



Meeting Minutes Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Subcommittee

Attendance	DATE	Monday, February 26, 2018	
	TIME	1:30 pm	
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management State Emergency Operations Center 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, Nevada 89701	
	METHOD	Teleconference	
	RECORDER	Rachel Micander	
Committee Members	Present	Staff and Others	Present
James Walker	X	Janell Woodward (Staff)	X
Craig dePolo	X	Shea Shultz (Staff)	X
Bunny Bishop	X	Sydney Wilson (NBMG)	X
Bill Elliott	X	Rachel Micander (NBMG)	X
Rebecca Bodnar	X	Chris Thorsen (NDWR)	X
Branden Pearson	X	Nicole Goehring (NDWR)	X
Sean Gephart	X	Mike Detmer (DAG)	Phone
Chris Lake	Phone		
Rajat Jain	Phone		
Dan Hourihan	Phone		
Mike Heidemann	Phone		
Carlito Rayos	Phone		

1. **CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND ESTABLISH QUORUM**

Chair Jim Walker called for introductions at 13:35. A quorum was not established. Jim Walker discussed the process and importance of completing the STAPLEE since it helps add to Nevada's enhanced status. Craig dePolo indicated that this is used to determine the feasibility of doing hazard mitigation. Mike Heidemann (phone) joined the meeting and a quorum was established at 13:42.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jim Walker called for public comment at 13:43. There was none.

3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Jim Walker asked for any discussion of the minutes from the last meeting and called for a motion. There was no discussion. Bill Elliott moved to approve the minutes. Bunny Bishop seconded the motion. The motion passed at 13:44.

4. **COLLECTION OF MEMBER INPUT ON PUBLIC AWARENESS AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES IN HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING AND ACTIONS**

Jim Walker emphasized the importance of capturing mitigation projects and/or outreach activities to include in the plan. Jim Walker stated that by tracking outreach and mitigation projects, it shows FEMA that Nevada is a mitigation state. Jim Walker asked if anyone had outreach or mitigation tracking forms or documents to add. Rebecca Bodnar, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), asked where the spreadsheet was, since NDEP has completed activities to incorporate into the outreach tracking spreadsheet. Rachel Micander indicated that outreach tracking and mitigation activities be sent to Janell, and NBMG would incorporate into the state plan. Jim Walker asked that outreach and mitigation activities be emailed to Janell and the updates would be included.

5. **UPDATE OF THE STATE ENHANCED HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN INFESTATION HAZARD PROFILE**

Sean Gephart, Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA), provided an overview of the infestation hazard profile. Sean stated that the noxious weed section had been finalized, and the insect infestation and aquatic species sections had been updated as well. Sean noted that the document as it stands should be considered current. Jim Walker asked if there were any questions or comments. Sean asked why changes are tracked in the infestation hazard profile, when he had removed them. Sydney Wilson stated that the changes are tracked in each profile to make it easier to locate updates. The changes will be accepted after the hazard profile has been approved. Jim Walker asked for a motion to accept the infestation profile with the updates made. Bill Elliott moved to accept the infestation profile. Craig dePolo seconded the motion. The motion passed at 13:50.

6. **UPDATE OF THE STATE ENHANCED HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN AVALANCHE HAZARD PROFILE**

Sydney Wilson, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology (NBMG) provided an overview of the changes that were made to the avalanche hazard profile. Sydney stated that input was received from Brandon Schwartz of the Sierra Avalanche Center and Dr. Bob Watters of the UNR Department of Geosciences and Engineering. Sydney reviewed the updates Brandon and Dr. Watters made to the profile. Sydney stated that, per Brandon's comments, Table 3-5 had many reporting errors. Sydney reviewed each event listed in the table in order to identify the errors and correct as needed. Sydney then discussed the updates that were made to the hazard profile, including adding an updated map of Sierra Avalanche Center's forecast area and new figures. New figures that were added included the Sierra Avalanche Center's observations and snowpit profiles, avalanche fatalities by state, and avalanche fatalities triggered by primary activity. Major updates included new figures and updated tables throughout the profile. Jim Walker asked if there were any questions or comments. Bill Elliott moved to accept the avalanche profile with the updates made. Bunny Bishop seconded. The motion passed at 13:57.

