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**Welcome**

Todd Stonely, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. After round table introductions, Todd, welcomed everyone.

**Approval of Minutes**

The committee by unanimous vote approved the August 2, 2018, minutes.

**Utah Hazard Mitigation Plan**

Bradley Bartholomew, Program Manager with the Division of Emergency Management, reported on the *Utah State Hazard Mitigation Plan* *2019 Update*. The Division of Emergency Management (UDEM) has been revising the hazard mitigation plan for the past two years. March 2019 is the deadline. Bradley provided an overview of the *2019 Update* and Utah’s recent recovery efforts, and he highlighted the importance of hazardous mitigation planning. The discussion covered the following items:

***The Disaster Risk Management Cycle (DRMC)***

* Pre-Disaster
  + Risk Assessment
  + Mitigation/Prevention
  + Preparedness
* Disaster Response
  + Warning/Evacuation
  + Saving People
  + Providing Immediate Assistance
  + Assessing Damage
* Post-Disaster
  + Ongoing Assistance
  + Restoration of Infrastructural Services
  + Reconstruction (Resettlement/Relocation)
  + Economic & Social Recovery
  + Ongoing Development Activities
  + Risk Assessment Mitigation /Prevention

Recovery involves a lot of effort and continues several years after a disaster. During recovery further mitigation activities are developed.

***Recent Recovery Efforts***

*Cache and Box Elder Counties*

A federally declared disaster occurred February 2017 in Cache and Box Elder counties when record snowfall melted within a couple of weeks. Funds from FEMA covered $4.4 million of the $6 million infrastructure destruction; not all the repairs were eligible. The counties and property owners continue to recover from the disaster with ongoing funding.

*Salt Lake City*

July 2017 Salt Lake City sustained substantial damage from a torrent of rain that caused $6-8 million in damage. Destruction from the storm was not a federally declared disaster. The State did not have enough uninsured damage to go forward with a disaster declaration. East High School and another school were damaged; both were covered by insurance. FEMA deducts insurance funds received. Libraries and some residential properties were damaged and uninsured. The libraries and home owners did not receive any assistance. FEMA does help communities get back on their feet, but it does not replace everything.

*Carbon County*

Carbon County September 2016 experienced multiple floods in the same area within a close time span. Each flood caused $1.6 million in damage. For Carbon County that is a lot of funding for recovery efforts. The floods were not federally declared disasters because the damages were never large enough to get federal funding. Carbon County recovery work is ongoing. Moreover, with the economic down turn with the coal mines in Carbon County, the situation seems unlikely to improve.

***Assistance for fire management (not recovery) =FMAG FIRES***

FEMA pays for fire suppression, but when it comes to recovery, there is no funding to help homeowners or business owners recover. The recovery process is multi-year and takes a toll on individuals and communities, especially small communities.

*Three FMAG Declarations 2018*

* Dollar Ridge
* Hilltop
* Bald Mountain

***Disaster Costs***

It can take years to tally the total cost of a disaster. Money will be a major issue. The State has no recovery funding to help communities or individuals.

*Direct Costs* *Indirect Costs*

Physical Damages Economic

Buildings Income

Utilities Jobs

Roads Businesses

Protective Measures Healthcare

Emergency Service Mental Health

***Mitigation Saves***

Mitigation helps reduce potential damage from hazards before they occur. A current, national study looked at mitigation and came up with an overall formula for all the hazards. The study showed that $1 spent on mitigation saves society an average $6 in future disaster costs. The savings vary depending on the disaster. For example, an earthquake is either 4-1 or 3-1 savings dependent on the type of mitigation project completed.

***Mitigation Planning***

Mitigation planning is not only the right thing to do to make Utah a safer, better place to live, but FEMA also requires states to have a mitigation plan. Without a mitigation plan, the State will not receive disaster or mitigation funding from FEMA.

