



**STATE OF NEVADA
MEETING MINUTES
NEVADA HAZARD MITIGATION WORKING GROUP**

Attendance	DATE	March 8, 2022
	TIME	10:00 a.m.
	METHOD	Zoom
	RECORDER	Janell Woodward

Appointed Voting Member Attendance					
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Lorayn Walser– Chair	X	Herman Fillmore	ABS		
Steven Aichroth	ABS	Sheryl Gonzales	ABS		
Solome Barton	X	Clair Ketchum	ABS		
Faith Beekman	X	Andrew Trelease	X		
Kathy Canfield	X	Erin Warnock	ABS		
Ryan Shane	ABS	Melissa Whipple	X		
Craig dePolo	X				

Legal/Administrative Staff		
Name	Agency	Present
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy Attorney General	Attorney General's Office – DEM/HS DAG	X
Janell Woodward – Emergency Management	NDEM/HS	X
Mark Shugart – FEMA FIT	FEMA RIX	X

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Lorayn Walser, Governor’s Office of Energy, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Roll call was performed by Janell Woodward, DEM/HS. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Walser requested a motion to accept the minutes from December 14, 2021. Solome Barton moved to approve the minutes. Craig dePolo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

4. State Hazard Mitigation Plan Status Update

Janell Woodward, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, DEM/HS, explained that there are three updates from the subject-matter experts and that these updates are in the hazard section, section 3 of the state plan, that were sent to the members ahead of time. Ms. Woodward first discussed the severe storms and extreme snowfall update, indicating that a lot of weather is generally combined into one section. Ms. Woodward informed the group that a sentence was added signifying that a significant portion of the winter snowpack is generated by Pacific, atmospheric, river, winter storms. Ms. Woodward further indicated that there is a requirement for climate change, which falls under all hazards and is not considered a hazard in and of itself. Ms. Woodward explained that the subject-matter expert added three paragraphs to the section regarding individual hazards and how climate change affects those specific hazards.

Jeremy Hynds indicated that in the NRAC meeting a year and a half earlier, a Nevada threats and hazards list was approved and that the vernacular in this is not the same as what was in the approved list. Mr. Hynds explained the importance of remaining consistent given that every jurisdiction is being asked to utilize the same vernacular throughout all the plans in the state and indicated that perhaps the Nevada Threats and Hazards in NRAC need to be reexamined to include additional items such as climate change that are not currently in the list presented today. Mr. Hynds further indicated that the state hazard mitigation document will be used to help write county documents and the hazards are not listed in the state plan but are listed in the county plan, this creates inconsistency and gives the impression of a lack of coordination between state and county.

Janell Woodward asked if on the NRAC list, the different weather was listed out separately.

Jeremy Hynds confirmed that this was the case and indicated that this is something that also needs to be reexamined and updated for clarity given that the list is broken up into categories and subcategories.

Jon Bakkedahl informed the group that he will share the document to which Mr. Hynds is referring with the group and suggested that the document be reviewed by the group, who could then provide input and approval. Mr. Bakkedahl informed the group that the document to which Mr. Hynds is referring was a preparedness document to help get through the THIRA (Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment) process. Mr. Bakkedahl indicated his understanding that NHMWG is focused on natural disaster but explained that DEM also needs to include man-made and technological. Following the approval of NHMWG, Mr. Bakkedahl indicated that the document could then go to NRAC for review and approval.

Janell Woodward concurred with Jon Bakkedahl's suggestion. Ms. Woodward clarified that the title of the section was combined when the state plan was updated, and at that point is when it was renamed and no longer separate. Ms. Woodward reminded the group that this list was discussed

at the last quarterly meeting and indicated that it could be re-sent to the members of the committee for feedback and discussion at the next meeting.

Jon Bakkedahl informed the group that the document did go through southern Nevada, rural Nevada, included law enforcement, fire, and received tribal input prior to going to NRAC, who added some additional hazards, like the air-quality component.

Janell Woodward shared the document with the group, specifically pointing out the section to which Mr. Hynds referred regarding severe weather. Ms. Woodward indicated that if the severe weather category is broken down into subcategories, this would be more in line with what the counties are doing throughout the state. Ms. Woodward asked Mr. Hynds to clarify if subcategories under the severe-weather category would mirror the counties or if each should be listed as a separate hazard.

