

**Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (NHMPC)
DRAFT Minutes,**

**Meeting Location: Fire Station 3, 3 John Deere Drive, Mesquite, Nevada
Date and Time of Meeting: Tuesday, November 12, 2013, 9:30 am
DIAL-IN INFORMATION: TELEPHONE NUMBER: 1-888-273-3658; PASS CODE: 8743295**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND ESTABLISH QUORUM** Craig dePolo called the meeting to order at 9:30 and asked attendees to introduce themselves for the purpose of establishing a quorum, beginning with new member Tim Faust.

NHMPC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Craig dePolo, NBMG
Tim Faust NDF
Andrew Trelease, Clark County Flood Control
Rob Palmer
Jim Walker, NDOT
Ron Lynn, NESC

Terri Garside, Member of Public
Rick Diebold, City of Las Vegas
Ryan Turner, Henderson EM
Jim Reagan, NV Energy

STAFF/OTHER:

Elizabeth Ashby, NDEM
Chris Smith, NDEM
Janell Woodward, NDEM
D.D. LaPointe, NBMG

Rose Marie Rey, AG office
(online)

Debbie O'Neal- Duckwater
Shoshone Tribe EM
Gary Johnson, NBMG

MESQUITE PERSONNEL PRESENT

John Higley
Aaron Baker
Bill Tanner

NHMPC MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Ed Atwell, Washoe County EM
Rob Fellows, Carson City Floodplain manager
Joe Curtis, Rural representative

Craig ascertained that a quorum of committee members (10 of 13) was present in order to conduct official business of the committee and thanked Mesquite for hosting the meeting.

- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT**—Chairman Craig dePolo opened the meeting for comments from the public; there were none.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES FROM October 15, 2013 Special Meeting. Craig called for a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting which had been distributed for members to review; Ron Lynn so moved, Rick Diebold seconded the motion, there was no discussion, all were in favor and the motion passed to approve the minutes as presented.

3. REPORT ON THE MYPLAN WEBSITE.

Gary Johnson with NBMG reported on updates to the MyPlan hazards website, which is now publicly accessible via various pieces of hardware: computer,

hotspot, I-phone, and tablet. The applications allow the public to view all hazards applicable near their home address or any area using ARCGIS, a program you can install easily. Once installed you search for "MYHAZARDS." Most of the cities in Nevada are bookmarked on the site, including Mesquite. Click on "My Content" for all the possible information to search on. Elizabeth said she will send out additional info after the meeting to help people with logging onto the MyPlan site.

Gary walked the group through several examples showing the imagery and capabilities of the system for such hazards as floods in the Mesquite area, and how to bring in different data layers such as Census Tract info on housing, urban development, URM, population and make some transparent for better visibility. Or Emergency Managers, you create a global account at ESRI and Elizabeth "invites" you to come onsite (protected site). On MyPlan, there is private information only for emergency managers allowed onsite via Elizabeth, whereas "MyHazards" is a public site open to all. There is wildfire data linked to NDF and census tract population statistics info important to emergency responders or highway department.

Gary fielded questions from the members on how to get local data back to him to upload to MyPlan (either send digital files to him directly gji@nbmg.unr.edu or through Elizabeth or he can help members learn to create digital data files).

Gary showed how other outside data such as NEXRAD radar weather data is also accessible and can be superimposed on MyPlan data. He reiterated that he is open to including more data for the MyPlan. He really needs more data such as any hazardous waste routes listed in NV as they are in other states (info from NDOT.) Gary reiterated that he needs more datasets to improve the website for all - from the public or private sector; can discuss any additions with Elizabeth. One more example of flood maps from the Lovelock area.

