## Minutes of the Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee 26 and 27 April 2011

The Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (NHMPC) met from 8:33 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26 and 8:00 a.m. until 11:50 a.m. on Wednesday, April 27, 2011, in the Nannini Administration Building, 540 Court Street, Elko, Nevada. These minutes and related documents are posted on the Web site for the committee (http://www.nbmg.unr.edu/nhmpc/nhmpc.htm).

#### Attendees included:

Elizabeth Ashby, Nevada Division of Emergency Management (DEM)

Ed Atwell\*, UNR Police Department

Matt Bernard, R.O. Anderson

Randy Brown, Flood Plain Manager, Elko County

Joe Curtis\*, Storey County Emergency Management

Mike Cyphers\*, Henderson Emergency Management

Kim Davis\*, Division of Water Resources

Rick Diebold\*, City of Las Vegas, Office of Emergency Management

Mike Dondero\*, NV Division of Forestry

Jeremy Draper, City of Elko

Gary Dunn\*, Carson City of Emergency Management

Robert Fellows\*, Carson City Public Works

Lynn Forsberg, Elko County

Terri Garside, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology

Karen Johnson, Division of Emergency Management

Will Lehmann, Elko Police Department

Ron Lynn\*, Department of Development Services, Clark County Building Department

Jonathan Price\*, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology

Jim Reagan\*, NV Energy

Robert Stokes, Elko City and County Manager

Jill Tingy, Elko County Cooperative Extension, UNR

Andrew Trelease\*, Clark County Regional Flood Control District

Jim Walker\*, Nevada Department of Transportation

Members of the Board of Directors of the Committee who were unable to attend: None

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Jon Price chaired the meeting. Attendees introduced themselves. A quorum (a majority of the 13 members of the Board of Directors) was present. Jon explained that the NHMPC meeting was being held in Elko to allow the Committee members to meet the local officials and to receive insight into the County's hazards.

#### **Approval of Minutes from February 10, 2011**

The minutes of the 10 February 2011 were unanimously approved. The minutes will be posted on the NHMPC Web site at www.nbmg.unr.edu/nhmpc/nhmpc.htm.

<sup>\*</sup> indicates a member of the Board of Directors.

## **Elko County Presentation**

Rob Stokes gave a presentation on the demographics, government, geography, and economy of Elko County.

Elko County is the fourth largest county in the continental U.S.. Its area is approximately 17 thousand square miles (11 million acres).

The incorporated cities are Elko, Carlin, Wells, and West Wendover. The population base is mainly located in Jackpot with 1,200 residents, Wells with 1,300 residents, Carlin with 2,400 residents, Elko with 18,000 residents, West Wendover with 4,400 residents, and the Spring Creek/Lamoille area with between 13,000-14,000 residents. The 2010 census data estimates the County's population at 49,000.

The economy is based on mining, ranching, outdoor recreation, and gaming.

The first university in Nevada was established in Elko in 1874 and was then moved to Reno in 1885.

Elko County provides library services for White Pine, Eureka, and Lander Counties.

Tax revenue is derived from consolidated (sales tax) taxes and property taxes.

The County's annual budget is \$20.5 million. The Governor's budget proposes to cut 8% from fiscal year 2011-12, and 13% from fiscal years 2013-14. It also proposes to transfer the costs of Health and Social Services and all Risk Fire Services to the County.

The Governor's budget also proposes cutting the Wells Honor Camp, which will eliminate the inmate hotshot crews who respond to wildfires. If the Wells Honor Camp is eliminated, the closest Honor Camp will be based out of Carlin, NV and could take up to 1.5 hours to reach a fire in rural Elko County. The delay could cause a fire that would normally burn a few hundred acres to burn approximately 200,000 acres, depending on how quickly the crews arrive on scene.

Wildland fires burned approximately 900,000 acres in 2007 in Elko County.

The Elko fire district was established in 1956. There are currently 15 volunteer fire departments in the County. The Nevada Division of Forestry annually provides 12 paid positions to the County, with more provided during the summer months.

The ambulance service has been upgraded to an advanced life-support service. There is only one hospital in the County, and some clinics, but there are no urgent care facilities.

The Northeastern Nevada Regional Railport was recently constructed. It is a 60-acre multimodal transload facility and a 440-acre industrial park. A railport is similar to a seaport. The railport was constructed with the purpose of providing the County another source of revenue.

Seventy-six percent of the County is federally managed lands.

#### Earthquake Hazards in Elko County

Jon Price reported that earthquake faults occur throughout Nevada. The Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology recently released the map *Quaternary Faults in Nevada* (NBMG Open-File Report 09-9, available at www.nbmg.unr.edu). The on-line version of the map is searchable, which allows for searching all known large and potentially active faults in the area of a specific address. The map is to be

used for approximate fault locations and should not be used as a definitive location of faults. If planning to build in one of the zones shown on the map, it is wise to hire a geological consultant to precisely locate faults and determine their frequency of movement. By using the information icon, and clicking on a specific fault, the known information on the fault appears. The faulds can be viewd on base maps showing aerial photographs or topography and roads.