Jeremy Hynds explained that this was a question he intended to direct to NRAC and reiterated that NRAC does need to potentially revise its document in order to make it more user-friendly.

Craig dePolo indicated that some of the severe-weather categories are already broken out into their own sections rather than as subcategories under severe weather. Mr. dePolo concurred with Mr. Hynds' suggestion to include everything.

Janell Woodward indicated that the committee will need to determine what should be included as far as sections, and which of these require greater detail.

Jon Bakkedahl explained that the intent of the document was to be inclusive, but not to the point that each was described as an individual hazard, but rather to be defined in categories for a table of contents so that they could be easily found. Mr. Bakkedahl further indicated that the biggest conflict previously had been the different use of terms among counties for describing the same type of hazard, thus facilitating the need for a more comprehensive document that includes everything and uses the same terminology. Mr. Bakkedahl explained that DEM was trying to encapsulate as much as possible yet still keep it simple by category and terminology.

Janell Woodward explained to the group that she would send everyone the list of threats and hazards and then in the next meeting, a discussion could take place regarding what might need to be changed. Ms. Woodward indicated that she would move on to the other sections under item number 4 and this one would be readdressed at the next meeting.

Janell Woodward next discussed extreme heat, indicating that the state climatologist suggested the changes. Ms. Woodward indicated that this particular subject is especially important to the south, the Clark County and Nye County areas, where the heat can get exceptionally high. Ms. Woodward indicated that the weather fatalities for 2020 were updated as well as the mitigation actions, which Ms. Woodward explained were not typically added in that particular section but could easily be relocated to the other sections that discuss mitigation.

Jeremy Hynds indicated that the 2010 census was the one that had been used and questioned if this would be updated to reflect current census numbers.

Janell Woodward indicated that she would note that and request that the information be updated.

Jon Bakkedahl explained that the census information should be accurate and available.

Jeremy Hynds asked if HAZUS would be redone now that the new data for the census is available.

Janell Woodward confirmed that HAZUS would be updated for the plan. Ms. Woodward explained that DEM does have a GIS person on staff who has plans to do this.

Jeremy Hynds asked about a timeframe for the HAZUS update.

Janell Woodward explained that there is not yet a timeframe in place but anticipated that HAZUS would be addressed within the next six months or so.

Janell Woodward returned to the updates to the extreme heat section of the hazards plan, informing the group that three areas had been listed as high-hazard category areas to include mitigation actions. Ms. Woodward explained that when things are not expanded out to further actions, DEM is unable to apply for mitigation project grants. Ms. Woodward informed the group of a couple of areas where DEM is currently working to expand out mitigation actions, including drought and pandemic/epidemic response.

Kathy Canfield discussed the section on providing subsidies or other programs to help people offset the cost of home cooling and/or weatherization and pointed out the concerns following the wildland fires such as smoke and air-quality issues. Ms. Canfield suggested that some of these perhaps have cross-purposes and should be additionally addressed as topics with mitigation.

Janell Woodward confirmed that this is a discussion that has been had within DEM, specifically in the drought section. Ms. Woodward further indicated that DEM has met with EPA and received some help regarding the multi-category benefit.

Craig dePolo indicated the importance for everyone to look at the list and ensure that something that has been discussed within a county but is not included be added. Mr. dePolo suggested emailing Ms. Woodward directly regarding additions to this list.

Janell Woodward echoed Mr. dePolo's request that members reach out to her directly with requests for additions.

Craig dePolo requested that some of the figures in the report be enlarged for easier viewing.

Janell Woodward indicated that this could be done. Ms. Woodward next addressed the final update on drought, indicating that the mitigation actions were pretty general, which falls right in line with what DEM wants. Ms. Woodward explained that if mitigation efforts are too specific, then a project can only be done in that certain way and as such, a bit more generality allows for more flexibility.

Jeremy Hynds asked if the section on water stored in Tahoe was vague enough or perhaps too specific.

Janell Woodward clarified that the mitigation actions rather than the narrative itself should be vaguer.

Jeremy Hynds next asked why Lake Tahoe is mentioned but not Lake Mead.