7. **UPDATE OF THE STATE ENHANCED HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN HAZARDOUS MATERIALS HAZARD PROFILE**

Rebecca Bodnar, NDEP, provided an overview of the hazardous materials hazard profile. Rebecca stated that NDEP completed a general update of the hazard profile. Rebecca noted that NDEP changed the wording in the profile for clarification, updated relationships between agencies, and updated the NDOT map (figure 3-20). Rebecca stated that NDEP was unsure of where the numbers in table 3-22 were sourced. As a result, they were removed for this update. Rebecca noted that tables 3-23 and 3-24 were updated with current numbers; however, the table title needed to be updated to read 2012-2017. Rebecca stated that NDEP included the Anaconda Copper Mine site in the profile, and updated the BMI Complex and Carson River mercury. Rebecca also indicated that NDEP did not get a chance to update Table 3-25 (Historical HAZMAT Events in Nevada), and if given more time and is deemed necessary, NDEP would update the table. Jim Walker and Craig dePolo indicated that it was important to update the table. Rebecca indicated that NDEP would do so.

Rachel Micander stated that NBMG has updated the erionite and naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) subsection of the HAZMAT profile, having been tasked with it at a previous meeting. NOA and its history were added to the subsection, and input was received from two mapping specialists with NBMG who had worked in southern Nevada where NOA has been documented. Rachel Micander indicated that a new a new table listing historic NOA occurrences in Nevada was also added.

Craig dePolo stated that considering there were only three changes needed in the hazardous materials profile, the subcommittee could accept the profile as long as the three changes were made. Jim Walker suggested that the subcommittee should wait until the next meeting for approval. Craig noted that the changes were minor and suggested the profile be approved with the caveat that those changes be made. Craig dePolo moved to approve the hazardous materials profile, understanding three changes needed to be made including: update the date for tables 3-23 and 3-24, update the broken links, and update table 3-25. Bill Elliott seconded the motion. The motion passed at 14:06. Craig asked Rebecca if she could finish the three remaining updates in a week. Rebecca indicated that she would.

8. **REVIEW AND COMPLETE THE SOCIAL, TECHNICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL, LEGAL, ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL FEASIBILITY (STAPLEE) REVIEW**

Jim Walker reviewed the STAPLEE, and emphasized that only one number is to be assigned to each section (social, technical, administrative, political, legal, economic, and environmental feasibility sections), and even though there are subsections, the subcommittee members can only put down one number per section.

Janell Woodward suggested that the subcommittee review an example together. Jim Walker agreed that the first one can serve as an example and then the subcommittee members can complete the rest of the STAPLEE individually. Jim Walker started reviewing the first row of the STAPLEE as an example for the

subcommittee. Craig dePolo asked for clarification about entering a single number for each STAPLEE section. Jim Walker stated that it was how NDEM and the subcommittee has done it in the past. Janell noted that the STAPLEE is used to determine the priority for each STAPLEE section. Additionally, Janell stated that the most important STAPLEE items, according to FEMA, are technical, economic, and environmental feasibility. Bill Elliott asked if the STAPLEE would be completed by subcommittee members during the meeting or on their own. Janell Woodward and Jim Walker said the intent was to complete the STAPLEE during the meeting. Craig dePolo asked if the subcommittee could promise to complete the STAPLEE in 48 hours, instead of completing the STAPLEE during the meeting. Craig dePolo noted it would be more efficient to complete the STAPLEE outside of the meeting.

An attendee left the conference call and Jim Walker indicated the need to check for a quorum. Jim Walker asked who was still on the phone. The following members identified themselves: Dan Hourihan, Carlito Rayos, Rajat Jain. There was no longer a quorum. Jim Walker reviewed action items left on the agenda. Rachel Micander stated that for agenda item nine, a list of questions for the subcommittee needs to be discussed, and she did not think anything would be approved at this date. Jim Walker stated that without a quorum, it would not be feasible to complete the STAPLEE during the meeting. Craig dePolo suggested subcommittee members complete the STAPLEE and send it back to NDEM within 48 hours. Janell Woodward stated that she would resend the STAPLEE out to the subcommittee. Rebecca Bodnar asked whom should fill out the STAPLEE. Craig dePolo said the goal would be for every subcommittee member to complete the STAPLEE. The subcommittee reviewed an example together and discussed. Craig dePolo reiterated that this was a study for feasibility. Jim Walker asked if there were any more questions. Jim Walker stated that if anyone needs help filling out the STAPLEE, to contact Janell Woodward or himself. Chris Lake rejoined the meeting (phone) and the quorum was reestablished. Jim Walker asked for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, the subcommittee moved onto agenda item number nine.

