

CLARK COUNTY 9-1-1 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

04/27/2026

MEETING MINUTES FINAL

MEMBERS ATTENDANCE:

Tim Shea, Chris Wardlaw, Brian O'Neal, Billy Samuels, Miranda Ramos, Richard Johnson, Fernando Gray, Tim Hacker, Joseph Calhoun, Damon Harris, Catalina Latorre, Tracy Fails, Heather Law.

ALTERNATES ATTENDANCE:

Jack Broadbent, Imad Bachir, Will Riggs.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Joel Guerrero, Michael Harris.

I. Call to Order

Chief Brian O'Neal called the meeting to order on Monday, April 27, 2026, at 10:01 AM.

II. Roll Call

Quorum present.

III. Public Comments

Stuart Cronan commented that he contributed to the development of the five-year plan initiated in 2024 and joined the meeting to serve as a resource for any questions regarding the plan or the bylaws.

IV. *Chair Rotation List

Proposed rotation:

1. Clark County
2. LVMPD
3. Boulder City
4. City of Henderson
5. City of Las Vegas
6. City of Mesquite

7. City of North Las Vegas

Tim Hacker with the City of Las Vegas asked if this rotation was a separate action from voting for the Chair, Brian O'Neal answered that way it would limit our choices for the Chair.

Tim Hacker **motion to adopt the rotation as proposed.** Second, Joseph Calhoun, no discussion, **motion carried.**

It was asked in the room if there was a specific agenda item to elect a Chair to continue with the order, since there was not one, Brian O'Neal initiated a motion to nominate a member of Clark County.

Joseph Calhoun **motion to nominate Billy Samuels as Chair,** second, Tim Hacker, no discussion, **motion carried.**

V. *Vice Chair

It was proposed that the Vice Chair will be the next in line for the Chair position, providing an orderly and predictable transition of authority. Following this transition the next entity in the previous list will continue as vice chair subsequently. Each Chair and vice chair will serve a term of one year.

Motion by Damon Harris: **To approve the Vice Chair rotation.** Second, Chris Wardlaw, no discussion, **motion carried.**

Chris Wardlaw **motion to nominate Damon Harris as Vice Chair,** second, Joseph Calhoun and Brian O'Neal, no discussion, **motion carried.**

VI. Presentation

Mike Harwell with the Clark County Business License Department explained that according to the five-year plan the estimate annual revenue is \$35M, that is based on the \$1.00 per line fee. The Board approved \$0.50 fee that will go up \$0.10 a year until reaching the \$1.00 cap. Phone companies have different billing cycles, any payments made to the phone companies in April we should receive in May. Mr. Harwell stated it is hard to predict how much we will receive in May depending on how many people pay their bill in April.

The Chair asked, once fees are collected, when the funds will be available to the committee and how to access the funds.

Mr. Harwell answered that any expenditure from these funds must first be approved by the County Board. The Treasurer is responsible for maintaining the fund. At the end of each fiscal year, we will monitor the balance to ensure it does not exceed the statutory limit. However, it will likely take some time to reach that threshold, particularly as funds begin to be spent while new revenue is coming in. The calculation for the statutory limit is determined on your end. If the fund exceeds the limit as of June 30 of a given year, adjustments will need to be made for the following year to bring the balance back within the allowable range. Business Licensing is responsible for collecting the funds, monitoring compliance, and ensuring payments are made. The revenue is then deposited into a special fund, which is overseen and controlled by the Treasurer's Office.

VII. Discussion

Brian O'Neal stated that the only reporting requirement to the Board is the submission of an annual report outlining the expenditure priorities and recommendations for spending. However, there is the option to provide regular progress reports to the Board if the group chooses to share information on a more frequent basis. The purpose of this agenda item is to determine whether we would like to provide periodic updates to the BCC throughout the year, or if we prefer to compile all information into the annual report submitted to them. The Chair asked for clarification on the reporting being at the end of fiscal or calendar year, what the expectation is regarding sharing information with the board. Brian O'Neal replied that it is not specific in the adoption, only states is an annual report. Joseph Calhoun suggested it would be more effective to provide the board with quarterly reports. It was discussed that it would be better to close out on a calendar year versus waiting for fiscal year, budgeting should mimic jurisdictionally fiscal year, but for reports to close out December 31st. The first meeting in January will report from this calendar year, the spending can start since we will be able to get it done before June 30th. It was noted that reporting will be quarterly.