FEMA had required states to update their hazard mitigation plans every three years. After some push back, states now have five years to update plans. Utah’s current plan was written in 2014. The planning cycle involves:

* Organizing the Planning Process and Resources
* Accessing the Risks
* Developing a Mitigation Strategy
* Adopting and Implementing the Plan

***Identifying Hazards***

A recovery plan is more guidance than a step-by-step detailed ‘plan.’ The recovery plan helps identify gaps, problems, funding, and mitigation opportunities. Planning, mitigation, and response all impact recovery and resilience. How well you recover is directly coordinated to how well you plan and mitigate.

Disasters that occur most often in Utah are caused by wildfires; the most damaging are floods. The earthquake that is expected will cause substantial damage.

Once the hazards are identified, risks are evaluated; the more people, the more damage and fatalities. Utah is expected to grow significantly in the next 20 to 50 years. UDEM looks at where the State is most vulnerable for each hazard. The *2019 Update* evaluates State facilities. Thousands of State facilities exist. All the facilities are located where people reside. This includes universities and schools. The Rio Grande Depot is the State’s number one facility at risk. The depot is a huge, unreinforced masonry building that needs retrofitting.

UDEM uses the risk software *Hazards U.S. Multi-Hazard (HAZUS-MH)* provided by FEMA.

Counties and communities within the State are also required to have a mitigation plan if they want funding from FEMA. To reduce risk for the economy and the population, local plans include a comprehensive understanding of the risks and vulnerabilities they face. The high priority hazards are wildfires, severe weather, earthquake, drought, and floods, which falls in line with the hazards on the statewide level as well. The most vulnerable communities remain in the most populated areas. The risk assessment helps communicate vulnerabilities, develop priorities, and inform decision-making, both for the hazard mitigation plan and for other emergency management efforts. The risk assessment provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the mitigation strategy.

***Mitigation Strategies***

Prevention is the best form of mitigation. Communities have the power to implement ordinances and higher standards for planning and building.

UDEM has many goals; this is one example:

Priority Goal:

* To reduce the effects of earthquakes on critical facilities.

Objective:

* To prepare digital maps that locate critical facilities in earthquake zones.

Possible Projects:

* Support seismic mitigation of state-owned critical facilities
* Develop maps showing critical facilities overlaid on the earthquake hazard
* Develop improved seismic hazard maps

Responsible Agencies:

* State government for state-owned facilities
* Local government for other facilities
* Utah Division of Facilities Construction and Management
* Utah Geological Survey

Possible Funding:

* State and local government operating budgets

Timeline:

* 3-15 years

***State Capabilities***

UDEM is also updating all local community plans. UDEM would like to hear from state agencies involved with projects that might relate to disaster, recovery, response, or mitigation, or if there is additional information state agencies would like to see included in the Utah State Hazard Mitigation Plan *2019 Update*.

UDEM will complete and submit a draft of the *2019 Update* to FEMA by January 2019.

In the past updating the plan entailed rehashing what was already in place. The *2019 Update* contains all new information. Steve Bowman, Utah Geological Survey, wrote the Geological chapter; David Marble, Division of Water Rights, wrote the Dam Safety chapter. Kevin Barjenbruch, Weather Service, wrote the weather chapter. Staff at the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Land wrote the Wildfire chapter.

Bradley answered questions.

**Forest Service; Utah’s Million Acre Challenge through Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative**

Dave Whittekiend, Forest Supervisor for the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, reported on the National Forests’ Million Acre Challenge. Dave provided a summary of the ‘Million Acre Challenge’ and discussed its partnerships and the hurdles the challenge presents, as well as its significance. The discussion covered the following items:

