



## Meeting Minutes Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee

<b>Attendance</b>	<b>DATE</b>	Tuesday, April 24, 2018	
	<b>TIME</b>	9:00 AM	
	<b>LOCATION</b>	NV Division of Emergency Management Executive Conference Room 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701  Las Vegas Valley Emergency Mgmt Center Executive Conference Room 7551 Sauer Drive Las Vegas, NV 89128	
	<b>METHOD</b>	Videoconference – Teleconference	
	<b>RECORDER</b>	Shealyne Schultz	
<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Staff and Others</b>	<b>Present</b>
Aaron Kenneston		Mike Detmer (DAG)	X
Robb Fellows	X	Shealyne Schultz (DEM)	X
Andrew Trelease	X	Rachel Micander (NBMG)	X
Craig dePolo	X	Sydney Wilson (NBMG)	X
Rob Palmer	X		
Ron Lynn			
Terri Garside	X		
Dan Hourihan			
Bunny Bishop			
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 March 1, 2018. Robb Fellows moved and Terri Garside 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 applications. There were four plans and two projects that were submitted to FEMA. Of these, all of the plans were approved and the two projects were denied. Janell explained that this was in part due to Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) issues and items that weren't included that were not required in the past. She noted specifically an H&H study for the project submitted for North Las Vegas that would have been allowed after, but is now required ahead of time. Andrew Trelease advised that this study was done as a requirement for their match funding. However, it is possible that this was not included in the documentation submitted.

Janell suggested looking at the feedback and trying to resubmit for an upcoming year. Carlito Rayos advised he would like to see what these comments are, but would like to take a cycle off and resubmit if they can identify a local match in the future. This was the last year they were approved match through the local flood control district.

Craig dePolo asked if there is any opportunity, if an H&H study was done, that we can show this for any reconsideration of were there comments beyond that. Janell advised that there were comments beyond this, part of which had to do with the BCA. She noted that they did their best to work through this issue, but it may be better for an engineer to complete it even if others have gone through the BCA class. Carlito agreed, noting that it is a very technical tool.

Craig commented that he thought the BCA was worked on in the class. Janell advised that this was done to a certain extent. She explained that the instructor went through what was done the year prior and gave suggestions on how to improve it. Carlito noted that they implemented all recommended improvements; however, it is not a "one size fits all" tool. They found themselves trying to fabricate information to fit the tool versus presenting the case on the actual return on investment, which is very clear in their submitted project. He believes that this all got lost in translation through the BCA. Janell added that she still needs to show the feedback that was given by the engineers that reviewed everything.

Janell continued, noting that all are disappointed by the outcome for both projects. She will send out the review forms that were provided from FEMA to Committee members.

Robb Fellows asked what was wrong with Douglas County's project. Janell advised that this was a BCA issue as well, noting they had also attended the class.

Craig recommended having a FEMA representative attend a meeting to explain to the Committee why this has happened two years in a row and why they are unable to work with us more, as they have in the past. Janell noted that FEMA Region IX commented that they feel things are requiring things that weren't previously required in the past.

Craig continued and requested that members think about the process. There was discussion on having a conversation with FEMA as something seems unfair. Craig noted that this is a

state with good projects, asked for assistance and reflected on the year before, followed the advice of FEMA, and still got denied. He suggested having a more one-on-one conversation with FEMA to get more explanation so this is a little clearer. Janell advised she will send the technical reviews that were provided by FEMA to members and invite a FEMA representative to attend one of the meetings.

Carlito thanked Janell and staff for all of the work that was put forth in trying to ensure they were successful in their application. He also thanked Andrew Trelease and the Regional Flood Control District for encumbering those funds for two applications. He continued that it was a great learning experience for all, and a great opportunity to get to know each other and work through the process. Craig added that this emphasizes another aspect of this project; a partnership between agencies.

## **5. PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Chair, Craig dePolo, provided a brief report on the Subcommittee. He advised the final draft was provided to the Subcommittee. Outside of some minor comments related to formatting or items that were planned to be addressed there were no major changes made. The draft plan was approved by the Subcommittee.

## **6. UPDATE AND REVIEW OF THE STATE ENHANCED HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN DRAFT FROM SUBCOMMITTEE**

Chair, Craig dePolo, began with noting the work that has gone into this plan update and how much information it contains. He commented on how local jurisdictions will be able to go in and extract information for their own communities and plans. He spoke to how much background information it contains, not only on the hazards, but on the processes within the state.

Craig advised he would like to go through the different sections and solicit comments from members. He noted that there are a few things that they did not get to this update (ex. Not asking the Nevada Earthquake Safety Council (NESC) to update their goals), but these will be noted for the next plan update. He added that this process needs to be completed by the end of May to stay on schedule.

Members went through each section and provided comments:

Section Zero – Overview of Plan: Robb Fellows commented on formatting. Rachel Micander explained that all formatting will be address in the coming month when the draft plan is up for public comment. Terri Garside noted that on the mobile version there is a heading of “October 2007”. There was some confusion as the desktop version does not list this heading. This was noted and staff will ensure that the final copy does not have this discrepancy. Rachel Micander commented on some of the updates that were made to this section. Jeremy Hynds noted that Figure 0-3a. encroaches on the footer. This formatting issue will be fixed.