Tim Faust had a question about linking MyPlan with Emergency Dispatch Centers. Gary answered no, since the primary intent is for hazard mitigation and assessment in pre-planning, not response; there are other systems that Chris Smith is working on through NDEM with the local emergency managers for emergency response, evacuation, etc will upload their information to an app - Working on that right now. Jim Walker had a question for Chris – Who is the person responsible for working on that? Chris' answer: "ETS" and they will set up a meeting on it. –Jim said that NDOT needs to coordinate with DEM on that. Andrew Trelease said that he has more to contribute - photos – snapshots... Jim commented that most of the Myplan data is static except for the NEXRAD radar weather service – can we link to more real-time live info? Gary said more can be added more if we want to. Rick commented yes, but Should we – since MyPlan is different form Response – we would be muddling 2 different aspects of hazards; mitigation and response.

Craig thanked Gary for his presentation and said that when MyHazard is "ready for prime-time" we should do a newspaper release and get a major press blitz

out on it. Chris expanded on it and said it should be wider than just news but out into all existing media, schools, and universities and visitors bureaus as well.

5. EARTHQUAKE HAZARD IN CLARK COUNTY PRESENTATION

Craig gave a presentation on earthquake hazards in Clark County - beginning With a brief background on basics of earth structure - earthquakes are a hard sell but when they happen, the consequences are “unacceptable.”

It’s difficult to get across because it’s been such a long interval since the last large earthquake, but he used a jack-in-the-box analogy; the earth’s crust is being stretched by tectonic forces and after enough stress, the stresses will cause the earth to crack, just like when the jack-in-the-box pops out of the box after the handle is wound tight enough.

He used a map of historic significant earthquakes in Nevada to show that they do occur in the state although the last period of large earthquakes was in the 1950s in the Dixie Valley/Fairview Peak area. We are better able now to monitor smaller ones and there are about 12,000 EQs per year in Nevada. In northern Clark Co., there is a zone of earthquakes that defines the Southern Nevada Seismic belt; where is a major crustal boundary beneath the surface in that area causes a lot of EQs such as a cluster back in the 1960s around Alamo and in the Caliente area - up to M5 and M4 near Mesquite. They were not well-monitored because of lack of instrumentation.

There is also Reservoir-Induced Seismicity in southern Nevada– EQs thought to be related to a crustal response to the level of Lake Mead. There were EQ clusters in the 1930s and 1950s, when lake was filling and we may have more in future.

We have only had 3 really big M7 EQ events in NV history –but these affect a huge area (shown on map in N. NV). There are faults all over state – many of which have not been studied – no part of state is without faults or without EQ potential. Two main different kinds: strike-slip vs. normal due to different plate motions.

Locally, Mesquite has faults at boundaries of mountains and valley – that appear to have had relatively recent faulting –this is a candidate for a M7+ EQ which would cause a lot of ground motion. There are other faults breaking up the surface – shown on air photos as well as some in adjacent areas of Arizona.

NBMG is about to do some more HAZUS studies because old estimates from the last HAZUS study were not good. Craig showed results of HAZUS damage estimates from new program for 38 communities in NV plus the probabilities of occurrence of the associated scenario EQs. For example Mesquite could expect \$52 million in damage from a M6 EQ in the Mesquite area (down from \$59 million in the earlier HAZUS study). This would result from an EQ with a 12% chance of occurrence – which may seem low but is still possible - as much as the Wells EQ had a chance of occurring a few years ago.

The bottom line is –in order to reduce injuries and damages:

- A. Be prepared to respond to earthquakes—This is the reason for the Great Nevada Shakeout.
- B. Mitigate structural hazards; improve building codes. Nevada has made tremendous strides in this area in the past ten years – especially in Clark County – Ron Lynn reported on much of what he has accomplished in Las Vegas in this area and in mitigating the URM problem.
- C. Mitigate Non-structural hazards; securing items that can fall on people.

Wells was a good example; some buildings were a total loss in the M6 EQ. the time of day of the EQ saved many people from serious injury by collapsing walls and parapets.

Map of state with URM's – some in Mesquite
2,400 residential
12,000 commercial
14,400 total

Elizabeth said we need to regularly add field verification of potential URM's to local hazard mitigation plans. Ron is working on it in Clark County. She asked Ron to provide his new data to the state when it is complete and we will get it into MyPlan for all to share.