* The Million Acre Challenge affords an innovative and proactive approach in fast-tracking the pace and scale of restoration on National Forest System lands. The five National Forests in Utah; (Ashley, Dixie, Fishlake, Manti-LaSal, and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache) in partnership with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) and Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (UPCD), initiated this effort to achieve one million acres of watershed restoration by 2022.
* October 2017 the five forest supervisors signed a letter to employees kicking-off the Million Acre Challenge. The program focuses on improving three ecosystem values: 1) watershed health and biological diversity, 2) water quality and yield, and 3) opportunities for sustainable uses of natural resources. The Forest Service anticipates restoring one million acres of watersheds—200,000 acres a year across all five forests. For the Forest Service that is a lot, yet within the 2.1 million forest acres, 200,000 acres is not all that much. It is barely, at most, keeping up with the changing watersheds. The year prior to the Million Acre Challenge, 2016 into 2017, the Forest Service restored 165,000 acres of watersheds.
* The Forest Service is also partnering with the Watershed Restoration Initiative run by the Department of Natural Resources to improve priority watersheds and collaborating with the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands (FFSL) through the CAT Fire Program to identify areas for fuel treatment to reduce the impacts of wildfire. The Forest Service has teamed-up with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on many projects to become more efficient at moving through SHPO’s process. Other partners include Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Mule Deer Foundation, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife, and the National Wild Turkey Federation. The Forest Service would like to work with the Department of Agricultural and Food (UDAF) and Utah Farm Bureau to identify the most important areas to do rangeland restoration.
* Projects include forest-wide pinyon/juniper treatments, forest-wide aspen restoration, and forest-wide timber management treatments. Treatment methods entail mechanical thinning, prescribed fire, pre-commercial thinning, and commercial timber sales. The Forest Service has also completed projects that relocate trails and recreation sites that are having an impact on watersheds.
* Funding is an issue, but also is capacity—rules, regulations, and policies. The Forest Service is strategically learning to become more efficient and effective on prioritizing and selecting the right acres.
* The Million Acre Challenge is a grand goal. Yet nothing is more imperative than restoring and maintaining Utah’s vegetation and watersheds.

Dave answered questions.

**Utah Geological Survey’s Mineral Potential Report for the Lands Now Excluded from GSENM**

Tom Chidsey, Senior Scientist at Utah Geological Survey (UGS), explained “*Petroleum Geology 101*” and presented an overview of the *Mineral Potential Report for the Lands now Excluded from Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument* (GSENM) that UGS prepared for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The mineral potential report, a major accomplishment by UGS, allowed the BLM to move forward with the planning process in an expeditious manner. The presentation covered the following items:

* GSENM located in Kane and Garfield Counties was declared in 1996 by President Bill Clinton. In late 2017, President Donald Trump rescinded parts of the monument.
* *Petroleum Geology 101*: Oil and gas fields exist when a trapping mechanism, source rock, seal, reservoir, and the perfect timing of hydrocarbon migration are all present. Trapping mechanisms can be (1) structural, such as a fold and/or faults in the rock layers, or (2) stratigraphic such as sand bars from ancient rivers surrounded by impermeable layers of shale. The source consists of organic-rich rock that if it is buried and “cooked” long enough will generate and expel hydrocarbons that then migrate into potential traps. A seal is a layer of rock keeps the oil and gas in any kind of reservoir from leaking out to the surface. A reservoir is a rock that contains enough pores capable of storing oil and gas. Oil and gas are lighter than water, and reside in the in the pores on the highest parts of the traps. Timing of oil migration denotes oil and gas migration through an area before a trap is formed. Even if four of these five criteria exist, it could yet result in a dry hole. The UGS looked at these basic criteria when evaluating the Grand Staircase-Escalante Excluded Lands (GSEEL).
* Most of the oil fields in Utah are located in the Uinta Basin (eastern Utah), the Paradox Basin (southeastern Utah), the Thrust Belt (northeastern Utah), and the coalbed methane fields in central Utah.
* The three distinct areas within the GSENM region include the Grand Staircase (western area), Kaiparowits Plateau (central area), the Escalante Canyons/ Circle Cliffs (the north eastern area). The Kaiparowits Plateau is an important, remote area where coal resources exist in the monument.

