



Meeting Minutes Nevada Earthquake Safety Council Unreinforced Masonry Committee

Attendance	DATE	Tuesday, October 24, 2017	
	TIME	9:00 A.M.	
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management DEM Executive Conference Room 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701	
	METHOD	Teleconference	
	RECORDER	Shea Schultz	
Committee Members	Present	Staff and Others	Present
Craig dePolo	X	Janell Woodward (DEM)	X
Mike Blakely	X	Gennady Stolyarov (Div. of Insurance)	X
Tim Ghan	X	Henna Rasul (DAG)	X
Werner Hellmer	X	Shea Schultz (DEM)	X
Kyle West		Chris Pingree (City of Reno)	X

1. INTRODUCTIONS, ROLL CALL, AND CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Craig dePolo, called the meeting to order. Introductions and roll call were performed. Quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair, Craig dePolo, asked for a motion to accept the meeting minutes from the July 26, 2017, meeting. Tim Ghan made a motion to approve the minutes. Werner Hellmer seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

4. UPDATES ON MISSION ASSIGNMENTS

Chair, Craig dePolo, asked for updates from each Committee member regarding their assigned projects.

- URM Summit – Kyle West was unavailable for this meeting. However, Craig discussed this project briefly. He advised that the summit will take place over 2-3 days in 2018 and be held in Reno. He will begin gathering partners for the summit. He would like to formally inviting Utah to join. As well as ask the Western States Seismic Policy Council (WSSPC) to become a member and potential sponsor to

assist with financial support. Additionally, he is hoping to get a National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) grant for support. Janell Woodward commented that such a grant may be possible, but funds wouldn't become available until October or so. Craig continued that funding the summit may be a challenge, but they usually come through. He noted that California may want to become involved. He advised that early next year he would like to bolster Kyle West with a committee to assist with planning this summit.

- Messaging and Communications – Gennady Stolyarov II provided a one page outline of his project to members. The outline provided a thorough explanation on two deliverables the Committee could look into:
 - *Consumer Guide*: 10-20 pages of in-depth information regarding URM danger, statistics, retrofit options, insurance information, visuals, and more. A free PDF version would be freely available to the public. For this guide he provided a list of potential influences and resources that could be used for gathering information.
 - *Fact Sheets*: 1-2 pages of brief, but powerful language regarding various topics (e.g. dangers of URM buildings, features of URM buildings, options for retrofit, etc.). Some of these could be customized and tailored to a specific consumer (e.g. homeowners, renters, business owners, legislators, etc.), and would be easily available in a free PDF format for the public.

Gennady explained that the next steps would be to develop the content and collaborating to ensure that all necessary information is put into these documents. There was concern over how much work would need to go into this. However, Craig explained that they could distribute components to members and request assistance from the entire Council.

- URM Building Inventory Project – Werner Hellmer advised he is partway through a draft of what he hopes will be a starting guide for others that may want to consider doing a URM survey. He advised that the most significant element of this is defining and establishing criteria for what a URM building is. He also noted that what Clark County found helpful was focusing on paring down the list of buildings and determining what buildings are not URMs versus buildings that are. As well as, focusing on buildings with one or more masonry bearing walls. It is important that they tell people what the list represents and develop protocol once the list becomes public information and individuals want to petition the results. He is hoping to have a draft of this available at the NESC meeting. Werner added that he is hoping that they may be able to pursue some funding at the state level to assist the remote areas of the state. This may be a good point for future discussion once the projects are completed to ensure the state receives a once over screening.

Craig noted Las Vegas' focus on one or more masonry bearing walls and questioned if they were concerned with parapets and similar elements. Werner explained that they are making notes on buildings where these are seen, but advised they want to be careful with their identification of URMs. Werner stressed the importance of having a guideline or definition when identifying a building as a URM. He noted that Clark County is using a hybrid definition of URMs by combining what has been done in other states. Craig wondered if they could handle the parapets and other elements outside of the inventory, as a general class of things to look out for.

Craig added that there are other opportunities for publishing this guide once available. Werner explained that once the draft report is completed he is hoping to get feedback from other agencies that have completed similar surveys and develop a

generalized guide. This would show different ways to do surveys and may be more inviting for some of the smaller, rural areas. Craig requested that the guide be formally sent to Carson City and Reno once complete. He added that they may consider talking to the Utah partners for input.

- Roadmap for Nevada and Overarching final Message of the Committee - Mike Blakely provided a five page draft report on a roadmap for Nevada. A copy of this handout is available upon request. Some of the things this draft report outlined an introduction, the problem, the plan and the goal.

There was discussion on the obstacles faced. Craig dePolo suggested using Santa Cruz as an example on the importance of retrofitting. Using this as a visual to outline and show the concern associated with how some of the assumptions have failed. Craig also suggested outlining some of their successes and things they are proud of as well. There was extensive discussion regarding some of the local buildings in the area among members.

5. DISCUSSION ON THE JOINT COUNCIL MEETING

Chair, Craig dePolo asked for input on the proposed joint statement from Utah and Nevada that will be going to the joint Council meeting on November 8th. The draft statement is as follows, “Unreinforced Masonry Buildings remain the most prominent killer buildings from earthquakes in Nevada and Utah and the reduction of risk from these buildings is under-addressed commensurate with the threat they pose to society. We need to systematically reduce the seismic risk of unreinforced masonry buildings.”

Craig explained that this is an attempt to put some perspective on URMs. Werner Hellmer noted concern with how it is phrased as “killer buildings” and wondered if there is evidence of fatalities in Nevada to support this. There was additional discussion on this wording. It was suggested that the word “killer” be changed to “dangerous”, and members were in agreement with his change. There were no additional comments on the statement and it will be forwarded to the Council.

6. COMMITTEE PROGRESSION AND FUTURE MEETINGS

Chair, Craig dePolo advised the dates for the next meeting are to be determined. After discussion it was suggested that the next meeting take place in the last week of January, but will be looked into further.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair, Craig dePolo, opened discussion for public comment. Werner Hellmer provided additional information on the change of codes that were mentioned in agenda item four. He noted that the 1961 UBC was the first code to require minimum reinforcing, and that took twenty-five years to get codes changed.

8. ADJOURN

Chair, Craig dePolo, adjourned the meeting.