe County Administration Complex
1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada
Building A – Second Floor Caucus Room**

This meeting was held in person with a teleconference option.

MEMBERS

Chris Ketring, Washoe County, Chair
Tara Edmonson, City of Sparks, Vice-Chair
Cody Shadle, City of Reno,
Andy Ancho, City of Reno
JW Hodge, City of Reno
Eric Diamond, Washoe County School District
Amelia Galicia, Washoe County
Derek Keller, City of Sparks
Cadence Matijevec, Washoe County
Connie Shepperd, City of Sparks

Committee website:

http://www.washoecounty.gov/technology/board_committees/911_response/index.php

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 1:36 p.m.

PRESENT

Tara Edmonson	City of Sparks (Municipal Court)
Chris Ketring	Washoe County (At-Large)
Andy Ancho	City of Reno (At-Large)
Amelia Galicia	Washoe County (Sheriff)
Cadence Matijevec	Washoe County (At-Large)

ABSENT

Cody Shadle	City of Reno (Municipal Court)
JW Hodge*	City of Reno (Police)
Eric Diamond	Washoe County School District (non-voting)
Derek Keller	City of Sparks (At-Large)
Connie Shepperd	City of Sparks (Police)

Washoe County Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson was also in attendance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 18, 2025, NOVEMBER 20, 2025, & JANUARY 15, 2026, MINUTES

Vice-Chair Tara Edmonson, City of Sparks, moved to approve the Committee meeting minutes of September 18, 2025, November 20, 2025, and January 15, 2026, as written. Cadence Matijevec, Washoe County, seconded the motion. There was no response to the call for public comment. Upon the call for a vote, the motion carried on a 5-0 vote with Cody Shadle, JW Hodge, Derek Keller, and Connie Shepperd absent.

4. 911 FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY & REVIEW OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed the Washoe County Enhanced 911 Fund summary provided in the agenda packet for this item. He noted the ending fund balance of just over \$9 million was based on actual expenditures and projected costs.

Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County, thought there was a large delta between the ending fund balance and the maximum allowed by Nevada Revised Statutes. She expressed concern that they would be forced to lower the rate if they waited until June 30 to spend the money in the fund. Mr. Korbolic confirmed none of the participating agencies responded to the County's request to be informed of forecasted expenditures. Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson, Washoe County, stated they would need to lower the rate if the ending fund balance remained over \$7.5 million at the end of the fiscal year. She said they would lower and raise the rate if they needed to, but that would create significant work for the telecommunications providers.

Mr. Korbolic noted that most facility upgrades would not be completed by the end of the fiscal year, but funds could be encumbered this year for work that was already contracted, reducing the end balance. He believed Washoe County Technology Services had some expenditures that could potentially be reimbursed. He was unsure whether the facility upgrades at the Regional Dispatch Center would be far enough along in the procurement process to spend the funds for them this fiscal year. Shannon Hardy, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, said work is being done to determine whether it made sense to expand the communications center now or build more onto it, and funds would not be encumbered by the end of the fiscal year.

Andy Ancho, City of Reno, indicated that mobile data terminals in patrol cars and fire apparatus had been discussed before he was on the Board but never funded, and that was something that could be used regionally. Chair Chris Ketring, Washoe County, responded that the three local fire departments were trying to obtain a regional platform for radio programming through L3 Harris, and that could possibly be finalized and funds encumbered before May. He agreed that the rate should not be lowered given the significant infrastructure needs in the future.

Mr. Korbolic opined that the population growth has exceeded the municipalities' expenditure rate. Vice Chair Tara Edmonson, City of Sparks, thought that rates would eventually need to be lowered either way. Mr. Korbolic said that the costs cited in the five-year master plan for body cameras and the new computer-aided design software were overestimated, and those were used to calculate the 911 charge.

5. 911 FUND EXPENSES RELATED TO PORTABLE EVENT RECORDING DEVICES

Cadence Matijevich noted that by suggesting this item, she was not advocating one way or the other for funding the purchase of body cams. Rather, she wanted information about potential impacts to the fund balance, allowing each Board member to return to their respective jurisdictions and inform them that they may be forced by the federal government to stop using these funds for that purpose.

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed slides with the following titles: Portable Event Recording Device Funding Background; Portable Event Recording Device Expenses (2 slides); and 911 Fund Overview – Discussion. He indicated that the proposal in his presentation contemplated a four-year drawdown of funds.