The discussion continued related to the carryover, whether projects are funded but not expended, if that would count towards the \$15M carryover or considered a rollover from the previous fiscal year. Chris Wardlow intervened, when discussing expenditures, it was noted that many of the actual project expenses will likely not occur directly from the accounting special revenue fund where the revenue is initially deposited. The Board will

need to further discuss how funding allocations will be handled once projects are approved. Specifically, if a project is associated with a particular jurisdiction—such as Clark County or the City of Las Vegas—the process for transferring funds from the County’s special revenue fund to the appropriate jurisdiction will need to be established. The Chair emphasized that the main project is the Red Rock Project before any other jurisdictional projects, does not mean we wouldn’t have any other projects, because Henderson might not really be a part of that, but still a part of this committee. As a group will be something to figure out, we will submit our recommendations to the board, we provide the ideas and the recommendations; the board ultimately will decide how to proceed. The Chair continued, our role is advisory, although it would be challenging for the board to go against recommendations coming from this group. It will make the process easier if the projects are ranked in order of priority to decide which projects to fund.

The fund had been already created but the dollar amount was not available at the time, Chris Wardlaw will get back at that later.

VIII. Budget and Allowable Costs

Chris Wardlaw stated that Mike has already discussed how our collection rates are currently about half of what we had initially proposed. Those rates will increase over the next five years by \$0.10 for a residential line and by \$1.00 for a trunk line until they reach the authorized maximums. We expect those rates to be fully implemented by Fiscal Year 2031. As for eligible uses of the funds, they include Next Generation 911 infrastructure, facility costs associated with the 911 system, and other related expenses. Chief Samuels already mentioned the Red Rock facility, body-worn cameras, and vehicle-mounted cameras — all of those are eligible uses under the program. What the county did was create Special Revenue Fund 2935, which is the 911 Surcharge Fund. We budgeted approximately \$4.25 million in collections during the fourth quarter of Fiscal Year 2026. None of those funds were appropriated for expenditures during FY26 because there was not enough time to develop a plan and bring spending recommendations before the board. As a result, we carried forward that \$4.25 million into Fiscal Year 2027, where we anticipate collecting approximately \$17 million based on the \$0.50 surcharge amount Mike discussed, along with some interest earnings on the cash deposited into the fund. From the budgeting side, we allocated nearly the entire amount — close to \$22 million — for

appropriations, subject to this committee's recommendations to the board regarding how those funds should be spent throughout the year.

Fernando Gray requested clarification regarding the FY26 budgeted revenue of \$4.25 million and whether the funds would be carried forward into FY27. Chris Wardlaw stated that no expenditures are currently planned for those funds pending recommendations from the committee and action by the Board, revenue collections are expected to lag one to two months behind billing cycles, with the majority of FY26 collections anticipated to be received in July or August.

Richard Johnson asked regarding allowable expenditures whether recurring expenses would qualify as eligible uses of the funds in addition to Next Generation 911 infrastructure, body-worn cameras, and vehicle-mounted cameras.

It was explained that not allowable expenses were general law enforcement operations, personnel salaries or non-emergency purchases. CAD systems and consoles, radios, and items like that will be allowable expenses.

Richard continued asking about some language for body worn cameras from the feds not being allowable, but this committee would make them allowable.

The Chair stated that in previous discussion with Damon the language was left intentionally there because NRS may permit such use, the use of body-worn cameras are still not planned to be used, this issue has been previously and significantly discussed during policy development; the use of these cameras could negatively affect or complicate other important policy on regulatory language. It was also noted that with the reduced rate that the rates will start it won't be possible to dedicate personnel to body-worn cameras given the available staffing as it is.

IX. Red Rock Joint Dispatch Center Update

Damon Harris provided an update on the project status, stating that the project is currently in the high 90% range for completion of the design phase. The team anticipates issuing a construction bid around August, staff are currently working with the city on system right-of-way issues. The expectation is that the project will be awarded and construction will begin by the end of the year. As a reminder, substantial completion of the RRJCC is still anticipated around December 2028.

Additionally, in response to a prior question from Chief Calhoun, Damon Harris stated that an operating interlocal agreement is currently being circulated for signatures among all participating agencies.

The Chair asked for clarification on whether substantial completion meant the center would be actively receiving calls by December 2028.

