



STATE OF NEVADA MEETING MINUTES NEVADA HAZARD MITIGATION WORKING GROUP

Attendance	DATE	October 12, 2022
	TIME	11:00 a.m.
	METHOD	Zoom
	RECORDER	Janell Woodward

Appointed Voting Member Attendance

Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Lorayn Walser– Chair	X	Ceira Sampson	X		
Steven Aichroth	ABS	Shari A. Davis	X		
Solome Barton	X	Clair Ketchum	ABS		
Faith Beekman	X	Andrew Trelease	X		
Kathy Canfield	X	Erin Warnock	X		
Eric Antle	X	Melissa Whipple	X		
Craig dePolo	X				

Legal/Administrative Staff

Name	Agency	Present
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG)	Attorney General's Office –	X
Janell Woodward – Non-Voting Member	NV Division of Emergency Management / Homeland Security (DEM/HS)	X

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Lorayn Walser, Governor's Office of Energy, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. Roll call was performed by Janell Woodward, DEM/HS. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Lorayn Walser opened the first period of public comment for discussion. There was no public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Lorayn Walser requested a motion to accept the minutes from August 30, 2022. Craig de Polo, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, moved to approve the minutes. Andrew Trelease, Southern Nevada Regional Flood, seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

4. INTRODUCTION OF NEW WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Chair Lorayn Walser introduced and welcomed the new Working Group members: Ceira Sampson with Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Shari A. Davis with NV Governor's Office of Economic Development, and Eric Antle with NV Division of Forestry.

5. REVIEW OF HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM (HMGP) FROM COVID SUBAPPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2021

Janell Woodward, Nevada Division of Emergency Management (DEM) led discussion by subapplicants, noting for the group that the funding amount listed on the agenda is a bit different due to the fact that changes needed to be made to the budgets to reduce out the allowed management costs.

- a. Carson City Maxwell Detention Basin was presented by Robb Fellows, Flood Plain Manager and Chief Storm Water Engineer for Carson City. Mr. Fellows discussed the Maxwell Detention Basin, for a little over \$2 million. Mr. Fellows explained that the basin provides 100-year flood mitigation for approximately 30 downstream residential and commercial structures in the Goni Watershed on the north side of Carson City. Mr. Fellows explained that the basin will be on city property so that, if need be, there will be room to expand if more volume is needed in response to climate change. Mr. Fellows noted that the application includes a detailed breakdown of the cost with a completion anticipated within three years.

Craig DePolo asked if the hundred-year flood addresses climate change, or if this should be increased to a 500-year flood.

Robb Fellows indicated that this was based on the cost-benefit ratio but could certainly be expanded later using city funds. Mr. Fellows indicated the belief that at this time, a hundred-year volume would suit the area and provide the mitigation for it. Mr. Fellows further explained that Carson City layers its defenses so that everything is not dependent upon one basin and that other infrastructure will be in place to take care of the different areas of the Goni and other tributaries in this watershed.

Jon Bakkedahl, DEM, asked if there have been any documented one-time impacts to any of the properties in the Goni Watershed or if this is strictly preventative planning.

Robb Fellows indicated that he is not aware of any claims for this area in recent times.

Andrew Trelease asked if the detention basin size will be below grade or if there is a spillway.

Robb Fellows responded that it will be a below grade detention basin but does have an outlet into a channel that continues south. As such, this will not be considered a dam.

Andrew Trelease noted that there are minimal fees expected for things like managing the project and asked if Mr. Fellows is confident in the costs listed.

Robb Fellows indicated that he is but cautioned that costs have increased. Mr. Fellows explained that the city does have a storm water fund and if costs do increase, the city will need to pay for it. Mr. Fellows further indicated that because there is a landfill close by, this will save on some costs.

Andrew Trelease indicated that the federal cost share information states 75 percent, but this project was calculated based on 90 percent and asked about the discrepancy.

Janelle Woodward indicated that typically these grants are 75/25, but in this case FEMA changed it to a 90 percent reimbursement with a 10 percent match for COVID application.

Andrew Trelease asked if the fees for FEMA were included on the FEMA estimates.

Robb Fellows indicated that they were not.

- b. Carson City ALERT Sites was presented by Robb Fellows. Mr. Fellows indicated that this is for \$33,000 to upgrade the nine alert sites and to install an additional one. Mr. Fellows explained that this is critical infrastructure as the sites are able to alert through the National Weather Service in flash flood conditions that would result in heavy runoff. Mr. Fellows explained that this does concern two repetitive loss properties directly affected. Mr. Fellows indicated that the timeframe for this project is three years.

