



Meeting Minutes Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee

Attendance	DATE	Thursday, March 1, 2018	
	TIME	9:00 AM	
	LOCATION	NV Division of Emergency Management Training Room 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701	
	METHOD	Teleconference	
	RECORDER	Shealyne Schultz	
Committee Members	Present	Staff and Others	Present
Aaron Kenneston	X	Sarah Bradley (DAG)	X
Robb Fellows	X	Shealyne Schultz	X
Andrew Trelease	X		
Craig dePolo	X		
Rob Palmer	X		
Ron Lynn	X		
Terri Garside	X		
Dan Hourihan	X		
Bunny Bishop	X		
Carlito Rayos	X		
Jeremy Hynds	X		
Janell Woodward	X		

1. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND ESTABLISH QUORUM

Chair, Craig dePolo, called the NHMPC meeting to order. Roll call was performed. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair, Craig dePolo, opened the meeting for public comment. There was none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair, Craig dePolo, asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (NHMPC) meeting held October 26, 2017. Ron Lynn moved and Robb Fellows seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. UPDATE OF PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION (PDM) 2017 GRANT CYCLE APPLICATION PROCESS

Janell Woodward provided an update on the 2017 grant cycle. There were four plans and two projects submitted to FEMA. The projects were from Douglas County and the City of Las Vegas. Currently, due to a system crash when applications were submitted, everything has been delayed. She is hoping that they may know what projects were chosen for review in the next week, but she will provide an update as soon as she has information.

There was discussion on the timeframe of this process and how things would work in a typical year. Janell explained that in a typical cycle PDM is opened in March with everything due in June. However, last year did not follow this schedule and was pushed back, creating the uncertainty surrounding the 2017 timeline.

Aaron Kenneston had a question regarding the date of funding and if grants would be back dated, similar to other federal grants. Janell advised that this would not be the case. The date would reflect the date FEMA funds it and this can vary. Aaron questioned when jurisdictions might receive funding for their plans or projects. Janell explained that projects can take a while due to the additional review requirements; for a plan, the June timeframe would be the usual with a performance period of three years.

Carlito Rayos questioned if his jurisdiction should send a letter to Region IX memorializing and explaining that their local match will end in June. There was brief discussion on this and how it may work in their favor to show this. Janell advised that she is hopeful that they should know by March if their project has been chosen for further review.

Janell added that there have been no updates on 2018 funding.

5. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF OPEN PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION AND HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM ALLOCATED NEVADA GRANTS

Janell provided an update on the open programs, noting that a lot of the grants have been closed.

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)

She advised that for the Moapa disaster (4202) they have finished the engineering, which is phase one. They are currently waiting on FEMA for the contractor before moving forward with phase two. The application for the January flood disaster (4303) was submitted and due on February 17, 2018, and the application for the February flood disaster (4307) is due at the end of March.

For 4303, they turned in generator projects as well as home elevations for Washoe County. For 4307, they turned in a Lemmon Valley acquisition/demolition project for Washoe County, as well as projects for Carson City and Storey County.

Chair, Craig dePolo, asked for additional information on the Lemmon Valley project. Aaron Kenneston explained that the idea was to take the top nine worst properties that were red tagged and clearly in the flood zone, allow the homeowner to sell the property to the county, and then the properties would become open space. This would not solve the flooding issue, but would improve the situation. Janell provided additional information on the project and the homes that were on the list. There was discussion on the current conditions of the Lemmon Valley area. Aaron thanked the Division of Emergency Management (DEM) for their assistance with this. Aaron questioned the timeline of this and what the sequence of events will be for this project. Janell advised that she is unsure what the exact duration will be.

Ron Lynn questioned if the residents knew that they were in a flood zone. Aaron provided some background on this, noting that many have been living there for years or have inherited them and moving would be difficult to do. Ron spoke to having dealt with a similar issue and how they were able to help by purchasing land and moving residents there. He noted this was more cost effective and may be something they should look into. Aaron noted that this is one of the options they have considered as the county does own land in the area.

Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM)

Janell advised that the following grant years are closed:

- 2008
- 2009 – A significant amount of money was returned to FEMA due to a policy issue and that caused a project not being able to be completed.
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

The following years are still open:

- 2010 (Special) is funded and in process
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016

Cooperating Technical Partner (CTP)

The only year that is open is 2016. Janell advised she will work with Bunny Bishop in going out to counties to assist with updating their mitigation strategies.

6. PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Chair, Craig dePolo, provided an update on the Planning Subcommittee and their last meeting. At the last meeting they reviewed the final three hazard profiles. These were all approved by the Subcommittee with minor changes needed to be made.

He advised members that the Subcommittee is requesting that everyone submit any information related to public awareness related to hazards or mitigation projects from 2013 to present. This information can be submitted to Janell Woodward. There was discussion among members on the different projects that have been done and what could be submitted. They would like this information within the next couple of weeks.

7. REVIEW OF STATE ENHANCED HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN DRAFT SECTION 3 (HAZARDS) FROM SUBCOMMITTEE

Chair, Craig dePolo provided a brief overview of the contents of the State Plan. The contents are as follows:

- Title Page
- Section Zero – Overview of Plan
- Section One – Official Record of Adoption
- Section Two – Planning Process
- Section Three – Risk Assessment
- Section Four – Mitigation Strategy
- Section Five – Coordinating Local Mitigation Planning
- Section Six – Plan Maintenance Process
- Section Seven – References

- Section Eight – Enhanced Plan Criteria Achievements Program
- Appendices

He noted that this template originates from FEMA. There was a question on the size of the plan when completed. The plan will be approximately 400-500 pages.

Jeremy Hynds asked what the difference was between this risk assessment and the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA). Janell Woodward explained that this assessment covers natural hazards, while the THIRA covers both natural and manmade.