Damon Harris explained that the goal is for the facility to be operational by December 2028; however, substantial completion generally refers to the stage near the end of a project when remaining work consists primarily of change orders, punch-list items, and final adjustments. No firm promise can be made that the facility would officially open in December 2028, although that remains the target timeline. There are no plans for a phased occupancy approach. Instead, all participating agencies, including LVMPD and fire services, are expected to move into the building simultaneously and begin operations together on day one.

The Chair expressed enthusiasm about the project and noted that dispatchers and call takers are expected to benefit from a modern and improved working environment, 135 consoles; 89 assigned to LVMPD and 46 designated for fire services, an approximate of 93,000 square feet.

Brian O'Neal asked about a preliminary budget.

Damon Harris stated that while a construction budget currently exists for the project, there is not yet an established operating budget, many operational costs remain unknown at this stage of the process. The project is currently focused on the construction phase, and officials are awaiting the return of construction bids to determine whether projected costs remain within budget expectations. Additionally, there is a preliminary FF&E (Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment) budget in place. The current estimate, which is included in the five-year master plan, is approximately \$17 million; budget estimates will likely be refined as additional funding information becomes available through surcharge revenue.

A question was raised regarding whether surcharge revenue is expected to fully fund the project or whether additional funding sources will be required.

Damon Harris explained that funding projections largely depend on timing and the pace at which telecommunications carriers begin remitting surcharge revenues, how quickly carriers will implement the surcharge collections and there may not be any retroactive payments tied to the ordinance's original effective date once charges begin appearing on customer bills. Current revenue estimates are only projections based on

anticipated participation levels and the estimated number of customers in the valley who will ultimately remit the surcharge. Actual funding capacity will become clearer once revenue collection begins and funds are received. At that point, officials will be better able to determine how much the RRJCC project can realistically be supported through surcharge revenue and align those funds with the project's operational timeline and opening needs.

Additional clarification was provided regarding project funding and the role of surcharge revenues. It was noted that the city and county have already committed construction funding contributions toward the project, including a construction budget of approximately \$42 million. Officials confirmed that the related interlocal agreement has been approved among the county, city, Metro, and North Las Vegas.

The speaker emphasized that the project was already moving forward before the surcharge revenue mechanism was established and that surcharge funds were never intended to serve as the sole funding source for the project. Initial capital funding had already been identified through contributions from the participating local governments.

It was further explained that, while surcharge funds are technically eligible to be used for construction purposes, there is currently no expectation that those funds will primarily be directed toward construction costs. Concerns were raised about reduced surcharge rates and the substantial FF&E costs associated with outfitting the facility. The speaker noted that future funding decisions will ultimately remain under the committee's discretion.

At the conclusion of the discussion, one participant commented that Verizon had already begun collecting the surcharge on customer bills, noting an observed charge of approximately one dollar for two phone lines.

X. *Create Bylaws

The Chair read articles that have been created on 04/26/2026 and make a few remarks and comments along the way. It was asked to the members and alternates to send their letter of appointment, invite Timothy Baldwin for situational awareness, and an administrative secretary will be provided by the Clark County Fire Department even when another jurisdiction will run

as Chair. Meeting will be held every other month; reporting will be done quarterly. County will post the agenda and minutes to comply with open meeting law (NRS 241.010-241.040).

It was asked to Stuart Cronan if the bylaws were borrowed from Washoe County and how these were working for them.

Stuart Cronan explained, we spun off their last version, and they've updated a few things since then, mostly based on legislative changes. It works very well. I think it's important to point out that every agency has two votes, except for the county, which has three. I believe that was based on a request from the Board of County Commissioners. So, there is an inherent equitable approach built into the structure. This model is essentially a variation of their framework, and it worked very well for them over the years. Brian O'Neal recommended to capture on Article II, Committee Leadership section the rotation of the chairs, as it was approved previously. The Chair suggested adding the Vice-Chair rotation. It was suggested to add it in Article IV and after some discussion, it was decided to be added under Article II.

Brian O'Neal **motion to approve the bylaws as amended**, second, Fernando Gray, no discussion, **motion carried**.

XI. 5 Year Plan Review

The Chair stated not going into detail about this plan since the agenda item is set as a discussion only and will only focus on a few subjects.

[1.2 Key Findings and Recommendations](#), need update to \$0.50 per line to identify it properly, with an escalator of \$0.10 per year to a max of \$1.00 per line. The Chair continued that it would be helpful to identify committed and uncommitted funding in that same section, to maintain the historical record.