Craig dePolo suggested adding a sentence at the beginning of the proposal indicating what an alert site is.

Robb Fellows acknowledged that this is a good point and explained that it is a tube that has all the instrumentation and a way to communicate with the National Weather Service, which then tracks the data and sends out alerts.

Andrew Trelease asked for confirmation that this is not so much a warning of weather, but an alert of weather already in progress.

Robb Fellows confirmed that this is correct.

Andrew Trelease inquired about the idea of going to Alert 2, with an increased cost, and asked why this upgrade is not included.

Robb Fellows explained that the National Weather Service is not ready to go to Alert 2 and as such, Carson City intends to wait until everyone can be on the same page.

- c. Carson City Water Resource Recovery Facility Flood Protection was presented by Robb Fellows. Mr. Fellows indicated that this flood wall around the wastewater treatment

plant at the east end of Carson City will cost a little over \$2 million and would provide the 100- and 500-year flood protection to the facility. Mr. Fellows explained that the city has some extra freeboard in the wall to account for climate changes that would affect the facility and indicated that this is a critical facility for the entire city. Mr. Fellows further explained that there are two repetitive loss properties, the same ones as on the west side. Mr. Fellows informed the group that this project can be done in three years' time and as it is a rather new project, has not yet been submitted for any grant.

Andrew Trelease asked about raising the 100-year protection to 500-year protection.

Robb Fellows explained that currently the protection that runs around the plant is at the 100-year with no freeboard, which cannot be removed from the floodplain because the criteria to do so is not met. Mr. Fellows discussed needing four feet upstream of the structure, which is Airport Road, and indicated that the whole thing does not need to be encircled because as one moves to the east it is less of a threat, but Airport Road to the west, north, and south sides does need to be protected.

Jon Bakkedahl, DEM, asked out of the three projects submitted, which would be Carson City's priority.

Robb Fellows indicated that project C, Carson City Water Resource Recovery Facility Flood Protection, would rank first.

- d. Douglas County Hot Springs-Buckbrush Flood Control Project. Courtney Walker, Storm Water Program Manager for Douglas County in the Public Works Department, explained that this project would impact properties located in the Johnson Lane community in Minden, Nevada. Ms. Walker indicated that there have been several years of flooding this area, flash flooding that is typically monsoonal. As a result of flood events in 2014 and 2015, the county did an area drainage master plan for this area and is now trying to move to the implementation phase of the projects that were identified through that drainage master planning process. Ms. Walker explained that the plan is to collect the sediment from a series of sediment basins and transport the water downstream in a controlled manner in order to separate it and clean up the sediment from one location rather than in multiple developed areas. Ms. Walker indicated that in the drainage master plan, there is a cost estimate and 15 percent designs were completed. Ms. Walker further indicated that all of the improvements are planned for Bureau of Land Management/federal land. Ms. Walker explained that the NEPA process was recently completed along with an environmental assessment with BLM and the right of way has been granted in order to construct these improvements. Ms. Walker further explained that this involves getting the designs from a 15 percent design up to a 100-year design and then package it up to go out to bid, followed by selection of a contractor.

Jon Bakkedahl asked what the total allotment is that DEM has in set aside from post COVID.

Janelle Woodward indicated that the total is \$13.5 million.

Jon Bakkedahl asked if there is an opportunity to have Douglas County do partial work and then do a partial arrangement should the allotment not be able to fund all the projects.

Courtney Walker indicated that there definitely could be an opportunity to do so and indicated the importance of ensuring that anything done in stages does not adversely impact someone else downstream.

Andrew Trelease asked why the sediment basins are separate from the water detention basins.

Courtney Walker explained that when there is a significant sediment erosion, it causes scour and for that reason, the basins are planned to be located in areas where it can be collected and not cause additional scour downstream.

Andrew Trelease asked about the impact on critical structures, indicating his belief that this is a mostly residential area that will be protected.

Courtney Walker indicated that it is most residential but there is also a fire station directly adjacent and an elementary school directly across from the project area.

Andrew Trelease asked if there is a flood zone here.

Courtney Walker confirmed that there is.

Andrew Trelease asked if FEMA would be consulted to revise the flood zone delineations as part of this project.

Courtney Walker indicated that this would be done as part of the county's own project and that the county would work directly with FEMA for a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) and as such, this was not included in the cost.