Craig stated that verified URM locations should be first sites for post-EQ response and Elizabeth emphasized that they should also be the one of the first places we want to concentrate mitigation efforts.

Craig concluded his presentation with a statement that Nevada is Earthquake Country and out in a request for a goal of 100% participation in the Great Nevada Shakeout statewide and for all to practice “Drop, Cover, and Hold” exercises.
(10-minute break)

6. CITY OF MESQUITE DEMOGRAPHICS PRESENTATION

Aaron Baker City of Mesquite Liaison Officer, gave the first presentation on demographics of the city. He presented in a series of “quiz show” type trivia questions about Mesquite to the group (with prizes!) which was entertaining and informative and held everyone's interest.

The current city was incorporated in 1984, although Mesquite was first settled in 1878, again in 1887, then reincorporated in 1894 and multiple times subsequently due to repeated flooding on the Virgin River. There are multiple irrigation canals in the valley.

The mayor is Mark Weir with a 5-member City Council elected at large. Population-16,775, plus about 5,000 transient “snowbirds” who live here seasonally.

Average age–50.6, more women than men

73% of households are 1-2 person

Median income - \$44,000/15% makes over \$100,000

Mostly retirees

17,000 occupied units

Mostly residences built mid-90s or later

Lots of resorts/hotel-casinos largest employers– get lots of out-of-state traffic

47% white collar worker/52% blue-collar

8 golf courses – big revenue-makers

27% vacancy rate

Lots of amenities in Mesquite; some people kayak on the Virgin River (believe it or not!), many parks & well-developed trail system – up on the Mesa, Sports Complex, long-drive park.

City occupies an area of 32 + square miles with many sq. miles of options for future growth, proposed airport, proposed future development, tens of thousands of residential lots.

Final remarks: Lots of people, area, infrastructure future growth to plan for hazards on limited budget based on July 1st population, which is lower than actual in the winter when it swells to maximum.

\$180,000 = Average SFR home price 3 BR 2 BA

7. CITY OF MESQUITE HAZARDS PRESENTATIONS

Next, Bill Tanner, Flood Plain Manager, City of Mesquite, gave a presentation on flood hazards in the Mesquite area.

Going to present flood areas and flood hazards and what we are doing about them.

Currently there are three major washes that present flood hazards in the city:

- Pulsipher Wash - detention basin constructed in 2005
- Abbot Wash - detention basin constructed in 2005
- Town Wash –detention basin constructed in 1990

These areas are well-defined and designed to withstand a 100-year flood event - even back-to back events within a 24-hour period as he understands it from the ACE (verified by Andrew Trelease).

The main flood hazard of course is the Virgin River (shown on map, which runs right through lower part of Mesquite.)

The most recent flooding along the Virgin River was in 2005 and again in 2010 (12/22/2010), both of which were winter flood events. Usually with major rain events, they get a couple hours warning notice of flooding along the Virgin River from upstream in the Beaver Dam area. Because of this, they haven't had significant damage in the past 20 years and most of the areas susceptible to flooding are pretty well defined.

In 2005, 78 homes were flooded damaging either the homes or landscaping; in 2010, the same type of flood event occurred, but they were able to use the 2005

flood deposit material to build a dike to protect most of the homes from flooding. They did finally “lose” the dike and the river ended up flooding one home. During periods of heavy rainfall upstream (Beaver Dam Wash, Utah, Zion areas) USGS and other websites usually alert them to give 24-36 hours of warning before the floodwaters rise allowing enough time to mobilize dozers to build dikes but sometimes they place them in the wrong spots to do the most good. There was a federal disaster declaration for the second 2010 event. In 2005 – did not have enough material to build a dike. In 2010 – used concrete block berm+ plastic sandbags but it was also raining in Mesquite –so had to pump as well. Now all these materials have been stockpiled and if a similar situation happens again, they should be able to build a dike again within 8-10 hours if necessary. In 2005 – in different area at Hughes Middle School, as the waters receded, they cut into the bank of the school property, undercutting close to a major 18-inch sewage interceptor line that they ended up losing and they had to pump sewage around it for about a week. Since then, NRCS came in with a project and ripped it to protect it and that’s how it was mitigated, and it held up well in the 2010 flood. They also lost part of the trails system (shown in photo – looked like a road) in the same area in the 2005 flood.