The Chair stated the need to work on the naming consistency. In some places we refer to it as the "911 Advisory Committee," while in others it is called the "911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee." We should make the terminology more uniform throughout the documents. For example, under the bylaws in the membership composition section, it states the "Clark County 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee," while the five-year master plan simply refers to it as the "911 Advisory Committee." The Chair stated preference to the simpler version for consistency and clarity. Suggested an update of the bylaws to change the name to the "911 Advisory Committee."

Someone intervened and discussed the naming convention prescribed in the ordinance and noted that the official name is the 'Clark County 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee.' It is possible to use an abbreviation or alternate shorthand reference; however, it was noted that the ordinance specifies the committee's formal name. Reviewing the ordinance language to ensure consistency with the board's prior approval. Direction was given to revise the 911 Five-Year Master Plan to replace references to the '911 Advisory Committee' with 'Clark County 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee' throughout the document.

The Chair continued reading the 5 year master plan, it was discussed since the document has been shared among the participants on multiple instances and everyone had a chance to review, input has been solicited, everyone had a chance to familiarize with the terms the reading wouldn't continue but more a discussion about the expectations on updates to the document and budget developments for each agency to have a clear path of what is being funded, what we have operationally to make sure it's timed correctly in order to submit budgets for the next cycle.

Brian O'Neal referenced page 52 on the document and stated that several sections will help guide upcoming committee discussions regarding PSAP operations, priorities and operational needs that will assist in establishing future funding priorities. Discussion continued regarding future funding and technology planning priorities for PSAPs. Committee members emphasized the importance of engaging PSAP agencies to identify operational priorities and develop multi-year strategies for technology implementation. It was noted that establishing funding priorities would require input and information from the participating agencies. The committee discussed the expectation that each incorporated city, the county, and Metro would provide their respective priorities for consideration in future planning discussions.

The Chair added that an agenda item should be added for the next meeting to start identifying those priorities and everyone can present theirs.

A committee member referenced a prior budget and planning process conducted in 2024 in which participating agencies were provided an Excel worksheet containing multiple tabs for submission of recurring operational costs, one-time capital needs, and related funding information. It was noted that the information was updated again in 2025 prior to presentation

of the ordinance to the Board of County Commissioners. Discussion followed regarding the possible reuse and revision of the worksheet process for future planning efforts. A recommendation was made for the county to update or streamline the forms and distribute standardized worksheets to all participating agencies for completion. The committee discussed having the County compile the submitted information for review and future funding discussions. It was further noted that updated financial information would likely be available by the next reporting cycle. A committee member stated that copies of the prior worksheets were available and would be shared with county staff for redistribution to the group. The committee agreed that agencies would review and update their priorities using the worksheets and return for further discussion at a future meeting.

Stuart Cronan referenced the flow chart contained on page 41 of the document and stated that it was included as an example of the purchasing and approval process. Mr. Cronan explained that the flow chart outlines how purchases would be agendaized, presented to the committee, entered the county's system, processed for payment, and tracked. Mr. Cronan further stated that understanding the process would be important for committee members and participating agencies submitting requests for consideration. He recommended that the flow chart and related purchasing process be included as part of discussion at the next meeting. The Chair agreed to review the chart and make sure all the legal names were correct. The Chair addressed Chris Wardlaw and asked to make sure the process was correct going forward.

A question was asked whether the committee is required to adopt the plan or if the Board of County Commissioners have already adopted the five-year plan. It was further noted that, pursuant to the ordinance, the Board of County Commissioners is responsible for adopting the five-year plan. The current version of the plan has already been adopted, and the committee's role was to provide recommendations regarding the use of the funding in accordance with the established guidelines. It was further clarified that no formal adoption action by the committee was required.

Brian O'Neal referenced [12.8 Periodic Reporting of PSAP Operational Metrics to the Committee](#), regarding the section addressing performance measurement, the purpose of performance measurement is to provide key information to assist with management and decision-making processes.

The Chair discussed the inclusion of performance measurement updates as a standing agenda item for future meetings. Committee members noted

that, when there are no updates, staff could simply report that there was nothing new to report. It was further discussed that the item would provide an opportunity to address project issues, delays, or requests for additional funding as they arise. The Chair continued and pointed out the need for a standardized reporting document to ensure consistency among agencies. It was suggested that the reporting metrics include timelines, fiscal expenditures, unencumbered balances, and related project information.

Discussion was held regarding distributing the plan back to the PSAPs for updates and evaluation based on the strategic plan. It was noted that submissions would be reviewed within the context of the five-year planning period.