9. **UPDATE OF BELOW NAMED SECTIONS FOR THE STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**
Jim Walker said that he wanted a review of all sections of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan on the agenda so the subcommittee can think of the plan as a whole, and hear a quick update for each section. Craig dePolo said that in addition to a quick update of each section, there will also be questions for the subcommittee to answer. Sydney Wilson and Rachel Micander reviewed sections 0-8 and asked the subcommittee remaining questions:

Section 0 – Rachel Micander said Section 0 is an overview of the state. Rachel indicated that a NBMG cartographer had made new maps, and that demographic tables have been updated. Rachel Micander said Section 0 is nearing completion.

Section 1 – Rachel stated that Section 1 is the adoption of the state plan. Rachel said Section 1 would be completed at the end of the update period.

Section 2 – Rachel stated that Section 2 is the planning process. Rachel said there are remaining questions in this section that needs to be answered by the subcommittee. Rachel asked if she could go through them. Jim Walker said to go through them now so the subcommittee could provide feedback.

The first question, asked by Sydney Wilson, was regarding hazard mitigation outreach presentations presented to the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) committee or Nevada Earthquake Safety Council (NESC). Janell Woodward said she has not been involved with the WUI committee, so she is not sure. Craig dePolo said something will be done with NESC, and to delete WUI from the subsection, but to keep NESC. The second question asked was regarding public comment, and if a draft version of the plan will be posted for public comment. Craig dePolo said that it would be good idea to post the plan for public feedback. Janell Woodward said typically, NDEM posts the plan for public comment on their website. Jim Walker argued that because NDEM posts subcommittee meetings and agendas, and meetings are public; these meeting should be considered for public comment as well. Craig emphasized that posting a draft version of the plan for public comment would be a good idea as well. Rachel indicated that section 2 would continue to be updated until the plan is submitted to FEMA.

Rachel Micander asked the subcommittee if there were any new examples of cooperation among agencies in order to comply with federal requirements of hazard mitigation planning. Rebecca Bodnar said she could give NBMG examples to include in Section 2. Craig dePolo asked if anyone else has examples. Bill Elliott mentioned that NDOT created a new storm water protection division. He also indicated that there is a drought task force for Nevada. Carlito Rayos asked if the weather ready nation ambassadors could be an example. The subcommittee agreed that weather ready nation ambassadors should be used as an example. Carlito also mentioned that there is a monsoon month PSA in southern Nevada during September.

Section 3 – Rachel Micander indicated that the majority of the questions in Section 3 were located in subsection 3.6. Rachel said this section refers to state-owned facilities and state-owned critical facilities. Rachel stated that NBMG, as the state geological survey, does not have access to updated information regarding facilities and has been reaching out to other agencies to acquire new information. Rachel indicated the need for the subcommittee to provide new and updated information in order for this subsection to be completed. As an example, Rachel reviewed table 3-37 (State Critical Facilities and Infrastructure) with the subcommittee. Rachel said it would be helpful if someone on the subcommittee could review this section and send updates back to NBMG. Sydney Wilson stated that the suggested method of reviewing the list of state-owned buildings to determine which should be considered critical is confusing, especially without any outside input. Janell Woodward said that the process implemented during the 2013 plan update, reviewing the list of state-

owned buildings, and determining which buildings are to be considered critical, is a judgement call. Rachel said that NBMG went through the list; however, NBMG is not comfortable making that judgement call. Craig dePolo asked who could update Section 3.6, and noted that NBMG should not be responsible for updating this subsection. Branden Pearson said he has a building database, and that critical facilities are very difficult to define. Branden said he would review Section 3.6 and table 3-37 and provide updates. Bunny Bishop asked if the wells listed in table 3-37 are state owned. Rachel Micander stated that wells are listed as state-owned. Bunny Bishop said she would look into state-owned wells.