Showed photos of Abbot Wash detention basin and Town Wash detention basin where they need to do some work this year removing some sedimentation. Normally there aren’t more than a couple of dozers in Mesquite, but police “escorted” some in to build the flood dike when needed.

Mesquite is currently working with CCRFCD and US ACE through their **Community Assistance Program, Section 205** plan to get funding to build a more permanent dike that is structurally sound. Bill thanked CCRFCD and Andrew for all their help on multiple fronts in flood control; CCRFD provides money for maintenance all their detention basins in the washes. Bill also thanked NDF who in 2010 sent a crew to Mesquite that “outworked 8,000 residents” during the flood to sandbag homes to keep the water away from homes.

Elizabeth asked if flash-flooding is more frequent than the riverine flooding. Bill answered that no, the necessary infrastructure in place (the detention basins) to be pretty effective in protecting the City of Mesquite from flash flooding. With the support of the CCRFCD, the Master plan is pretty well 90% built out except for the Virgin River. Pulsipher Wash area is protected. The only flash-flooding in Mesquite typically happens on Mesa Blvd., where there is a planned project to put in underground storm drains, as funding becomes available over the next 5-7 years. As for the Virgin River area flooding, the more permanent and more structurally sound dike should help control flooding in that area, and that is incorporated into the master plan. The problem right now is when the water starts receding it cuts down (erodes) wherever the temporary dike is not reinforced.

Andrew said there also is a vegetation plan. In 2005, natural vegetation was blamed for diverting water and changing the path of the floodwater from the south and pushing it towards the city. There is a revegetation plan for the future to leave a clear corridor open for the water to go - clear of natural vegetation. Elizabeth asked for a short note on all the ongoing flood mitigation projects for the Silver Jackets Team that will be meeting soon (ACE is the lead on that) and that they be kept apprised of all such flood-related projects.

How about future floodplain development in the future? It was pointed out on the map that there is currently only one subdivision in the 100-year floodplain and the city will not issue building permits for any other areas within the 100-year floodplain. The rest of the area is BLM land. So there is only a very small area that can be developed for homes. – Only if one developer would install a floodwall around it. Elizabeth asked if there were a possibility of City acquiring the land. Ans:– Yes possible in the future – but owner is not interested now. Possible to make a park? Yes – possible consideration in future. City may consider purchase of floodplain land in the future to avoid development. But city has more acreage than it needs now.

Next speaker was John Higley Emergency Manager for the City of Mesquite. He said there are basically no other major hazards in town. The Bunkerville Diversion Dam is outside town where there is a canal that runs right along the riverway where they lose a community person or so every year; who gets stuck in the sand gates while swimming. So they have identified all the sand gates and washouts and GPSed each one of them and identified the water-users of each one of them and mapped them all so that if a problem does arise they can quickly coordinate efforts to find any individuals who get stuck in the sand gates. It's not even in Mesquite's jurisdiction; but they are the first responders out there until the county can come take over.

Other hazards both man-made and natural:

Airport-related:

Mesquite airport is east-northeast of town almost on the Arizona border, right by one of the nicest golf courses in town. They have had airplanes sometimes go off onto the golf course so they have to deal with that.

Interstate 15 is the major highway through town – mentioned already. Along I-15, Mesquite's emergency management dept. responds to incidents NE into Arizona and up into Cedar Pockets in the Virgin Valley River Gorge and west back towards Las Vegas as far as the rest stop and even as far as Mile Marker 100 towards Logandale.

Fortunately this stretch is fairly free of nuclear hazards although there are about every other hazard you can think of. They even had a semi-truck leave the freeway and hit a home and explode in one area shown on map. There is periodic flooding along the roads and highways: Last year during a 3" rainfall, there was a mudflow resulting in 3 inches of mud covering one parking lot in town and all the detention basins were flooded.