Tracy Falls, Mesquite PD, noted that his agency was in the process of preparing and finalizing Fiscal Year 2027 budgets and asked whether it was too late to submit additional worksheets or funding requests for Fiscal Year 2027 for agencies not currently included in the Red Rock project. It was noted that available funding appeared to total approximately \$17.5 million.

It was explained that, based on the funding flow chart previously reviewed by the committee, the cities would be responsible for paying project invoices upfront and then requesting reimbursement through the committee process. Participating jurisdictions would need to have the appropriate budget authority in place at the local level prior to seeking reimbursement from the county.

Discussion was held regarding project submissions and funding requests. A committee member noted that no projects had yet been formally approved or funded and stated that all agencies should update the existing project spreadsheet with current information. It was further noted that agencies were not prohibited from submitting future funding requests to the committee for consideration and approval, and that reimbursement requests would likely need to be prioritized.

Committee members also discussed expectations for the initial fiscal year, noting that project activity and reimbursements would likely proceed slowly due to the timing of revenue collections and the availability of fund balances. It was further noted that many proposed projects involve significant costs, and reimbursement timing would depend on available collections within the fund.

Tim Hacker discussed anticipated timelines for fund utilization and program ramp-up, with reference made to a prior project in which implementation

of a similar program required approximately 18 to 24 months before full staffing or expenditure occurred. It was noted that it would likely take a year or more to build up reserves, and that initial fund withdrawals were expected to occur gradually as revenues are collected and projects are initiated. Any movement of projects forward would require approval through the appropriate process, including review and approval by the Commission. It was further noted that expenditure activity would begin in alignment with the approved plan and governing body authorization.

Discussion was held regarding whether baseline reserve levels should be established within the fund. Committee members discussed whether it would be preferable to retain reserves or to distribute funds more quickly to support operational and capital needs. It was noted that maintaining a large reserve balance was not the intended purpose of the funding and that expectations did not include holding significant funds in reserve.

Finance representatives noted that establishing a substantial reserve could unnecessarily tie up available funding and that agencies should instead be positioned to submit eligible expenses as projects are identified. It was further noted that agencies could begin submitting invoices or funding recommendations under the existing rules and framework.

Committee members discussed anticipated fund utilization, noting that prior projections reflected significantly higher eligible costs than currently anticipated collections, and that there would likely be sufficient opportunities to allocate funding to projects. It was also noted that the goal was to avoid large unspent balances carrying over between fiscal periods. Committee members further discussed the need for agencies to develop and present a five-year strategic expenditure plan, with emphasis on making year-one plans more concrete while allowing later years to remain more flexible and forward-looking.

XII. Ethics Training

The Chair discussed ethics training requirements for committee members and participating jurisdictions. Ethics training is required for members of boards associated with the Clark County and that compliance must align with applicable NRS and Nevada Ethics Commission standards. Documentation of completed ethics training would be collected for reporting purposes to Clark County, a form would be distributed to members to certify completion of training, and that training resources and links would be provided to assist members who still needed to complete the

requirement. It was clarified that separate additional training specific to the County would not be required where jurisdictions already comply with Nevada ethics standards. Documentation of completion will be maintained for administrative compliance purposes.

XIII. *Meeting Scheduling

Discussion was held regarding the proposed meeting cadence and scheduling of future meetings. Staff noted that two tentative dates had been placed on the calendar (July 30 and October 29) to reserve the meeting space, but that formal invitations had not yet been issued. A committee member noted a scheduling conflict with the proposed dates due to Fiscal Affairs Committee obligations and requested that the dates be reconsidered. Members discussed the requirement for more regular meetings, noting that the bylaws reference meetings occurring on a bi-monthly basis. It was suggested that upcoming scheduling focuses on June, with additional meetings to be determined thereafter. The Chair proposed using a scheduling poll (Doodle poll) to identify available dates, suggesting multiple Monday options in June to accommodate member availability and avoid conflicts with other standing meetings. It was further discussed that Mondays may be the most feasible option given competing meeting schedules on other weekdays. Staff indicated they would distribute a scheduling poll for members to select preferred dates, and that the intent would be to establish a consistent bi-monthly cadence moving forward based on the selected meeting date.

No action was taken.

XIV. Public Comments

No public comments.

XV. Adjournment

Tim Hacker **motion to adjourn the meeting**, second, Richard Johnson, no discussion, meeting adjourned.