Rachel Micander said there were remaining questions in section 3.6.3.2, Loss Estimation for Flood for State Facilities. Rachel Micander said she could send the section to Bunny Bishop for review. Branden Person suggested contacting Department of Administration- Risk Management or Division of Insurance. Craig asked where these data were sourced during the last plan update and Rachel indicated that it came from the state flood plain manager.

Rachel Micander also indicated that there were remaining questions in Section 3.6.3.3, Loss Estimation for Wildland/Urban Interface Fires for State Facilities. Rachel noted that in the 2013 plan, a replacement cost of \$200 per square foot was used. Rachel asked if this number should be changed for the 2018 plan update. Branden Pearson indicated that it was a difficult question, and thought that \$250 a square foot would be a better average, given inflation.

Section 4 – Sydney Wilson provided an overview of Section 4. Sydney Wilson stated that she and Janell Woodward made updates to this section. Sydney updated all of the links listed in Section 4, and changed the wording in a few paragraphs to reflect the current status of local hazard mitigation plans. Sydney made updates to table 4-7 (Existing State Model Codes). Sydney indicated that Section 4 would be finished at the end of the update period (April), and that Janell would provide the remaining charts and tables that need to be updated. This section update is also dependent on the STAPLEE.

Section 5 – Sydney Wilson said there were no questions for Section 5. Rachel Micander indicated that Section 5 was nearing completion, with a few minor things to wrap up.

Section 6- Rachel Micander said Section 6, the Plan Maintenance Process, was almost complete.

Section 7- Rachel Micander indicated that Section 7 was a list of references. Sydney Wilson said she had been working on this section and asked the subcommittee how to handle references. Specifically, Sydney noted that references were listed at the end of hazard profiles in Section 3, so she was unsure if they should be removed from the hazard profiles, and only included in Section 7. Craig dePolo indicated that there was an advantage having them included at the end of the hazard profiles. Sean

Gephart agreed that the hazard profile references should be kept in Section 3, and listed in Section 7 as well. Sydney said she had been compiling references for all sections, updating bad links, and formatting.

Section 8 – Rachel Micander stated that Section 8 is the enhanced plan status section and that there were a few remaining questions in Section 8. Rachel Micander asked the subcommittee if there were any new private mitigation examples to add, specifically on page 8-27. Craig dePolo said this could be sent out to the subcommittee as a whole and members should respond with examples.

Rachel Micander asked if there were any new examples of Nevada’s effective use of existing programs to achieve mitigation goals, as noted in Section 8.5.2. Rachel said that this should be sent to the subcommittee via email for additional input. Bill Elliott mentioned drought mitigation efforts in Southern Nevada (removal of lawns). Additionally, Bill mentioned the dredging of the Walker River in Yerington. Craig dePolo asked if there were any infestation mitigation projects. Sean Gephart said NDOT has been looking at weed mitigation plans submitted by contractors. Furthermore, Sean said that NDOW and NDA conduct water vessel inspections. Sean also indicated that NDOW has been looking for aquatic invasive species, and NDA has been looking for aquatic invasive weeds. Craig dePolo asked Sean if he could write up a sentence or two about the vessel inspection stations. Sean said yes, that he would provide a summary. Bunny Bishop mentioned the 2015 dredging for flood mitigation in Yerington. Bunny indicated that she would write a sentence or two about these projects. Bunny also mentioned using the big dig as an example. Craig dePolo asked Bunny about the big dig, and Bunny explained the project. Janell Woodward noted the need to add Nevada’s Flood Awareness Week (FAW) to Section 8.5.2. Rachel Micander said she would add FAW to Section 8.5.2. Rachel indicated that she would compile a list of remaining questions for the subcommittee and send it to Janell for distribution to the subcommittee. Jim Walker asked if there were any additional questions about the plan as a whole.

10. **ANNOUNCEMENT OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Jim Walker announced the need for another meeting since all of the sections need approval from the subcommittee. Jim said the meeting would be scheduled soon. Jim said an email was sent out regarding the scheduling of the next meeting, and asked the subcommittee members to respond to the email.

11. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jim Walker called for public comment at 15:18. There was none.

12. **ADJOURN**

Bill Elliott moved to adjourn the meeting and Craig dePolo seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 15:18.