Craig DePolo asked if this will be adequate to ensure against future climatic change effects.

Courtney Walker indicated her belief that it will be adequate because it will control the outlet and be maintained by an in-house dedicated maintenance staff.

Janelle Woodward reminded the group that there is a significant amount of funding available this year with the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program should a project end up needing more money than is available.

- e. Nevada System of Higher Education, University of Nevada Reno Advancing Hazard Mitigation in Nevada through Earthquake Early Warning Research and Planning. Janelle

Woodward informed the group that this is the only program HMGP that can be applied for at the moment for earthquake early warning through the mitigation program.

Daniel Trugman, UNR Professor with the Nevada Seismological Laboratory, indicated that this project is focused on doing some of the scientific research required to bring earthquake early warning to the state. Dr. Trugman informed the group that Nevada is a seismically active area of the country, concentrated primarily in the Reno/Carson area. Mr. Truman discussed the 50-year peak ground acceleration hazard map, indicating the areas with the most people. As such, Dr. Trugman explained that earthquakes are a primary concern for people living in the state and that it is only a matter of time before one occurs. Dr. Trugman indicated that there are some strategies that help to mitigate the hazard, beginning with earthquake early warning, which indicates that if an earthquake can be detected and characterized very quickly in real time, the measurements can be used from the fastest arriving waves, called P waves, to detect and characterize an earthquake in progress and send alerts to populations before the slower-arriving, stronger waves hit the center. Dr. Trugman explained this project proposes to begin the process to bring this type of mitigation to the state.

Janelle Woodward asked Dr. Trugman to discuss what USGS is saying that Nevada needs in order to join into the earthquake early warning program.

Daniel Trugman explained that in places like California, Oregon, and Washington, the seismic network for the state, the state government, and the federal government did some baseline research to determine what would be a reasonable and effective earthquake early warning system. Dr. Trugman indicated that this project does not actually bring the earthquake early warning system to Nevada as this is very costly, but rather for the research necessary to create a plan to bring forward to legislation with the specifics of what is needed to bring this mitigation to the state and what value it would add.

Andrew Trelease asked if Dr. Trugman believes this is something that ultimately the nation will be doing as a whole and whether or not Nevada is behind the times.

Dr. Trugman explained that he does not know if the earthquake early warning system will be nationwide as this issue does not affect a significant amount of the country but noted his belief that this is the way things are trending for the western part of the country.

Andrew Trelease asked if this plan, when fully implemented, is intended for residents or for something like an industrial complex that already has some safety protocols in place.

Dr. Trugman explained that there are two aspects to this plan: the public alerts to residents; and things that can be implemented in an automated fashion for places like energy companies, hospitals, and transportation networks who may already have some automated systems in place.

Erin Warnock inquired about the alert wildfire camera system and whether or not it overlaps with these seismic sites.

Dr. Trugman indicated that this is dependent on the site itself and that there would be significant fiscal value by adding new seismometers in fire camera sites where they do not currently exist, particularly as there is always worry with earthquakes of a secondary hazards such as fires.

Craig DePollo commented that this particular project allows for many communication opportunities for public awareness.

- f. State of Nevada Division of Emergency Management (NV DEM), Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Update. Janelle Woodward noted that without this five-year update to the state hazard mitigation plan, no other projects can be funded and indicated that because Nevada is an enhanced state, it is afforded an extra five percent when there are disasters. Ms. Woodward noted that the HMGP post fire came in, indicating that there was one fire in the state this year, but the cost was over a million dollars, up from last year's fire management assistance grant declarations for wildfire. Ms. Woodward further noted that part of this work was started in the past by the bureau of Mines and Geologies, so some of the work is done, and that the committee is working with an independently hired contractor and state mitigation staff to complete this update.
- g. State of Nevada, Public Works Division Hobart Creek Reservoir Dam (HCRD). Brian Wacker, Chief of Planning at the State Public Works Division, indicated that Hobart Reservoir is located between Lake Tahoe and Carson City. Mr. Wacker explained that the Marlette Lake Water System was constructed in 1873 and is a historic civil engineering landmark listed on the National Register of Historic Projects. Mr. Wacker further indicated that the Hobart Dam was constructed in 1877, an earth and field structure that retains 110-acre feet of water and is classified as a significant hazard dam. Mr. Wacker informed the group that a section of the dam was rebuilt in 1956 following a washout. Mr. Wacker indicated that this structure is a critical part of the infrastructure that provides water to Carson City and is the only water source for Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City in Storey County. Mr. Wacker explained that thus far, completion of approximately 40 percent of the schematic level design on this project has been completed through grant funding from FEMA and preliminary designs show that the dam is at risk for a failure from a seismic event primarily due to inadequate consolidation to the structure itself. In addition, Mr. Wacker explained, there are other functional issues with the dam, such as crest width and difficulty to access in the winter, oftentimes only able to be accessed via helicopter. Mr. Wacker further indicated that there is downstream seepage and erosion due to the age of the structure, and that failure of the structure would result in a significant downstream flooding event potentially reaching all the way to Washoe Lake. This is the only drinking water source for Storey County. Mr. Wacker explained that the project proposes to mitigate these deficiencies to improve resiliency of the structure and protect both the structure itself and the source of water in northern Nevada.