Amelia Galicia, Washoe County, believed that the expense figures provided by Washoe County for recording devices may not be accurate because they are still sorting through the contract. Mr. Korbolic said that whatever the total is would be reduced by 20 percent each year over the drawdown period. Vice-Chair Tara Edmonson, City of Sparks, explained that the City uses a premium package in its Axon contract that reduced the overall cost from what was estimated. The City is now responsible for the lion's share of the costs for body-worn and fleet cameras versus what it previously brought to the Board for reimbursement. Mr. Korbolic reiterated that the 20 percent reduction would be taken on actual costs, not estimates. He was unsure whether the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) would actually enforce the prohibition of funds for bodycams like they threatened to do.

Mr. Korbolic said multiple scenarios could be run about how to reduce the fund balance to be under the statutory cap. Ms. Matijevich responded that contemplation could be given to using the funds for capital projects as was recently authorized. Hopefully there would be time to go through the procurement project on bigger projects as informed by the Master Plan. Mr. Korbolic concurred that the five-year master plan would anticipate additional capital expenses, though that might only encompass \$800,000, which is not much considering the size of the surplus. He pointed out the need to enhance current systems.

Mr. Korbolic indicated that Washoe County planned to request an item on the May meeting agenda regarding expenses already incurred for the radio system. All public safety agencies have a stake in making the shared radio system work, and using this fund for that purpose would help alleviate some of the issues, especially since laws limit what 911 funds can be spent on. Ms. Gustafson confirmed that there are things allowed in federal law that are restricted by state law, and vice versa. If the FCC ended up prohibiting the use of 911 funds for bodycams, Ms. Matijevich stated, that may give the agencies some leverage to ask the State Legislature to lessen its restrictions on what the funds could be spent on.

Chair Chris Ketring, Washoe County, wondered about the criminal penalties for 911 fee diversion. Ms. Gustafson replied that the 911 Fund Fee Diversion Strike Force was put together to assess the program, and one of their recommendations was to impose criminal penalties. However, that has not happened yet. The option to impose penalties could still be weighed should Congress reconsider the matter.

Stuart Cronin from Clay Group indicated that Humboldt County was taking away the money for body cameras, and Clark County is not including it in its new legislation, even though it currently uses their funds almost exclusively for body cams. He did not think it would be an immediate issue. He believed using funds for the radio system should be fine as it is allowable under FCC rules.

Ms. Matijevich stated she would bring this item to the County's leadership for direction and she encouraged other Board members to do the same.

Mr. Cronin corrected his previous statement, noting that Carson City is the agency almost exclusively using 911 funds for bodycams. Clark County is not including body-worn cam funding in its budget moving forward, though that funding has been slated for other infrastructure expenses. He was unsure whether Lyon County even collected the fund, though Ms. Matijevich believed they did.

6. 911 MASTER PLAN STATUS

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, indicated he is working with the vendor to finalize the language in their statement of work, and he hoped to get the contract to the Board of County Commissioners for approval on April 14. The drop-dead date for completing the plan is the end of November.

7. Consent Items

- a. **REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT WASHOE COUNTY TECHNOLOGY SERVICES BODYCAM FIBER**
- b. **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FOR FUNDING THE PURCHASE OF CAD SOFTWARE**
- c. **REQUEST FOR TRAINING REIMBURSEMENT FOR SPARKS POLICE DEPARTMENT PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)**
- d. **REQUEST FOR TRAINING REIMBURSEMENT FOR SPARKS POLICE DEPARTMENT PSAP**
- e. **REIMBURSEMENT REQUEST FOR HARRIS RADIO CONSOLE EQUIPMENT FOR SPARKS POLICE DEPARTMENT PSAP**
- f. **REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF RENO PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCH PRIMARY PSAP**
- g. **REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF RENO PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCH PRIMARY PSAP**
- h. **REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF RENO PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCH PRIMARY PSAP**
- i. **REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF RENO PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCH PRIMARY PSAP**
- j. **REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR CITY OF RENO PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCH PRIMARY PSAP**

There was no Committee discussion or response to the call for public comment.

Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County, moved to approve Consent Items 7a through 7j. Amelia Galicia, Washoe County, seconded the motion, which carried on a 5-0 vote with Cody Shadle, JW Hodge, Derek Keller, and Connie Shepperd absent.