Janell Woodward indicated that she did not know the answer but would note that as a question. Ms. Woodward next indicated that the history, location, and severity are noted by the expert as well as the impacts to both rural and urban areas. However, Ms. Woodward pointed out, there is nothing specific entered about climate change under the mitigation actions, something that needs to be added to the section. Ms. Woodward informed the group that she would ask the subject-specific experts to attend the June meeting for a more robust discussion and indicated that she would send the noted items back for additional editing.

Craig dePolo indicated that the numbers in section 3 were somewhat out of order and suggested that the group revisit that section. Mr. dePolo reiterated Jon Bakkedahl's suggestion from earlier in the meeting to add some quick-reference things upfront in order for people to find something quickly.

5. Mitigation Grants Update

Janell Woodward, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, DEM/HS, explained that four total applications were submitted for the BRIC program, one of which was a repeat of a submission from last year from State Public Works on the Hobart Dam area water system, a grant application equaling approximately \$10 million. Ms. Woodward indicated there were three other planning type applications that hit the \$500,000 planning cap in DEM's set aside. Ms. Woodward explained that the set aside was actually for \$1 million, but some different agencies that were going to submit did not end up doing so and as a result, \$500,000 was left on the table. Ms. Woodward clarified that part of the issues with those submissions that ultimately chose not to submit were issues with BRIC, including building code issues, which are not adopted at a statewide level in Nevada. Ms. Woodward explained that in Nevada, 97 percent of the population is covered by the latest building codes, three counties have no building codes adopted, and a couple of counties have earlier codes that were adopted. Ms. Woodward indicated the other big issue with submissions was that 2020 BRIC has not yet been funded due to the FEMA-GO system not yet being ready to make any amendments for additional grants. Ms. Woodward explained that as a result, when the first grant of the year is funded, the clock starts ticking on the period of performance. As such, Ms. Woodward explained that FEMA Region IX decided not to start with funding by that one grant that can be funded and to hold off until the FEMA-GO issue is resolved so as not to penalize any of the states or territories in Region IX.

Janell Woodward next discussed two options for available grant funding, beginning with the HMGP Post-Fire Fire Management Assistance Grant (FMAG) declaration that triggers mitigation funding. Ms. Woodward explained that the first obligation is to the counties to do some type of a fire grant and that there is still approximately \$2.3 million available for that. As such, Ms. Woodward indicated the importance of generating projects and the use of advanced assistance, which uses seed money, to put together a project. Ms. Woodward explained that this application does not

have to go to FEMA, and that this is what generates shelf-ready projects so that when the funding does come along, the application is ready to go. Ms. Woodward next discussed HMGP from COVID funding for \$13.5 million that came as a result of COVID. Ms. Woodward explained that the \$16 million number provided by FEMA includes management costs for both the local level that applied for a grant and the state. Ms. Woodward said that these grants are available on a first-come, first-serve basis and encouraged everyone to get grant applications in as soon as possible as the sooner the applications are approved, the sooner the projects can be funded. Ms. Woodward explained that it is easier to fund HMGP grants because they are in a different system and are not yet tied to FEMA-GO. Ms. Woodward informed the group that paper applications have been posted on the DEM website and all the documentation can be downloaded for submission. Ms. Woodward indicated that the same \$10 million project applied for the HMGP from COVID but explained that DEM is holding back that particular application for the moment to see what other submissions come in. Ms. Woodward explained the importance of getting in applications so as not keep giving back the funds that have been allocated to the state for spending due to a lack of submissions; Ms. Woodward further explained that if the money routinely is returned because it can't be spent, the federal government may ultimately decide that the state does not need it. Ms. Woodward encouraged members to reach out to her or to Ryan Gerchman with any questions or concerns. Ms. Woodward informed the group that the deadline for the HMGP Post-Fire to FEMA is May 31 and that the deadline for the HMGP from COVID is June 30.

6. Public Comment

Chair Walser opened the second period of public comment.

Rebecca Bodnar explained that she is updating the hazardous materials 3.3.11 and questioned whether the section on hazardous materials being left over in neighborhoods following forest fires would go under hazard materials, forest fires, or both.

Janell Woodward indicated that she could add a few sentences addressing the effects seen from climate change on hazardous materials in her section, but explained that it would also be addressed in the wildfire section.

7. Adjournment

Chair Walser asked for a motion to adjourn. Solome Barton moved to adjourn the March 8, 2022 Nevada Hazard Mitigation Working Group meeting. Craig dePolo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.