During the 2006 wildfires, the helicopters filled up at the detention basins. – although there was little vegetation in the area to burn, there was concern that propane tanks would explode. They have a high school and junior high school that fit the “active shooter” community profile so they are concerned about that and stay alert for such an incident.

Q: As for the “Sun City” retirement community of older folks possibly some with disabilities, with only one way in and out – evacuation route. (There are other routes being constructed.) are there any particular hazards up there that one should be concerned about? A: Not yet. There is talk of building a new high-rise casino in that area but it has not happened yet. We don’t have natural gas yet so anything that is gas-fired is fueled by propane tanks. Familiar with for CERT?

Yes. 78 average age of Sun City residents.

Craig asked about liquefaction potential during an earthquake. There was some discussion about this due to the possibility of less than a 10-foot groundwater level indicated by some area wells.

Craig thanked City of Mesquite officials for their hazard presentations.

9. UPDATE OF HAZARD MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANT APPLICATIONS and 12. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE STATUS OF OPEN PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION AND HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM ALLOCATED NEVADA GRANTS

Craig called on Elizabeth Ashby, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, to summarize the results of the October 15 special meeting of the NHMPC last month to evaluate and rank the hazard mitigation assistance grant applications. Copies of the 6 applications and the rankings that were submitted to FEMA had already been distributed for the committee for review. There are two lists given to the committee today as handouts, one showing those applications for PDA and one showing those for FMA only:

The one list with 6 items on it (PDA) shows:

- Clark County Seismic Valves I
- Clark County Seismic Valves II
- Washoe County HM Plan
- State Route 88 Flood Mitigation Project/Douglas Co.
- TRFMA Home Elevations in Hidden Valley
- State management costs (10% of the total projects)

The second list shows just the 2 Flood Management Assistance grant proposals:

- State Route 88 Flood Mitigation Project/Douglas Co.
- TRFMA Home Elevations in Hidden Valley
- State management costs (10% of the projects)

So these are the applications that were submitted and are under review and we should hear back from FEMA in about 60 days on eligibility and selection for further review.

The process is new this year and we will keep you posted as to how it progresses and anything we hear and if applications are approved or not. Craig asked if the government shutdown affected the process. Elizabeth replied that they did not extend their deadline because of it and we submitted everything in a timely manner (on the 15th of Oct., ahead of deadline). There were some issues with TRFMA not having their own HMP; They are their own entity now, but FEMA allowed them to apply anyway and will have to do an addendum to the Washoe Co. HMP and someone will have to track it.

Another issue: Douglas Co. did not yet have an approved plan so it was submitted through the Carson Water Subconservancy District, as a State Agency. Craig questioned that Douglas County did not have an approved Hazard Mitigation Plan and Elizabeth explained that it had expired.

Next Elizabeth reviewed the quarterly grant report status for each year's hazard mitigation grants (see handout)

Elizabeth reminded all that grantees have to close each individual part of a grant before we can close the overall grant.

1629 – In process of doing the audit and trying to close it out. Only part pending is the Lawton Interceptor; which has an amount of \$142 that needs to be refunded to FEMA for administrative costs - all that is holding up the close-out of the grant!

1738 – We are getting ready to close this one out; Lyon County Plan is done, although the City of Fernley has not yet adopted we hope it soon will be, and everything else is done. The Dant Wash money went back to FEMA; that was the one for which City of Reno could not purchase the right-of-way to do their project, and that one will be closed soon.

2008 – The **Clark County** Mitigation Plan Update award was just closed pending the Sky Tavern wildfire work which received an extension until 2014 (which needs to be updated on this spreadsheet). They are having issues with their match, so we are hoping they can get their match commitment in place and complete the project during the year extension and if it cannot be completed, then they have to return all the money they have used already to FEMA. Craig clarified that it is the City of Reno that has to come up with this match, and Elizabeth verified that.

*At this point Elizabeth stressed to the committee one of the primary problems of having to return money to FEMA is that it involves the 10% management cost allocated to NDEM, which may often have already been spent on administrative help, support staff, technical assistance, etc. It is difficult to find a way to return that as well and makes it really difficult for the Division.