Section Three was provided to members for review. Craig explained that he would like members to take a look over this section, provide comments, and potentially approve this section. Members were allowed a 15 minute break for review.

Rob Palmer questioned if there was a hazard that stood out to Craig that needed more work. Members could focus on that one versus looking over each hazard. Robb Fellows added that if there wasn't, maybe there are others that are clean that don't need review and can be approved. Craig advised that there was not.

Ron Lynn noted that after looking over the section there are routine corrections and language that needs to be cleaned up. His two comments are that when windstorms and severe storms are combined (page 3-5), the word "winter" needs to be removed as this is not just limited to winter; and he would like unique identification for each figure.

Andrew Trelease asked if each section is pre-determined or if they are chosen. Craig advised that these are pre-determined.

Carlito Rayos questioned if subject matter experts (SMEs) looked into the various hazards. Janell advised that each hazard was updated by an SME in that area. Jeremy Hynds voiced concern over having a single SME update a portion versus having several when discussing a general hazard like this.

There was additional discussion among members regarding the hazards contained within the plan. It was explained that FEMA does not look at the manmade disasters if they are in the state plan, their focus is on the natural disasters. Aaron Kenneston noted that when developing their plan he chose to add both.

Craig advised this is not comprehensive, but is designed to give a general idea of the hazard and the risk associated within the state. The counties and cities within the state are the principal users of the plan and use it as a reference to build theirs.

Jeremy Hynds suggested that where tsunami/seiche references Lake Tahoe (page 3-5) it should be changed to something more generic like "lakes in Nevada" as there are other lakes within the state that could experience tsunamis.

Bunny Bishop commented on the formatting of tables between pages. It was determined that some of the formatting may have been lost due to track changes. This will be looked into and formatting will be corrected as necessary.

Craig dePolo went through each hazard with the members, highlighting any changes that have been made. The following sections were commented on:

Avalanches: The history, new figures, and fatalities were updated.

Drought: Members were advised that this information came from the Desert Research Institute (DRI). Examples of the drought pages that can be viewed were given. Terri Garside asked if it was possible to get data that was more current than 2016. Janell explained that this was done in 2016, the same year a drought study was done and this is where the information was pulled.

Floods: Robb Fellows noted that Carson City has levees that should be added to the table on 3-78 and questioned if there was any way to increase the image/table size. Bunny Bishop advised she will look into the accuracy of this table and update.

Severe Storms: There was discussion on the risk rating of thunderstorms, specifically the difference between flood risk and thunderstorm risk. It was recommended that language be added to clarify that the thunderstorm risk only takes into account the primary risk and not secondary risks associated (ex. flash flooding). Andrew Trelease will look into this. Carlito Rayos asked if the product used to rank the hazards is available. Janell will look into this. If available, Carlito and Jeremy Hynds will compare it to the THIRA to check for consistency. Terri Garside questioned if there were any updated thunderstorm and hail events to add to the tables in this section as they end with 2016. There was discussion among members on how to ensure that the plan is comprehensive. Unfortunately, there has to be a cutoff and everything can't make it into the plan.

Hazardous Materials: This section has been updated. Jeremy Hynds recommended referencing the test site and transportation relative to this in Southern Nevada as this is a very active hazard within the state.

Infestation: This was recently updated by the Department of Agriculture. Jeremy Hynds suggested adding a reference to the Zika virus on page 3-106.

Land Subsidence and Ground Failure: This was updated.

Landslides: Additional information into the different kinds of landslides that can occur was added. Craig explained that this was done as the mitigation of landslides involves identifying where they are, and they need to be able to identify them to inventory them.

Severe Winter Storm and Extreme Snowfall: This will need to be modified if windstorms are brought in.

Terrorism: There was discussion among members and the confusion with having terrorism be in the plan and the difference between non-natural and manmade disasters or accidents. It was recommended that this be removed from the plan as it contradicts the rest of the plan.

Carlito Rayos made a motion to strike the section on terrorism from the plan and reference the THIRA specific to weapons of mass destruction and hazmat. Jeremy Hynds seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Tsunami/seiche: As noted above, this section will be broadened and will be made non-Lake Tahoe centric.

Volcano: This was updated in an attempt to change the perception of this hazard as there are volcanoes within and in neighboring states that can cause issues. There was discussion among members of volcanoes in the area. Craig recommended pulling volcano response plans from other states and having them readily available for emergency managers should they be needed.

Wildfires: This section was rewritten to reflect the new views on wildfire within the state.

There was a question on if unreinforced masonry is referenced in the document. Craig advised it should be in the earthquake section, specifically where mitigation is discussed. There was discussion among members regarding unreinforced masonry within the state.

Andrew Trelease questioned not assessing the risk of floods in the population centers of Las Vegas with hazus. It was recommended that they add a footnote to reference the money spent on mitigating the flood risk within this large population area.

Jeremy Hynds commented on the table on pages 3-188 and 3-189, noting there are a handful of hazards here that are not profiled within the plan. It was explained that the data for this table is pulled from the latest plan update from the locals. There was concern over some inconsistencies and will be double checked.

Jeremy also asked if space weather should be addressed in the plan as it has become more of a known problem recently. Aaron commented that he has had citizens come to him on this as well. Craig advised that this will need to be added to the next plan update should they want to address it.

8. ANNOUNCEMENT OF POTENTIAL FUTURE MEETINGS

Janell advised the next meeting will fall after the next NHMP Subcommittee meeting in the first week of April. There was some discussion on the next meeting and timelines for submitting the plan, but the exact date will be determined outside of the meeting.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair, Craig dePolo, opened the meeting for public comment.

10. ADJOURN

Chair, Craig dePolo, adjourned the meeting.