Due to extension, Nevada is acquiring approximately 1.3 acres of land each year. Salt Lake City and Reno are moving apart about a centimeter a year.

Jon distributed Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology's Open-File Report 09-8, *Estimated Losses from Earthquakes near Nevada Communities*, available at

www.nbmg.unr.edu/dox/of098/Scenarios/OpenFileReport09-8.pdf. The report contains HAZUS runs for 38 communities in Nevada, essentially all towns with a population of at least 500. The report contains runs for magnitudes 5, 5.5, 6, 6.5, and 7 earthquakes. The runs were compiled using a fault on the Quaternary fault map that is closest to the center of the community. The fault depth is run at 10 km (the average depth of earthquakes in the Great Basin).

The largest recorded earthquake in Elko County was a 6.0 magnitude on February 21, 2008 in Wells. The most recent earthquake with a magnitude greater than 3.0 was a magnitude 3.7 on January 1, 2011 near West Wendover.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, the probability of a magnitude 6.0 earthquake within the next 50 years occurring near (within 31 miles or 50 kilometers) Elko is approximately 10-15%. The total economic loss to Elko for a magnitude 6 earthquake is estimated at \$160 million.

HAZUS is an excellent tool that city and county managers, emergency managers, and planners should use in hazard mitigation, planning, and emergency response and recovery exercises.

The consequences of earthquakes can be huge in Nevada, particularly if individuals are not prepared.

The best thing that can be done to prevent building damage and loss of life or injury is to be prepared to respond; mitigate structural risks, largely through having current building codes; and mitigate nonstructural risks.

Jon's PowerPoint presentation on "Earthquake Hazards in Elko County" is available online at www.nbmg.unr.edu/Geohazards/Earthquakes/EarthquakeResources.html#Presentations.

## Flood Hazard in Elko County

Randy Brown gave a presentation on Elko County's flood education program.

The most common kind of flood in Elko County is a riverine flood, usually in the spring.

The 1993 flood of the Owyhee River in Mountain City was caused by a bridge (the Bridge to Nowhere). The culverts under the bridge could not handle the spring runoff, causing the earth foundation of the bridge to collapse, resulting in the bridge blocking the drainage path, further causing upstream flooding.

The 1983 flood of the Humboldt River caused flooding from Wells to Palisade.

Elko County used 300,000 tons of fill to raise the railport by three feet to mitigate future flooding in the railport area (the area affected by the 1983 flood).

The communities of Jarbidge, Lamoille, Midas, Jackpot, Mountain City, and Wells are the main flood-prone areas in the County. Flooding on Lamoille Creek is almost an annual event.

Most of the damages from flooding in the County are to crops bridges and roads (due to erosion).

In January, 2011, the daytime temperatures rose into the 60s, causing an early snow melt. When the temperatures dropped below zero overnight, the result was ice-flow flooding on Lamoille Creek.

Jon Price recommended Elko County work with DEM to apply for flood-mitigation project funding through FEMA.

ACTION ITEM: Elizabeth Ashby and Karen Johnson will coordinate with Randy Brown in Elko County regarding applying for FEMA funds for flood-mitigation projects.

ACTION ITEM: Andrew Trelease will send Randy Brown in Elko County copies of Clark County's flood license plate educational program.

## **National Flood Insurance Program Description and Eligibility**

Kim Davis discussed the general aspects of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The National Flood Insurance Program is a federal program designed to provide insurance to property owners. It is available only in NFIP-participating communities. Currently in Nevada, only Esmeralda County and Lovelock do not participate in the NFIP.

Flood insurance rates vary by flood zones delineated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Insurance is mandatory for all federally-backed loans in high-risk flood hazard zones. Flood insurance covers all losses and is not a loan. It covers damage to two or more adjacent properties from any flooding source, provided one of the properties is insured.

The following grant programs are available:

- FMA (Flood Mitigation Assistance), Repetitive Flood Claims (RFC), and Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) grants are designed to reduce claims against NFIP; must address NFIP insured properties; and mitigated properties must maintain flood insurance in perpetuity.
- Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) and Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) grants Jurisdiction must participate in NFIP if project is located in a high-hazard flood zone

Mitigated properties must maintain flood insurance. The community must participate in the NFIP in order to qualify for the grant programs.

Common causes or types of flooding in Nevada include riverine, alluvial fan, canal brakes, flash, and flooding after a fire.

The water storage facilities are for agriculture use and not for flood water storage.

Flooding in Nevada causes a lot of damage to property and infrastructure and occasionally some loss of life.

FEMA is in the process of updating the flood maps. They have not updated the maps for Elko County yet. The most recent copies available are from 1986.