Andrew Trelease noted that structures downstream that would be impacted by this failure should be highlighted more prominently in the application and suggested that the

application further outline the effects a 100-year or 500-year storm could have on the structure in order to make the potential danger to the community more impactful.

Ed Scheetz concurred.

Janelle Woodward conveyed Jon Bakkedahl's question regarding whether or not this is an all-or-nothing project, or if it could be reintroduced into BRIC by addressing the scoring issues, since there is 2.1 billion available for competitive projects.

Brian Wacker explained that this is most likely an all-or-nothing project primarily because of the need to adequately address seismic issues at the dam. Mr. Wacker further indicated that this project has been submitted for the last two BRIC cycles for funding but did not get selected to move forward.

Craig DePolo asked if any comments were given as to why the funding was not given.

Brian Wacker indicated that he was not aware of any comments.

Janelle Woodward concurred that there were no technical comments received for those not chosen for BRIC funding.

Craig DePolo asked if there would be houses impacted by downstream flooding along with the highways and access roads.

Brian Wacker indicated that Red House, a historic structure not currently occupied, would be lost but conceded that the project did not identify a loss of the homes currently occupied when failure of the dam was studied. Mr. Wacker noted his belief that likely by the time the water hits Washoe Lake, it would start to fan out some coming out of the mountains, and for that reason residential housing was not really studied whereas the loss of drinking water to Storey County was studied.

Erin Warnock asked if the inundation map considers the cascading effect with Marlette, or if they are two separate dam breaches.

Brian Wacker confirmed that they are two separate dam breaches.

Andrew Trelease questioned the wording on the slides as a significant potential hazard dam versus a high potential hazard dam in the write-up.

Brian Wacker noted that Nevada Dam Safety classified this as a significant hazard dam.

Andrew Trelease noted that this should be clarified as this is an important distinction.

Eric Scheetz, Washoe County, expressed his surprise that there would not be more repercussions from a dam failure, noting his belief that the destructive force of this could certainly be major and would help the application.

Craig DePolo concurred and asked if Virginia City were to lose this water and then has a fire, would there be reserves or would this impact that, as well, creating a public hazard.

Brian Wacker explained that there is a reservoir in Storey County with a several day supply, but without Hobart Dam, the reservoir could not be replenished, thus eventually creating a large issue.

Janelle Woodward asked for the estimation of time prior to water being restored should there be an issue with the dam.

Brian Wacker indicated that this is dependent on the severity of the event and could be a 30-day to a 60-day outage.

- h. Washoe County SE Washoe Home Elevation COVID Batch was presented by Eric Scheetz, Truckee River Flood Management Authority. Eric Scheetz explained that the homes proposed for elevation due to potential flooding are in the East Reno area in Washoe County. These homes were approved on a prior FEMA grant, however COVID hit and stopped their ability continue the project, especially since they were unable to get a time extension. Now, without funding, homeowners would be 1099'd and need to pay between \$60,000 and \$100,000 in taxes. Mr. Scheetz indicated that the FEMA maps from the 1980s are approximately 1.8 feet too low, meaning that there is significant impact to people. Mr. Scheetz discussed the different options that were studied in order to mitigate the threat and indicated that ultimately the least risk and lowest cost, at approximately 1/10th the price of other solutions, would be in raising the homes. Mr. Scheetz further indicated that the budget numbers are based off of the FEMA letter, but also include an adjusted amount for last year's inflation following COVID. Mr. Scheetz further noted that if numbers need to be modified in any manner, they are willing to discuss those requests. They are addressing tribal concerns and climate change with the three-foot higher increment. There are numerous repetitive loss houses historically, and they are addressing the homes that repeatedly flood.