Section One – Official Record of Adoption: There were no comments.

Section Two – Planning Process: Rachel Micander noted that there are a couple of tables that will continue to be updated up until the point of submittal to FEMA. These tables that the work that is continually being done. It was noted that for this reason, track changes was left on this document. Jeremy Hynds noted an error on Table 2-1. Rick Diebold is listed as being

with the City of North Las Vegas Office of Emergency Management; however, he was with the City of Las Vegas Office of Emergency Management. This will be changed.

Section Three – Risk Assessment: Members went through this section in detail at the last meeting. It was noted that the changes that were requested at the last meeting were done; the THIRA is now referenced in Appendix M, the tsunami/seiche section has been edited, and terrorism has been removed. Janell Woodward noted that some of the counties have chosen to leave terrorism in their plans.

Section Four – Mitigation Strategy: Craig dePolo requested an addition to Table 4-2. He would like to add #3AB, Earthquake Early Warning System for Nevada. This will be expanded in Table 4-10, and Craig will provide this information to Rachel Micander to input into the table. Terri Garside noted a missing period in Table 4-2 at the end of #3AA.

Section Five – Coordinating Local Mitigation Planning: Craig dePolo asked what the “update” label in Figure 5-1 means. Janell explained that these counties are going through the plan update process. It was discovered that the graphic for the “Hazard Mitigation Plan in Update Process” is missing from the legend. This will be fixed.

Section Six – Plan Maintenance Process: Janell Woodward asked if the footers are being updated as some are listing the incorrect year. This will be updated.

Section Seven – References: Rachel Micander noted that as they continue through the plan update process there will likely be more references, as such, this section will continue to be updated up until the point of submittal to FEMA. Craig dePolo added that the references will be alphabetized by section. It was noted that the citation style of the references will be uniform throughout the document.

Section Eight – Enhanced Plan Criteria Achievements Program: Carlito Rayos question if the Executive Order for the Implementation of Nevada’s Statewide Resilience Strategy should be referenced as it is currently an overarching theme for the state. There was some discussion among members on this, and it was decided that it will be referenced. A paragraph referencing the order will be added to section 8.6.6. Jeremy Hynds commented on adding a reference to the THIRA in this section, and Rachel Micander will look into this. Terri Garside questioned if the links will be checked to ensure they are active. Rachel advised that will be part of the formatting and review process.

Appendix B – Participating Organizations: Jeremy Hynds noted that the list of emergency managers in Section B.2 is not up to date. This will be updated with the most current list prior to submittal to ensure it is the most up to date.

Appendix C – Bylaws: There were no comments.

Appendix D – Agendas and Minutes: Rachel Micander explained that once the minutes from this meeting are completed they will be added to the end of this section in draft form.

Appendix F – HAZUS EQ Maps: Craig dePolo provided a brief overview of some of the updates to the maps in this section.

Appendix G – List of Dams in Nevada: Rob Palmer suggested adding the definitions on the hazard rankings in Table G-1. These will be added.

Appendix H – HAZUS Flood Maps: Craig dePolo requested a minor change of moving the label for Muddy River down slightly in Figure H-1. He also noted in the same figure that there is an area near Panaca that indicates a flood map; however, he could not find one. Rachel Micander will look into this.

Appendix I through Appendix N: There were no comments.

Appendix O – Completed Mitigation Activities: Rachel Micander thanked Sydney Wilson for organizing this section. Carlito Rayos noted he still needs to provide some additional dates on classes that were facilitated. Carlito questioned if the Weather Ready City initiatives were included. Sydney confirmed this has been added in this section as well as in Appendix P. There was a header issue that was discovered, and this will be fixed.

Appendix P – Public Outreach: Sydney Wilson noted that some of the images are currently overlapping, however this will be fixed.

Appendix Q – Nevada Ditches: There were no comments.

Appendix R – State Mitigation Plan Review Guide: Rachel Micander explained that this was previously Appendix S and Appendix T. However, FEMA has since changed their crosswalks to combine these into one document. She added that this is directly from FEMA's document. It was confirmed that the "Location in Plan" column in section B.2 will be updated to indicate where in the plan those line items are. Terri Garside noted that it states "Appendix B" throughout the document, but this is Appendix R of the plan. Craig dePolo recommended adding a note explaining that this is from the FEMA document and that it has been carried over from it. Janell Woodward will reach out to FEMA as well. Terri noted that the footer needs to be updated to reflect the correct appendix. This will be done. There was brief discussion on general formatting among members.

Appendix S – Drought Study – DRI: Janell Woodward confirmed that this contains both reports that were done. Rachel Micander advised it does.

Appendix T and Appendix U: There were no comments.

STAPLEE: There were no comments.

Carlito Rayos thanked all those that worked on this document. Other members echoed this.

Chair, Craig dePolo, asked for a motion for the Committee to approve the 2018 plan. Carlito Rayos moved and Robb Fellows seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

## **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

## **8. ADJOURN**

Chair, Craig dePolo, adjourned the meeting.