There have been thirteen Nevada State disaster declarations since 2002.

The annual average flood insurance premium for Elko County is about \$900. There are a total of 107 policies issued County wide, with total coverage at \$17,608,700, and with a total of 12 claims made since 1978.

NFIP will only insure structures with four walls and a roof.

## 2011 Unified Hazard Mitigation Grant Cycle Information

Elizabeth Ashby reported on FEMA's Unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance (UHMA) Program. Two programs available to Nevada communities are:

- I. HMGP Post Disaster Mitigation; available after a presidentially declared disaster.
- II. PDMC Pre-disaster Mitigation; nationally competitive grants for pre-disaster projects and planning activities. PDMC project grants require a Benefit-Cost Analysis and documentation that will support the application. Documentation is critical to a successful proposal. The cap on each proposal is \$3 million.

Elizabeth distributed a leaflet on the "Unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance Program in Nevada" (see attached; deadlines are included in the flier). The next deadline is June 16, 2011 when the letter of intent to submit applications is due.

Any community that does not have a FEMA-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan by November, 2011, and submits a project application in the 2011 application period, will have the project application held until the Plan is approved.

DEM and the Army Corps of Engineers will be holding a workshop on applying for hazard mitigation grants in Elko on June 9, 2011. Contact Elizabeth Ashby at <a href="mailto:eashby@dps.state.nv.us">eashby@dps.state.nv.us</a> for further information.

Elizabeth reported that the State Hazard Mitigation Plan was approved by FEMA as an enhanced plan. The enhanced plan will allow for up to 20% in additional funding for mitigation efforts after a Presidential declaration of disaster (instead of the current 15%). The application period for the additional 20% of funding is twelve months after the disaster event.

Jon Price recommended that the counties have mitigation project proposals prepared in advance for submission when Nevada receives post-disaster declaration funds. Having project proposals prepared in advance will speed up the application process.

Jon Price asked if there were any communities in Elko County at risk from canal or irrigation ditch breaches. Randy Brown replied that there were a few but not very many. The County has been very active in preventing new housing developments in flood-prone areas.

#### **Current Vacancies on the NHMPC Board**

Jonathan Price welcomed new Board member Ed Atwell, Emergency Manager, UNR Police Department. Ed replaces Press Clewe in the position of Washoe County Emergency Management.

## **Report on the Status of Grants**

Karen Johnson reported on the status of the following funded projects (see attached):

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)

- HMGP1540, Waterfall Fire funding Pending FEMA closure
- HMGP 1583, S. Nevada Floods Pending FEMA closure
- HMGP 1629, N. NV Flood mostly completed
- HMGP 1738, Fernley Floods Lyon Co. plan in process; Dant Wash improvement pending environmental review.

## PDM (Pre-Disaster Mitigation) Grant Program

- PDM 04/05, HAZUS Date Base Update Closed
- PDM 06, Elko Band Council Plan Closed
- PDM 07, awards for plans for Storey, Esmeralda, and Washoe Counties and the Henderson Sewer Project;
- PDM 08, Sky Tavern Wildfire water storage tank, Clark County Mitigation Plan Update
- PDM 09, Funding requests from Douglas County Emergency Management are under FEMA NEPA Review
- PDM 10, City of Reno received a Congressional earmark, Lincoln Co. Plan Update, Churchill/Mineral County Plan, White Pine County Plan, Nye County Plan Update are all funded and in process; Douglas Co. 395 Culvert Project, TRFP Demo Edison Way and Storey 6 Mile Canyon are in the environmental review process.
- Special Projects, My Plan Nevada, project started
- PDM 2011, Elko County HMP Update, City of Caliente Flood, Pershing/Lander/Humboldt HMP, Douglas County HMP Update, Douglas St. Route 88 Culvert Project, NV State Parks Ft. Churchill, UNR Seismological Laboratory – all selected for further review
- FMA 2011, Washoe County Marlin Channel Detention selected for further review

#### **Public Comments**

No comments received.

#### **Five-Year Strategic Plan for NHMPC**

Jill Tingey served as facilitator of a discussion on strategic planning. The committee discussed the future path of the NHMPC and how to maintain continuity in the committee. A major concern is replacing retiring members with people who can commit the level of participation to the committee that current members do.

Strategic planning is used to keep the organization on track.

Tools = education, planning, grants

Vision: Help safeguard citizens of Nevada

Mission: To provide the tools and processes for all of Nevada jurisdictions to identify and mitigate risks and hazards.

Below are items that were mentioned during brainstorming discussions and a few action items resulting from the discussions.