2009 – The Douglas County-Tahoe Fuels Reduction project was awarded and they are working on it now, and part of the management cost money on that project will probably fund travel for this committee for this coming year.

2010 – We're working on the Douglas County 395 culvert project which NDOT is a big part of and that one is just beginning the environmental review. The Storey County Sixmile Canyon project is almost done with the environmental review so we should have that money sometime in 2014. Everything else is progressing as it should be. The demolition of Edison Way is complete – was viewed at last

meeting in Reno, done. They are also returning \$200,000 of this money due to changes in the design of the Truckee River Project that required less vegetation rehabilitation which means that the money goes back to FEMA, which in turn means NDEM also has to return 20% management costs – which presents a financial problem that is hard to budget for as discussed earlier. All are on different schedules.

Special projects are those funded through the Cooperative and Technical Partners by FEMA. These are great because they are 100% federally funded by FEMA, they do not require a match, but they are basically for a lot of the planning that goes on that helps with travel to communities like White Pine & Ely who are working on their Plans. It also helped with institution of the “TableTop” Hazard Mitigation evaluation exercise that NDEM staff coordinates with locals who have an approved plan in order to help walk them through a strategy for updating their plans. An additional \$50,000 was just received from FEMA for this purpose.

2011 –Pre-disaster mitigation; The City of **Caliente** - Spring Heights flood project is almost at the end of its environmental review and we should see the award in 2014 as well. Pershing- Lander-Humboldt- Hazard Mitigation Plan has stalled – so we need to go out and spur them on to complete it. It is an important one because it involves three of our most rural communities. Q. Why? A. Loss of interest, the contractor is not pressuring them, we have not been pressuring the contractor, so the staff needs to go out and mobilize them because the money is going to expire soon.

Q. is there any mechanism for the State to “pre-empt” a local Plan and complete it for them? A.–Well, we’ve done that before..... Ron: I was wondering if we could establish a template for them where they could input the specific data for their community and it gets accomplished, given the economy, lack of resources and unlikelihood of change over the next 5 years or so. Elizabeth: I don’t have an answer. There was some back and forth discussion as to the reasons for this; some counties run into roadblocks with staffing– can’t commit resources, management, oversight, to completing such a project. E. will check on the status of the local agreement and what we can do to make it happen, and get it completed. Karen has been assigned to do some of these jobs checking on the local plans.

FMA – Washoe Co. Marlin Channel Detention Basin Project is currently stopped pending an attempt by the group to obtain authority to institute a Flood Control District in order to be able to impose a fee that will provide the match to get the job done. We do not know how long FEMA will wait for them as they are ready to proceed with the environmental reviews and may tell them they need to come up with the match money or give the whole grant money back. Commitment letter is signed and in place.

2012 –The Douglas Co. HM Plan is completed and under review at FEMA region IX; they have only one staff member to do all of CA and NV, Guam, Hawaii, rest of Pacific Islands, so.....it’s tough to get anything approved quickly.

The State Plan is approved!! (NHMPC all have a copy of the Adoption notice/Proclamation) and good to go for at least for another 3 years. We do not know yet if there will be a change to 5 years; the Code of Federal Regulations

would have to be modified in order to change to a five-year update cycle. This will be further discussed later under the Planning Subcommittee update. For 2013, Public Works Board, for the Community Youth Center - the bridge that is going to replace the culverts; that environmental assessment is completed and should see funding early in 2014. We did provide the Living with Fire Program some funding to hold their Wildfire Awareness Week as part of our support, and also funded the printing of Living with Earthquakes publication at NBMG as part of our management costs.

Finally Elizabeth has 2 requests for the committee –

1. We are looking at changes in the way FEMA receives applications for post-disaster for the Hazard Mitigation Program (HMP). We used to be able to submit “placemaker” pre-applications in to FEMA, and complete them at a later date but now they will no longer accept these. FEMA now **wants completed applications only**, not just pre-applications, so E. needs committee’s help in getting applicants to submit completed applications only from now on.

2. In a post-disaster situation, FEMA arrives with a lot of resources and technical assistance and wants to know immediately how they can best help. But in a post-disaster situation, we are too busy working and responding to best prioritize our needs. So, she would like the Committee to complete a Strategic Plan ahead of time to hand to FEMA that says these are the activities that we’d like you to help us accomplish. Then when FEMA comes in, we have a prioritized list of needs that will help us maximize the resources we obtain from them while not diminishing our own efforts. I would like a prioritized strategic list for each of the major hazards for which we might have a Presidential Declaration: a flood, earthquake, and a wildfire strategy so that when we do have a disaster we can just pull out that strategy and tell FEMA these are the activities that we are looking for help with.

Q. Are you looking for an Operation Plan for how you are going to deal with these disasters?

A. No, I should have brought an example. What I would like to do first is have someone from FEMA to come in and talk to us on the Presidential Declaration process and what they offer under that to the states as to hazard mitigation. Based on that, I have a sample based on the Fernley Canal Breach of the strategy that FEMA presented to me and said “What do you want done here by FEMA out of these activities we can provide?” So I was going to use that same strategy and give it to you guys to come up with a prioritization for each scenario of major disasters that we could envision happening here in order to help make those decisions when they do occur. So for example, one of the things that came up from the Fernley breach was a study of canals, and that was partially funded with some of the money that FEMA brought in. Technical assistance money doesn’t necessarily come to the State; FEMA completes the projects, and does the tasks, such as public awareness,

So for the February meeting E. will ask someone from FEMA to come in and talk to us about the resources and activities available upon a Presidential Declaration (such as Jeff Lusk, suggested)

Discussion of locations of next meetings

Feb. 2014 - S. NV

May, 2014 – N. NV

July, 2014 – S. NV?

Elizabeth suggested Ely as a favored location because they are working on their plan and asked all for input. All other counties have been covered except Lander so Battle Mountain was mentioned as a possible site.

There was discussion of the moving of future meetings to Thursdays and of the departure of Joe Curtis from the Committee and need to replace him with another rural county representative, not Clark or Washoe, please send suggestions.

10. PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Subcommittee Chair, Jim Walker reported that as reported by Elizabeth, the Plan is done and approved by FEMA. We got a very quick turn-around by FEMA on this Enhanced State Plan which is a great testament to the work done by the NDEM staff and he would like to express once again his appreciation for all the work they did on the plan. It has been approved for at least another three years, which it has been up until now, 5 for the county plans. We are holding off a bit on the next plan update until we hear if it will be a 3 or a 5-year cycle. We'll give them a few months and if we don't hear of a change will assume it's another 3 years. We have begun putting together a strategy of how we are going to approach the update over the next cycle. The last time we met quarterly so we wouldn't have it all to do at the end and we will continue to do that. The way we have done it previously is a sequential treatment starting with Section 1 and working our way through the plan. We'd like to rearrange the way we do it with the next update; the approach will be to place one of the longest sections - the strategy (strategic actions, objectives) first since that is one of the parts that changes the most with updates over the current cycle and we should make it most visible to FEMA right up front. We also need to take into account the changes that FEMA is doing for what kind of information we need to have immediately available "on the shelf."

We do appreciate the efforts that all committee and Subcommittee members are making in doing this Plan and will continue to look at new sources of information from any new agencies that we can bring into the Subcommittee so we can continue to get their involvement in the plan as we are updating it and adding new things to it.

Craig suggested that our State plan should not only serve as a model and guidance to the state but also to the Counties & locals for writing and updating their plans and grants. Elizabeth suggested that "it's all about the Money" - The

Goals and objectives of the State Plan may offer suggestions or opportunities to the County and communities and others for mitigation projects to consider but the County and community plans, however, need to focus more on local projects and not on statewide issues.

Craig asked if we should add more strategies (esp. for EQ mitigation) at the State level plan for counties to model, and Elizabeth said she would like to hear more about risk assessment and work them into an application. Can't be too specific in the state level plan – better in the County plans.

11. NEVADA EARTHQUAKE SAFETY COUNCIL REPORT

Ron Lynn, Chair of the NESC gave a brief report on the Great Nevada Shakeout. We had roughly about 520,000-550,000 participants in all from 13 counties and it was a big success and we hope it will grow. It was a sizeable percentage of our population.

ATC 20 and FEMA 154 training was done in Southern Nevada. Ryan and Ron discussed emergency preparation for post-disaster response. Clark County had some methodology in place; and it has been used – it may be exported to (and enhanced by) other counties if they desire to do so. Pretty much the same procedure and forms are used for any declared disaster earthquake, flood, etc. One of the problems brought up repeatedly (especially with earthquakes) is the lack of monitoring devices throughout the state. Could a proposal be made where FEMA paid for the equipment and the support for some select sites in urban areas in both northern and southern NV? It would give a better idea of how buildings would perform during a disaster. Craig responded that Seismo Lab would have to respond officially on this, but he sees a great need for instrumentation in the Las Vegas area just to be able to locate earthquakes in the area.

E: Since FEMA changed funding and we no longer get NEHRP money, is that something we can ask of FEMA? It should be brought up at the NESC meeting tomorrow and find out more about how that's going to work.

Craig – lamented that the money may now be going to private contractors instead, and the reasoning behind it was that some states could not provide the match and it was a way to get around it, but for the states that can provide a match (like NV), this is really going to hurt their earthquake programs. Ron said we need to ask FEMA about that; they may be able to work something out. Ron ended by saying there is a group meeting tomorrow - combined with ID, UT, and CO, and will also be discussing the Western States Seismic Policy (WSSPC) which impact 14 western states.

E: Question – Should local plans include seismic monitoring as part of their mitigation strategy? Craig's answer is that Seismo Lab would be the best source to answer that but such monitoring would definitely enhance the location of earthquakes within that community. E: Should we encourage them to consider it?

Craig – we've been trying unsuccessfully to expand the network for 20 years so anything would help. E. asked for some training on how the network works so

she can better convey to the locals the importance of including monitoring in their plans, if they would like to locate EQs in their area, locally. It was decided that Graham Kent with Seismo Lab would be the best person to talk to.

12. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF OPEN PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION AND HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM ALLOCATED NEVADA GRANTS–
Progress Report – (this was included with 9. above)

13. ANNOUNCEMENT OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Chairman Craig dePolo announced the following meeting dates and restated as Elizabeth suggested that we add those to our calendar with exact venues to be decided (possibly Lander Co. and White Pine Co. for two) These will follow the NESC meetings so Ron will be able to report on what transpired at the NESC meeting the previous day.

- a. February 13, 2014
- b. May 15, 2014
- c. August 14, 2014
- d. November 13, 2014

14. PUBLIC COMMENT–Chairman Craig dePolo opened the meeting for comments from the public;

Elizabeth had a comment: Our Program Manager FEMA Region IX for earthquakes, Jennifer Monnette, sent out a notice to quickly to submit training requests for the next year for earthquakes, so she requested 4 trainings for ATC 20 and 154 in both northern and southern Nevada, a Train the Trainer for Public Awareness in North and south and one more training session for a total of four training opportunities for each - north and south and if we need to provide more we can let her know. Ron Lynn asked if we could change them and E. answered yes we can – these are just place holders. Craig asked if there were other comments; there were none.

Craig noted the presence of Chief Chris Smith, head of the NDEP and thanked him for attending and participating. Craig thanked everyone for attending and the City of Mesquite for hosting the meeting.

15. ADJOURN

Chair Craig dePolo called for a motion to adjourn the meeting; Jim Reagan so moved, Terri Garside seconded the motion, all were in favor, none were opposed, the motion to adjourn carried, and Craig adjourned the meeting.

*Respectfully submitted,
Daphne LaPointe
Nevada Bureau of Mines & Geology
MS 0178/SEM building
UNR, Reno, NV 89557-0178*