Janelle Woodward asked what this could be brought down to if overmatched on this grant.

Eric Scheetz noted that currently the 1.27 million price is for the overall project and that the county could go down to 75/25 or even 50/50 if need be.

Andrew Trelease asked what makes these homes the lowest hanging fruit.

Eric Scheetz confirmed that this was because they were already approved and should fly through quickly in terms of schedule as well as the fact that the homes are in the low area of Pebble Beach and regularly sustain water damage.

Andrew Trelease asked if the age of the houses is a concern in terms of the construction type potentially being important to this process.

Eric Scheetz explained that outside of some improvements to beams because of flooding and partial replacement of stem walls, there are no constraints to the project due to the manner of original home construction.

Andrew Trelease asked about the two alternate homes mentioned in the application, noting that five of the homes and homeowners are ready to go with the project, so why the need for the alternates.

Eric Scheetz noted that the alternates are in place in case someone sells a home, or something changes in order to eliminate the time constraint of finding additional homes willing.

Craig DePolo asked how many houses in total should be elevated in that area to mitigate the flood problem.

Eric Scheetz explained that this is one aspect of the overall flood project and that the number would be closer to 40-to-50 homes needing elevation.

Janelle Woodward walked the group through the form that will be used for the ranking process for these projects, noting the importance of spending all of the \$13.2 million of available grant money.

Solome Barton asked if any of the projects could give up funding or if it was all-or-nothing.

Janelle Woodward confirmed that the projects submitted are all looking for all-or-nothing funding, with the exceptions of the home elevations (h.) able to make some adjustment, and possibly Douglas County (d.) able to make some adjustment.

Kathy Canfield stated that she would need to leave the meeting and would email her ranking order to Janell Woodward.

Samantha Ladich, Nevada Attorney General's Office, confirmed that Janell Woodward could read Ms. Canfield's ranking order into the public meeting for recording purposes. Janell Woodward confirmed the Working Group would still have quorum with Ms. Canfield's absence.

Eric Scheetz added that if the project were to move to a 75/25 match, that would take it down to 954.

Samantha Ladich informed the group that the rankings are to provide a starting point for a discussion and that the list of recommendations to present to DEM will come out based on a vote, not on rankings.

Janell provided directions on rankings and score sheets. It was noted that these rankings provide the order the Working Group would like to present the projects for recommendation to the Chief of DEM. The Chief makes the final decision on HMGP projects.

Shari Davis noted that she will step away from ranking as she has not had an opportunity to review the materials but will participate in the vote.

A 5-minute break was taken.

Janell Woodward called roll order and ensured quorum. Quorum was re-established.

6. PRIORITIZATION OF THE SUBAPPLICATIONS FOR THE HMGP FROM COVID FFY 2021 GRANT PROGRAM

Janelle Woodward called roll and ensured quorum following the break and prior to prioritization of the subapplications. Ms. Woodward also asked that no one use the chat feature in Zoom (see attached Zoom Chat Transcript)

Eric Antle's rankings were as follows: 1, SPWD Hobart Dam; 2, Douglas County Hot Springs; 3, Carson City Recovery Facility; 4, TRFMA Home Elevations; 5, DEM SHMP Update; 6, Carson City Maxwell Project; 7, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 8, Carson City ALERT Site

Solome Barton's rankings were as follows: 1, DEM SHMP Update; 2, Carson City ALERT Site; 3 UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 4, TRFMA Home Elevations; 5, Carson City Recovery Facility; 6, Carson City Maxwell Project; 7, Douglas County Hot Springs; 8, SPWD Hobart Dam.

Faith Beekman's ranking were as follows: 1, Carson City Recovery Facility; 2, Carson City ALERT Site; 3, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 4, Douglas County Hot Springs; 5, DEM SHMP Update; 6, TRFMA Home Elevations; 7, Carson City Maxwell Project; 8, SPWD Hobart Dam.

Kathy Canfield's rankings were as follows: 1, SPWD Hobart Dam; 2, Carson City Recovery Facility; 3, DEM SHMP Update; 4, TRFMA Home Elevations; 5, Douglas County Hot Springs; 6, Carson City ALERT Site; 7, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 8, Carson City Maxwell Project.