## **Overall Strategic Issues**

- I. Funding Vulnerability
- How can we increase the funding stream?
  - Without funding, we can't mitigate risks or plan

- o Participation
- o Alternate funding sources
  - Private sector
  - Other federal agencies
- How do we remain competitive?
- Funding needs:
  - Communities
  - Committees
- Unreinforced Masonry Builds (URMs)
  - o People don't know how to mitigate
  - Historic issues
  - o People will die
  - Expense of retrofitting

#### II. Education and Outreach

- Promotion
- Create internal fact sheet
  - What the committee has done and how it has been successful
- Public needs to understand the importance of the risks
- Document best practices
- Public relations campaign
- Political situation; other agencies may not be funded to provide education outreach
- Provide accomplishments
- Personal Responsibility

## III. Continuation of Committee Effectiveness and Strengths

- Succession Planning
- Promote the committee's value to local stakeholders
- Orientation for new members
  - o DC Review Process
  - Complicated process
  - Culture of Committee
    - Participation
    - o Expertise
    - Communication
    - Committed
    - Dedicated
    - Networking
    - Staff support
    - Leadership
    - o Diversity of disciplines
    - Experience
    - o Knowledge

#### IV. Political Climate

- Political support makes the committee a reality
- Enables participation for committee members
- Encourages mitigation projects submittals
- Reporting structure
  - o Share successes/accomplishments with elected and appointed officials

• Legislation involvement/position on issues

## **Key Strategies for Achieving Goals**

- Funding
  - Congressional delegation needs to know accomplishments
  - o Funding sources for operations, associations, foundations
    - Compile a complete operating budget
  - o Return on investment
  - o Potential funding for projects (in addition to FEMA's regular grant process)
    - Congressional support
    - BLM and Forest Service support/responsibility
    - Sustainability monies
    - HUD
    - US Army Corps of Engineers
  - Barriers
    - Time
    - Lack of money/lack of local match
    - Competitive
    - Staff local communities lack of expertise
    - Need to orchestrate communication with congressional delegations
  - Goals in the next six months
    - Compile fact sheet
- Education and Outreach
  - Web links
    - \*Improve webpage (staff and NBMG)
    - Easier link or ability to find/new URL
    - Send Web opportunities to stakeholders
    - Establish and prioritize target audience
    - Presentations to communities
    - Flood, earthquake, fire include funding opportunities
  - o \*Develop presentation on all hazards to general public next six months
  - o Produce a video
  - \*Identify state agencies (NACO, Nevada League of Cities, etc) to reach in outreach activities (committee effort to promote mitigation and the successes of the committee)
  - \*Create fact sheet/white paper
  - o Target audience who will have the greatest to lose
    - Resorts
    - Industry
    - Manufacturing
    - Insurance
    - Construction
    - Mining
  - \* Major initiatives

ACTION ITEM Elizabeth Ashby, Mike Cyphers, and Mike Dondero will provide information to Jon Price for development of an all-hazards presentation.

- Continuation of Committee Effectiveness and Strengths
  - Succession planning
    - Who will replace exiting members?
    - Change bylaws for more flexibility

- Orientation develop one page paper (staff develops with committee contribution)
  - List of committee expectations
    - Exiting member alerts staff
    - Find replacement
    - Culture of committee
    - Characteristics to complement committee
  - Attend Proposal Review Panel in D.C.
- Fact sheet (staff developed)
  - Letter to supervisors
  - New initiatives sent out

## Wednesday, April 26, 2011

- Political Climate
  - Fact sheet
  - o Develop presentations face-to-face interaction with a CD
    - No more than 30 minutes
    - Dynamic speaker
    - Need separate presentations that hit the highlights (10 minutes) for local officials
    - Use previous successful applicants as champions to share accomplishments
    - Off-session presentations to Legislators
    - Focus on local officials (city councils and county commissioners)
    - Inform Congressional delegation about the success of the mitigations dollars spent in Nevada (Chairs of NESC and NHMPC meet with DEM Chief)
    - Meet with the Chief of Staff of Legislators
    - Need DEM's approval
    - Become active in National Emergency Managements Association (NEMA)
    - Cross-fertilization sharing successes with other states (SHMO annual meeting)
    - Presentations at IAEM (International Association of Emergency Managers) annual meeting (September 2011 in Las Vegas); take fact sheet

ACTION ITEM: Jon Price and Ron Lynn to meet with the Chief of DEM to request support of going to legislators in support of NHMPC and NESC.

- Need to get to know legislators/officials
- Legislative disaster awareness day
- NACO and League of Cities presentations
- Legislative champion
- Barriers
  - Time limitations during session
  - Term limits learning curve steep
  - Lack of disasters

Mitigation Priorities – What should we focus on?