* The five potential oil and gas plays in the GSEEL include:
  + Late Proterozoic/Cambrian
  + Paleozoic Devonian-Mississippian
  + Permo-Triassic Unconformity
  + Cretaceous Sandstone
  + Coal Bed Methane
* Significant oil production from the Permian Kaibab Limestone and Triassic Moenkopi Formation occurs at Upper Valley field adjacent to the GSEEL and is the basis for the Permo-Triassic Unconformity Play. Thus, this play has a high rating for development of potential for new oil discoveries. The other plays rate low to moderate with no established production, most likely due to the lack of one or more basic criteria required for hydrocarbons to be present. Coal bed methane potential was also rated low because of low methane content in the coal, low coal rank, and the coal is immature in terms of gas generation.
* Limited exploration and development for oil and gas has occurred within the GSEEL. A total of 26 well locations were drilled within the excluded lands between 1928 and 2017, all plugged and abandoned with no significant hydrocarbon shows. Given the extreme high exploration risk, remoteness of the region, lack of pipelines and infrastructure, depressed prices, and other factors, it is unlikely that much if any drilling activity will take place in the GSEEL. Most companies exploring in Utah will continue to focus their efforts in the Uinta and Paradox basins where there are high rates of drilling success, well-established infrastructure, and major exploitable oil and gas reserves.
* UGS also evaluated the coal potential. The Cretaceous Dakota and the Straight Cliffs Formations within the GSEEL of south-central Utah are coal bearing. The Dakota coal occurs in the Alton coalfield, where only the far eastern side overlaps with the GSEEL, whereas the Straight Cliffs coal occurs in the Kaiparowits Plateau coalfield, located in the north-central area and south-central area of the GSEEL. Substantial past coal exploration drilling in both the Alton and Kaiparowits Plateau coal fields has been sufficient to meet BLM requirements to delineate Known Recoverable Coal Resource Areas (KRCRA). However, despite the presence of several exploratory drill holes, no historic coal mining has occurred in the Alton coalfield within the GSEEL area. Due to the mostly thinner nature of the coal beds, it is believed that development potential in this area is low. The coal resources of the Kaiparowits Plateau within the GSEEL areas are rated high for development potential, except within Wilderness Study Areas, where the development potential is rated as low.

Tom answered questions.

**Election of Officers**

* RDCC members requested by affirmation Bill James serve as RDCC chair. Bill James was elected by unanimous vote and consented to serve.
* RDCC members requested by affirmation James Greer serve as RDCC vice chair. James Greer was elected by unanimous vote and consented to serve.

**Agency Reports**

* Todd Stonely reported the following for the Division of Water Resources (DWRe):
  + FERC finally made a determination of jurisdiction on the Lake Powell Pipeline project. FERC will take jurisdiction of the hydropower components of the project only and not the entire pipeline alignment. The project is now moving forward.
  + The Millsite Dam upgrade scheduled for completion this winter is behind schedule due to cracks found in the concrete of the spillway and outlet works. The cracks were patched and a plan was outlined for correction in the rest of the concrete.
  + The State of Utah established a Dam Safety Program overseen by the Division of Water Rights and funded through the Board of Water Resources. The board initially allocated about $4.2 million annually to the program, but later cut it back to $3.8 million. DWRe has been working with $3.8 million since the late 90s. At the current rate of the rising expenses of dams, it will take DWRe 65 to 70 years to repair all the high hazard dams on the list. DWRe has requested an increase of $6.2 million up to an annual allocation of $10 million to repair all dams up to standard within 25 to 30 years. Work on the dams also involves a lot of other state agencies.
* Allan Moore reported the following from the Division of Waste Management and Radiation Control (WMRC):
  + The two new proposed landfills, Promontory Point and Franklin Hill, have been quiet for a while. WMRC has heard nothing specific, yet there have been discussions associated with a landfill and the impact to the greater sage-grouse. A meeting has been scheduled with DWR in a couple of weeks to discuss whether or not the impact to the greater sage-grouse habitat would affect the approval for the landfill.
* Barrett Anderson reported the following from the Department of Agriculture and Food (UDAF):
  + UDAF is reviewing documents for the Ashley and Manti-La Sal National Forests Plan Revisions.
* Jason Gipson reported the following from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):
  + USACE is closing its St. George Office and will regulate southern Utah and southern Nevada *via* its Bountiful office. USACE has struggled to get quality candidates who can operate independently in St. George.
  + In regard to the Promontory Point Landfill, USACE does have an action for the rail spur that would service that landfill. Right now it is just a request to verify the boundary of the aquatic resources. A permit application is coming later. The landfill is contingent upon that rail spur to service. Otherwise it would be trucks, which is not viable.
  + