Introduction of members:

Minutes of last meeting approved as prepared and submitted.

Old Business:

Ms. Helen. DuBois, of FEMA reported that she met with the consultants and received the first draft copy (approximately 1/3 complete) of a portion of the State Plan. She had planned to make unofficial comments on the plan but due to the hurricane in Guam, had no time to address the document. She did report that she is pleased to see that the State of Nevada is this far along in the process and that the project is moving forward. She also complemented the December 17, 2002 Local Government Training Workshop.

Jan Rogala gave a general overview of the one-day workshop. There was a good turnout with almost all of the subgrantees being represented. They had an opportunity to ask some excellent questions and it was extremely helpful to have Helen DuBois of FEMA present to address some of the planning issues. One of the concerns over the confidentiality of materials was discussed; FEMA advised that the information submitted to FEMA would be public information. Local information that needs to be kept confidential will have to be addressed on that level and referenced in the plan. It will be up to the local
planners to make a determination as to what they will include and explain their process and conclusions.

Bert Prescott reported on the meeting with Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee: Bert identified members of this committee. He and Jan Rogala reported the concerns about sensitive information as requested by the committee. The decision was made to have two plans: one for public, which will be printed without security sensitive information and the second, will be kept in-house and not made available to the public.

Discussion was held on the Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee. Bert explained that once this plan is completed the committee might not meet again until it is time to start the update process in two years. The Division of Emergency Management is in charge of facilitating the DMA 2000 updating. Some members of this committee reported they are interested in continuing their participation on a Hazard Mitigation Committee after this plan is initially implemented with an update required in three years. Bert reported the members of this committee would have an opportunity to work on the update of the plan. Helen said that the plans are expected to be submitted 30-days before the 3 year mark. They have 45 days to turn around within FEMA. The committee recommended that this issue be addressed again in the future regarding the formal way to proceed with incorporation of the local plans and accomplishing the required updates. Bert explained that all local plans would be attached to the State Plan as an Annex upon their completion.

A question was raised concerning what time frame is required to complete the plan? Bert said that April was and would have the plan to FEMA in 2003. Bert is working on a 1-year grant that is being extended to April. The committee will be needed to participate in folding local plans into the State plan. Bert recommended that the committee continue with the goal to have 17 counties with a DMA 2000 Plan. No further questions on the planning committee.

New Business and Committee Comments:

1. Website: Jon Price advised all meeting minutes and edited workbook information needs to be placed on the website. He advised that the Website needs to be more useful for all entities coming on board. He recommended a link back to local governments, and, to include the FEMA Workbook links on the website as well as the training website. Bert requested that Jan and Helen discuss how to obtain more websites to link to the website. Kim advised that the digitized flood maps can be linked to site. Kim advised that the scanned flood maps can be linked to site. Kim said there is a way to get scanned images of the maps. Kim advised she will send the website information.

2. Frank Taylor asked what the difference was (referencing the Floods of ’97) in the reimbursements that the State of Nevada Department of Transportation can get from DOT and FEMA and what qualifies for each agency program. Helen advised that FEMA is the last resort funding pool. FEMA clears projects making sure there are no other Federal Agencies responsible for the reimbursement costs. The division of funding is based on the Federal Highway eligibility criteria for roadways listed as on-system roads. For those roads, Federal Highways accepts maintenance and repair responsibility. FEMA will cover off-system roads. There is a qualifier and that is if damage is due to deferred maintenance they will not be covered.

3. Kim Groenewold distributed summaries of the State’s critical facilities in the flood plain that she has accumulated thus far. State facilities that are in flood risk areas are categorized as follows. Red delineates where there are facilities in 100-year floodplain, which implies that they fall under the regulations of a flood insurance plan. Blue signifies a 500-year flood plain. The
second page shows the locations in 100-year flood plain areas. She has only gone through half of the list and has not been able to get NDOT buildings. The other thing about doing this assessment based on the flood maps is that there are unidentified flood areas like the flash flooding at Spanish Springs. It occurred in a non-NFIP zone. Lots of damage.

4. Mines/Geology: Jon Price requested a report on involvement of the Tribes and wanted to know if this steering committee was working with the tribes? Jan Rogala reported she had contacted tribal organizations and invited them to participate; they have been cooperative in providing information. However, they said they would participate directly with FEMA or the County in which they resided. Jon commented that there are some areas that probably cross over a number of hazards that we may not be catching. He recommended the use of HAZUS. It’s a valuable tool, and includes wind and storms. HAZUS could support multiple hazards identification. FEMA advised that there are a few people using HAZUS in the state. It was recommended that the implementation of a HAZUS users group be formed in Nevada as a Mitigation Strategy. Bert advised we will designate a group “other”. DEM will participate in HAZUS.

5. Jon reported on earthquake mitigation strategies. The Earthquake Advisory Council is putting through budget details for the specific projects they recommended. He is also looking at flooding with flood hazard experts along with hydraulic experts to identify flood hazards along steep parts of mountains, the sloping areas, the alluvial fans and piedmonts (an area between the flat areas and mountains) to make some further recommendations. It will involve looking at the geology and the past to determine what will happen in the future. He said that what’s missing is the detailed geologic maps to draw the hazard maps. Only 18% of the state is covered by geologic maps, which are needed to create hazard maps. The goal of the hazard mapping recommendation is to prioritize those places around urban areas and new growth areas as highest priority areas for geologic mapping. Under the current program the state will get 5 geologic Maps a year plus 5 flood hazard maps a year costing a total of $850,000 per year. Funding is from various state departments. Jon reported on a Level 2 project that is a science and engineering program to look at the methodology. Approximately 2/3 of the FEMA flood insurance maps were found to be incorrect. Further, 1/3 was incorrect because some areas were not prone to flooding and because focus is on large areas only. This is a real problem. This program will validate the methodology and come up with a better one to make sure the geology is being included in the flood mapping process. The program will use areas like Laughlin as a case study. The project requires acquisition of more accurate topographic map data. A new radar called LIDAR (Airborne Light Detection and Ranging System) allows more accurate mapping of topographic data by allowing us to “see” through trees and growth for actual topography data. This methodology can be applicable within mountainous areas throughout the U.S. Potential funding sources: FEMA FIP interested in funding. Bert asked about FMA funding. Kim said she needs a FEMA approved plan to fund a project. Kim cannot give FMA money to fund an unapproved plan. Bert asked if the planning process itself is eligible for funding. Kim advised that repetitive loss properties are the higher priority for funding. Pre-disaster Mitigation (PDM) may be a resource. However the State would need an approved plan first. Necessary 25% cost sharing would come from State matching funds. Kim advised that the State has a cooperating partner’s agreement that has not been exercised. More investigation would be needed to see if this could be a mechanism to use.

6. Dates for next meeting: Jan 22. Mines/Geo. Cannot make the next meeting unless it is changed.

7. Helen’s comments: Thanked all who participate in meetings. She appreciated yesterday’s training session as an opportunity to meet local people.

8. No further comments.
9. Public input strategies: No public attended the meeting. Reno Gazette publishes the Public Meeting Announcements.

New Committee Assignments:

1. Committee assignments: To review hazard mitigation strategies and come back to the committee with priority recommendations.

   a. Jeanne Reufer and Kim Groenewold will review the flood Mitigation Strategies, they will contact other flood representatives to assist.

   b. Rick Diebold agreed to be on the Drought strategy prioritization committee, and include a new posting Kim Groenewold’s Department and possibly ask the State engineer to participate, and possibly a “State Water Authority” representative.

   c. Earthquake prioritization is to be done by Jon Price and Ron Hess.


Meeting adjourned at 11 a.m.
/gpc