- URMs
- Critical infrastructure (utilities, power, water, gas, roads, telephones)
- Flood control projects; large and small; storm water drainage
- Mapping (updates, accuracy) LiDar, H&H, modeling, restudies
- Irrigation canal and levees inventory
- Data collection stream gages

- Buildings in danger of flooding (elevation projects)
- Historical flooding events (videos/photos); flood frequency analysis; for entire state
- Dam hazard issues
- Fire/flood correlation
- Vulnerability of Schools (committee select a demonstration project submit proposal)
  - Non-structural hazards
  - o Shelter in place
  - Built to code
- Wildland Fire
  - o Fuels management
  - o Post-mitigation fuels management
    - Sheep (Carson City)
  - o Comprehensive state-wide public education programs
  - Urban wildland interface projects
  - O Hardening infrastructure e.g. underground utilities
- Mapping all hazards in detail LiDar data acquisition
  - Landslides
  - o Flood hazards (alluvial fans)
  - o Faults
  - Liquefaction
  - Master plan land use and planning
  - o Mapping of abandoned mines
  - o Hazards disclosed to property buyers before close of sale
- Real time warning system for earthquakes
  - Seismometers
- Flood warning systems
- Roads and bridges
  - Drainage and flood issues
- Terrorism
  - Coordination of projects
  - Seismic detection

(Funding for terrorist acts is currently available to cover this item.)

## Modification of NHMPC Ranking Criteria for Hazard Mitigation Assistance Applications

Elizabeth Ashby distributed examples of ranking criteria worksheets from FEMA, Nevada, Ohio, Iowa, Indiana, and Wisconsin. The committee reviewed the handouts and discussed ways to improve Nevada's ranking criteria.

ACTION ITEM: Elizabeth Ashby will research how FEMA assigns the 40 points to applications received for the EMPG program in relation to how NHMPC rates the proposals and report back to the committee.

A motion was made and passed to provide applicants with FEMA's ranking criteria when the letter of intent to apply is received.

After a detailed discussion on items 1 to 3 of Nevada's ranking criteria sheet. The following changes were recommended to item 3:

- Item A, use wording from FEMA's ranking criteria
- Item B to be deleted

- Items C and D, no changes
- Item E, add cost effectiveness
- Items F and G, no changes
- Item H, change to Resilience, Maintenance, and Sustainability Plan (with future clarification on each of those criteria for consistency in rating)

A motion was made and passed to accept the recommended changes to Nevada's ranking criteria sheet on items 1 to 3.

A motion was made and passed to renumber the Grant Prioritization Form a through h, deleting item b and adding item h as Resilience, Maintenance, and Sustainability Plan, but keeping the Assigned Values at 0-10.

A motion was made and passed to accept FEMA's ranking points from 1 to 1,000 divided by ten to end up with a point factor of 100.

The ranking criteria sheet will include a "yes" or "no" item asking if the application for a planning grant follows the format of the State plan so it is easily incorporated into the State plan.

## **Announcements of Future Meetings**

Tuesday, August 23, 2011, in Henderson (depending on proposal submissions) Thursday, August 25, 2011, in Virginia City Thursday, November 10, 2011, in southern Nevada

#### **Review of Action Items**

Elizabeth Ashby and Karen Johnson will coordinate with Randy Brown in Elko County regarding applying for FEMA funds for flood-mitigation projects.

Andrew Trelease will send Randy Brown in Elko County copies of Clark County's flood license plate educational program.

Elizabeth Ashby, Mike Cyphers, and Mike Dondero will provide information to Jon Price for development of an all-hazards presentation.

Jon Price and Ron Lynn to meet with the Chief of DEM to request support of going to legislators in support of NHMPC and NESC.

Elizabeth Ashby will research how FEMA assigns the 40 points to applications received for the EMPG program in relation to how NHMPC rates the proposals and report back to the committee.

The Nevada ranking sheet will be revised to separate plans and projects so they will have separate evaluation criteria.

#### **Public Comments**

No comments received.

## Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m. on April 26<sup>th</sup>.

Respectfully submitted by Terri Garside May 16, 2011

Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee c/o Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology University of Nevada, Reno/MS 0178 Reno, NV 89557-0178

775-784-4415

## **Appendix A, Complete Compilation of Ideas**

## Stakeholders:

- Citizens and visitors to Nevada
- Cities and counties
- Businesses.
- State agencies,
- Infrastructure owners/operators,
- Non-government offices (Red Cross Salvation Army),
- Tribal governments/federal governments.