Ceira Sampson's rankings were as follows: 1, DEM SHMP Update; 2, Carson City Recovery Facility; 3, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 4, Douglas County Hot Springs; 5, TRFMA Home Elevations; 6, Carson City Maxwell Project; 7, SPWD Hobart Dam; 8, Carson City ALERT Site.

Andrew Trelease's rankings were as follows: 1, DEM SHMP Update; 2, Carson City ALERT Site; 3, Carson City Recovery Facility; 4, TRFMA Home Elevations; 5, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 6, SPWD Hobart Dam; 7, Douglas County Hot Springs; 8, Carson City Maxwell Project.

Lorayn Walser's rankings were as follows: 1, DEM SHMP Update; 2, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 3, Carson City Recovery Facility; 4, TRFMA Home Elevations; 5, Carson City ALERT Site; 6, Carson City Maxwell Project; 7, Douglas County Hot Springs; 8, SPWD Hobart Dam.

Erin Warnock's rankings were as follows: 1, DEM SHMP Update; 2, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning; 3, TRFMA Home Elevations; 4, Carson City Recovery Facility; 5, Douglas County Hot Springs; 6, SPWD Hobart Dam; 7, Carson City ALERT Site; 8, Carson City Maxwell Project.

Craig DePolo's rankings were as follows: 1, Douglas County Hot Springs; 2, Carson City Recovery Facility; 3, Carson City ALERT Site; 4, DEM SHMP Update; 5, TRFMA Home Elevations; 6, Carson City Maxwell Project; 7, SPWD Hobart Dam; 8, UNR Lab EQ Early Warning.

Faith Beekman advised the Working Group that Melissa Whipple has been unable to connect to the meeting. After several attempts of trying to contact Ms. Whipple and confirming the phone line to the meeting was working as an alternative to participating via Zoom, it was decided to move forward without her ranking order.

Janelle Woodward provided the summary of the rankings:

1. DEM SHMP Update
2. Carson City Recovery Facility
3. TRMFA Home Elevations
4. UNR Lab EQ Early Warning
5. Douglas County Hot Springs
6. Carson City ALERT Site
7. SPWD Hobart Dam
8. Carson City Maxwell Project

Janelle Woodward indicated that the first six projects could be funded at \$10.6 million, and that seven could be funded at \$12.473, but to include the Hobart Dam puts the amount over to \$20 million.

Craig DePolo asked if seven were funded and Hobart were not, what could be done with the leftover funds.

Janelle Woodward noted that there was still time to find a project for submission and suggested if going that route, to reach out to stakeholders and see if somebody has a project that can fit into the specific amount of money that is let. Ms. Woodward further noted that there is funding available from different things, like BRIC with a \$2 million set aside as well as some HMGP post-fire funding for over \$1 million, which goes to fire people first but who traditionally never spend all of their money. Ms. Woodward indicated that Hobart, should the committee decide, could revise and strengthen the application for BRIC funding.

Craig DePolo indicated that he would endorse this idea were Hobart willing to do so and the rest of the group were to agree.

Andrew Trelease asked if the committee were to submit in a particular order, do some projects have a better chance than others on the list.

Janelle Woodward indicated that all seven, excluding Hobart, which would still be submitted, would be funded because they fall under the \$13 million mark under the 90/10 matching rather than the 75/25 matching.

Craig de Polo moved to recommend all of the projects in the current ranking order with the exception of Hobart due to budgetary considerations. Andrew Trelease seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Public Comment

Chair Lorayn Walser opened the second period of public comment for discussion.

Eric Scheetz, Truckee River Flood Management Authority, thanked the committee for its time and congratulated all submissions and their projects.

There was no additional public comment.

8. Adjournment

Chair Walser asked for a motion to adjourn. Andrew Trelease moved to adjourn the October 12, 2022, Nevada Hazard Mitigation Working Group meeting. Solome Barton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Attachment A: Zoom Chat File for NHMWG Meeting 10.12.2022

00:46:53 EScheetz: Congrats to new board members
00:47:19 Shari Davis: Thank you! Happy to be here!
00:47:46 Ceira Sampson - RSIC: Thank you
01:38:49 Carol Lynn: Humboldt County would like to have some more information about the project.
01:39:40 BartonS: I am so sorry. I was pulled away. I am here now.
01:40:38 EScheetz: I don't have a vote, but I vote for the state HMP that we need for all of ours;)
01:42:42 Erin Warnock, NV DWR: I have not seen it either.
03:08:29 DEM: Please do not use the Chat any longer. Thank you, DEM