End of Consent Items

8. RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE REIMBURSEMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026 BODY-WORN CAMERAS (HEREINAFTER “BWC”) AND FLEET IN-CAR CAMERAS FOR WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

Amelia Galicia, Washoe County, stated the four different invoices were separated in the staff report. They were all for body-worn cameras and fleet in-car cameras, and one of them was a contract for six additional vehicles that was drafted after the initial larger contract.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice-Chair Tara Edmonson, City of Sparks, moved to approve reimbursement for fiscal year 2026 body-worn cameras and fleet car cameras for the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office in an amount not to exceed \$1,665,569.09. Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County, seconded the motion, which carried on a 5-0 vote with Cody Shadle, JW Hodge, Derek Keller, and Connie Shepperd absent.

9. 911 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICY UPDATES

Quinn Korbolic, Washoe County Technology Services, said the policy updates were discussed at the October 2025 meeting, and the information from that presentation was transferred to a more official document. This streamlining of the reimbursement process was done because it had been causing a substantial administrative burden on staff. He reviewed the guidelines that were included in the agenda packet for the item and described some of the previous challenges with reconciling receipts. The new provision requiring reapproval of any requests not submitted for reimbursement within the same fiscal year was because the Comptroller’s Office has directed that encumbrances for those items not carry over from one year to the next. He said the policy did not need to be approved right now if Board members had comments or requests.

Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County, asked whether this only had to do with the reimbursement requests and not the initial request coming to the Board for approval. Mr. Korbolic responded that an agency coming to the Board for a reimbursement request for something that was already spent will now need to submit a full package including an invoice. Ms. Matijevich thought she would benefit from staff reports referencing the allowable uses according to Nevada Revised Statute 244A so the Board could consider the agency’s specific statutory justification for the request. Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson, Washoe County, thought that would be more appropriate to include that in the Board’s bylaws, which the Board could reconsider if necessary.

Vice-Chair Tara Edmonson, City of Sparks, noted that the City will have an agenda item for which they received preapproval in September, but for which the anticipated costs have risen due to the selection of a different product. They will seek reapproval in May. Mr. Korbolic said that would be up to the Board’s discretion; this policy is intended to be a set of guidelines and not a rigid policy. In her case, he continued, they would need reapproval anyway because of the change in costs. Vice-Chair Edmonson discussed the reasons for the delay in getting the product that was originally approved. Amelia Galicia, Washoe County, pointed out that agencies have 60 days from the receipt of the product to submit reimbursement requests, not 60 days from approval. She opined the City of Sparks could return with a request that addresses the reason for the cost increase. Mr. Korbolic said the goal is to expend funds within the fiscal year so as not to carry over encumbrances each year, but there would be exceptions, particularly for things approved very late in the fiscal year.

Chair Chris Ketring, Washoe County, inquired about the ramifications for missing the 30- and 60-day windows. Mr. Korbolic thought that requiring reapproval on expenses approved for reimbursement but not invoiced in time might create as big an administrative burden as they were trying to address. He thought that if one agency consistently failed to turn in invoices in time, the Chair could have a conversation with that agency. He believed that agencies should want to submit requests so they could be reimbursed in a timely fashion. He indicated that multiple agencies have been poor at submitting requests on time, though generally they were for smaller expenses.

Chair Ketring thought requiring reapproval might frustrate the Board into ensuring that each member's jurisdiction submits reimbursement requests quickly. He suggested not taking action at this time because the policy was only made available earlier in the day and agendaizing it for discussion and possible approval at the next meeting.

10. 911 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER AND/OR STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County, announced that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) discussed potential bill draft requests (BDRs) to submit for the next legislative session, and one of the suggestions was for a bill that would allow the County to use up to 3 percent of the 911 Surcharge Fund to cover the costs associated with running the fund, which she estimated as roughly equivalent to one full-time employee. She felt it should be determined whether this would constitute a diversion before the BDR is submitted. The BCC was supportive of the suggestion, and she recommended to them seeking a legislative sponsor or submitting it as a County BDR. Staff will return to the BCC in the summer with the results of its legal analysis and whether they could obtain a sponsor, and the BCC would make a decision about the BDR at that time.

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson, Washoe County, stated that would not constitute a diversion under Federal Communications Commission guidelines. She reviewed the relevant portion of the guidelines.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor

Approved as written in Session May 21, 2026.