#### **External Threats:**

- Losing committee membership
- FEMA funding-dependent
- Economy-local funding
- Current political climate
- Stakeholder's lack of awareness
- No direct political reporting structure
- Structure of state organization-no director of DEM
- Limited rural resources
- Bureaucracy
- Complicated process
- Limited rural input
- Mitigation long term easy to put off indifference politically/publically
- Feedback from feds
- Might not always be successful in grants

#### Internal Weaknesses:

- Expertise
- Difficult to internalize/understand content
- Succession plan
- Lack of rural representation
- Participation willingness/comfort
- Parent organization support
- Staff workload and time constraints; how to maintain level of support

## **External Opportunities:**

- Obtain funding from the private sector
  - Other sources of funding
- More promotions/Public Relations to public leaders and the public
  - Annual report
  - Fact sheet
- Rural outreach
- Big city outreach
- Return on investment
- Influence FEMA advocate best practices
- Continue rural outreach
- Educate applicants as stakeholders
- Communicating/educating elected officials

- Army Corps of Engineers what they can offer
- Education on hazards (flooding)

## Internal Strengths

- Technical diversity
- Consistency
- Dedicated to the fairness of the process
- Internal communications
- Common interest to serve the stakeholders
- Networking
- Mutual respect is high
- Experience with federal review process
- Participation
- Caring about communities
- Commitment to Nevadans
- Experience
- Strength and dedication of staff
- Leadership
- Friendly
- Welcoming to new committee members

## **Greatest Threats:**

- General Funding
- Continuation of Strength of Committee/Succession Plan
- Political Climate
- Complicated Process

## **Greatest Strengths:**

- Diversity of Members
- Experience
- Participation
- Dedication to stakeholders
- Leadership

## **Greatest External Opportunities**

- Outreach
- More Promotion
- Education of the public

## Strategic Goals:

- Reduce man-made and natural hazards
- Reduce risks

# Hazard Mitigaiton Assistance Grant Program

	4 F 4 C		1 - 1	
1720	7671	1 _ 1/1	<i>l</i> aterfa	II LIPA
	1.141	,	Valella.	

Available Funding	Allowable	Allocated		Difference	
12-Month Lock-In	\$ 726,541.00				
State Management Costs	\$ 226,808.97				
5% Initiative Public Awareness	\$ 36,327.00	\$ 36,327.00	Public Awareness	\$	-
7% Planning Project	\$ 50,858.00	\$ 50,352.00	Elko Co.	\$	506.00
Regular Projects	\$ 413,053.00	\$ 271,044.00	SPWB & State Parks	\$	142,009.00

Requesting Entity	I	Federal Award	Expended	Balance	Status as of: 1-Apr-11
Proposals	_				
State Parks	\$	87,202.03	\$ 87,202.03	\$ -	The request for closure is pending at FEMA Region IX.
Elko County	\$	50,352.00	\$ 50,352.00	\$ -	CLOSED
SPWB	\$	325,851.00	\$ 184,743.00	\$ 141,108.00	The request for closure is pending reimbursement of Admin
Public Awareness	\$	36,327.00	\$ 36,309.92	\$ 17.08	CLOSED
Subtotal	\$	499,732.03	\$ 358,606.95	\$ 141,125.08	
State Management Costs					
UNR	\$	42,493.20	\$ 42,492.91	\$ 0.29	
DEM	\$	184,315.77	\$ 99,754.10	\$ 84,561.67	
Subtotal	\$	226,808.97	\$ 142,247.01	\$ 84,561.96	
Total	\$	726,541.00	\$ 500,853.96	\$ 225,687.04	

## **Hazard Mitigation Grant Program**

# HMGP 1583 - 2005 Flood

## Available Funding

12-Month Lock-In

	Allowable	Allocated		Differen	ce	
	\$ 533,519.00					
5% Initiative	\$ 26,676.00	\$ 25,851.00	State Parks	\$	825.00	State Mgmt
7% Planning Project	\$ 37,346.00	\$ 37,346.00	UNR Risk Ass.	\$	-	
Regular Projects	\$ 469,497.00	\$ 328,519.00	SPWB	\$	140,978.00	De-obligated

## Proposals

Requesting Entity	Fe	ederal Award	Expended	Balance	Status as of: 1-Apr-1	1
Proposals 5% Initiatives						
State Parks	\$	25,851.00	\$ 25,851.00	\$ -	CLOSED	
Proposals Regular Projects						
SPWB	\$	469,497.00	\$ 328,519.00	\$ 140,978.00	The request for closure is pending at reimbursement of adm	nin.
Proposal Planning						
UNR Risk Assessmt	\$	37,346.00	\$ 37,346.00	\$ -	CLOSED	
Subtotal	\$	532,694.00	\$ 391,716.00	\$ 140,978.00		
State Management Costs	\$	825.00	\$ 795.71	\$ 29.29		
Total	\$	533,519.00	\$ 392,511.71	\$ 141,007.29		

HMGP-1629-New Yea	r's Flo	ood				
<b>Available Funding</b> 12-Month Lock-In			<b>Allowable</b> \$625,497.00		Allocated	Difference
12 World Look III	5% lı	nitiative	\$31,274.85	\$	22,872.00	
		Planning Project	\$45,675.00		45,248.00	
		ılar Projects	\$548,547.15	·	,	
Requesting Entity	l E	ederal Award	Expended		Balance	Status as of: 1-Apr-11
Proposals 5% Initiative	+-	euciai Awaiu	Lxperiaea		Dalatice	Otatus as of.
Froposais 5 % illitiative	+					
Sparks	\$	25,125.00	\$ 22,872.00	\$	2,253.00	Moved to Management Costs
Proposals Planning						
State Plan Update, UNR	\$	45,675.00	\$ 45,675.00	\$	-	Completed.
Proposals Regular Projects						
Washoe Co School	\$	444,017.00	\$ 33,487.99	\$	410,529.01	Closed - \$288,024 Transferred to State Mgmt. & Reno - Lawto
	\$	(288,024.00)				
Reno- Lawton Interceptor	\$	286,680.00	286,680.00	\$	_	Complete
Subtotal	\$	513,473.00	388,714.99	\$	412,782.01	
Management Costs						<del>-</del>
UNR - Planning Sub. Support	\$	150,364.63	\$ 42,273.47	\$	108,091.16	
UNR - NHMPC	\$	45,478.73	\$ 13,665.96	\$	31,812.77	
DEM	\$	67,938.00	\$ 60,967.98	\$	6,970.02	
Subtotal	\$	263,781.36	 116,907.41	\$	146,873.95	-

Proposals Planning Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4	roject \$	Allowable 475,538.00 23,776.90 33,287.66 418,473.00  Expended  7,826.25	\$ \$	33,287.66  Balance	State Management \$ 23,253.81  Status as of: 1-Apr-11  In process
Requesting Entity  Federal Gr Proposals 5% Initiative  JRM inventory - NBMG  Proposals Planning  Lyon County Plan I  Proposals Regular Projects  Lyon County Plan II - Outreach  SPWB  5% Initiative  7% Planning Proposals Segular Projects  14,0  14,0  15,0  16,0  17% Proposals Regular Projects  16,0  17% Proposals Regular Projects  17% Proposals Regular Projects  18% Proposals Regular Projects  19% Proposals Regular Projects  20% Proposals Regular Projects	roject sts s	23,776.90 33,287.66 418,473.00 Expended	\$ \$	33,287.66  Balance	Status as of: 1-Apr-11
Requesting Entity Federal Gr Proposals 5% Initiative  URM inventory - NBMG \$ 23,7  Proposals Planning  Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects  Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4	roject \$ cts \$  rant   776.90 \$	33,287.66 418,473.00 <b>Expended</b>	\$	33,287.66  Balance	Status as of: 1-Apr-11
Requesting Entity Federal Gr Proposals 5% Initiative  JRM inventory - NBMG \$ 23,7  Proposals Planning Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4	rant 776.90 \$	418,473.00 Expended	\$	Balance	Status as of: 1-Apr-11
Requesting Entity Federal Gr Proposals 5% Initiative  JRM inventory - NBMG \$ 23,7  Proposals Planning  Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects  Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4	776.90	Expended	\$		
Proposals 5% Initiative  JRM inventory - NBMG \$ 23,7  Proposals Planning  Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects  Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4	776.90	-			
Proposals 5% Initiative  JRM inventory - NBMG \$ 23,7  Proposals Planning  Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects  Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4	776.90	-			
Proposals Planning Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4		7,826.25		31,603.15	In process
Proposals Planning  Lyon County Plan I \$ 33,2  Proposals Regular Projects  Lyon County Plan II - Outreach \$ 14,0  SPWB \$ 100,4		.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Ţ p. 00000
\$ 100,4	I .				Contracting w/URS
	028.00	-	\$		Contracting w/URS
	445.00		\$	100,445.00	Reviewing Ely Conservation Seismic Retrofit
City of Reno Dant Wash \$ 304,0	000.00	-	\$	304,000.00	Pending NEPA & FEMA Funding
Subtotal \$ 475,5	537.56	-	\$	418,473.00	_
State Management Costs \$ 23,2	253.81	7,177.30	\$	16,076.51	
<b>Total</b> \$ 555,8	855.93	15,003.55	\$	499,440.32	_

2004-2005								
Requesting Entity	l F	ederal Grant		Expended		Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
JNR-BMG	\$	60,063.50	\$	60,063.50	\$	-	CLOSED	
2006					l			
Requesting Entity	F	ederal Grant		Expended		Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
Elko Band Council	+ '	29,115.00		29,115.00	Φ		Adopted & Approved by FEMA Closed	I-Api-11
IKO Band Council		29,115.00		29,115.00	Φ		Adopted & Approved by FEMA Closed	
2007			·					
Requesting Entity	F	ederal Grant		Expended		Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
Storey County Plan	\$	26,377.50	\$	26,377.50	\$	-	Closed	
Esmeralda Co. Plan	\$		\$	24,949.50	\$	-	Adopted & Approved by FEMA Closed	
Vashoe Co. Plan	\$	38,406.75	\$	38,406.75	\$	-	Awaiting adoption PLPT	
Henderson Sewer	\$	377,853.00		18,650.59		359,202.41	Construction Contract Awarded & Delay for part	ts
Subtotal	\$	467,586.75		108,384.34	\$	359,202.41		
Managamant Coat								
Management Cost JNR	<b> </b>   \$	44,000.00	Φ.	44,000.00	Φ.		Completed	
DEM	\$	2,779.00		2,779.00			Completed	
Subtotal	\$	46,779.00		46,779.00		-	Completed	
- Cantotal	Ψ	10,170100	Ψ_	10,110100	<u> </u>		-	
Total	\$	514,365.75	\$	155,163.34	\$	359,202.41		
	*	,	<u> </u>	,			-	
2008								
Requesting Entity	F	ederal Grant		Expended		Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
Reno - Sky Tavern Wildfire	\$	464,081.50	\$	-	\$	464,081.50	Awarded to Reno	•
Clark Co. Mit Plan update	\$	56,985.42		-	\$		Consulting Contract to be awarded	
Subtotal	\$	521,066.92				·	-	
Management Costs (10% of	1		ı		I		T	
federal funds received)	æ	52 106 60	r o		\$	52 106 60	Bonding FEMA funding	
ederal fullus received)	\$	52,106.69	φ	-	Φ	5∠,106.69	Pending FEMA funding	
Total	\$	573,173.61	¢	_	\$	52,106.69		
	Ψ	010.110.01	w w	_	w	JZ. 100.03		

# **Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants**

2009 - Pending Funding

zooo i onanig i ananig						
Requesting Entity	F	ederal Grant	Expended	Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
Douglas County Emerg. Mgmt.	\$	482,580.00	\$ -	\$ 482,580.00	FEMA NEPA Review started	
Douglas County Emerg. Mgmt.	\$	488,325.00	\$ -	\$ 488,325.00	FEMA NEPA Review started	
Subtotal	\$	970,905.00		\$ 970,905.00	_	
Management Costs (10% of						
federal funds received)	\$	97,090.50		\$ 97,090.50	Pending FEMA Funding	
			 		·	
Total	\$	1,067,995.50	\$ -	\$ 1,067,995.50	_	

2010 - Pending Funding

Requesting Entity	Federal Grant	Expended		Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
City of Reno JES Wildland Fuel	\$ 500,000.00		\$	500,000.00	Pending FEMA Funding	
Douglas Co 395 Culvert Proj.	\$ 1,350,000.00		\$	1,350,000.00	Pending FEMA Funding	
TRFP - Demo Edison Way	\$ 834,597.00		\$	834,597.00	NEPA Review close to completion	
Lincoln Co. Plan Update	\$ 30,799.00		\$	30,799.00	Funded	
Churchill/Mineral County Plan	\$ 52,500.00		\$	52,500.00	Funded, In Process	
White Pine County Plan	\$ 41,250.00		\$	41,250.00	Funded	
Nye County Plan Update	\$ 39,001.50		\$	39,001.50	Funded, Consultant Hired	
Storey - 6 Mile Canyon	\$ 1,239,711.04		\$	1,239,711.04	Pending FEMA Funding	
Subtotal	\$ 4,087,858.54	\$	\$	4,087,858.54	<u>.</u>	
Management Costs funded	\$ 14,006.26		\$	14,006.26		
Management Costs pending	\$ 336,450.97		\$	336,450.97		
Total	\$ 4,424,309.51	\$	- \$	336,450.97		

Special Projects					
Requesting Entity	Federal Grant	Expended	Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
My Plan Nevada, UNR	\$ 100,000.00			Funded & Started	
Portfolio Mgmt.	unknown				

Requesting Entity	F	ederal Grant	Expended		Balance	Status as of:	1-Apr-11
PDM			·				•
Elko County HMP Update	\$	97,500.00		\$	97,500.00	Selected for further Review	
City of Caliente Flood	\$	763,470.00		\$	763,470.00	Selected for further Review	
Pershing/Lander/Humboldt HMP	\$	60,004.93		\$	60,004.93	Selected for further Review	
Douglas Co. HMP Update	\$	67,125.00		\$	67,125.00	Selected for further Review	
Douglas St.Rt. 88 Culvert	\$	1,716,928.00		\$	1,716,928.00	Selected for further Review	
NV State Parks Ft. Churchill	\$	1,557,000.00		\$		Selected for further Review	
UNR Siesmic Lab	\$	399,982.57		\$	399,982.57	Selected for further Review	
Subtotal	\$	4,662,010.50	\$ -	\$	4,662,010.50		
Management Costs funded	\$	-		\$	-		
Management Costs pending	\$	466,201.05		\$	466,201.05		
FMA							
Washoe Co. Marlin Channel Det	\$	1,930,138.27		\$	1,930,138.27	Selected for further Review	
	•			•		•	
Management Costs pending	\$	193,013.83		\$	193,013.83		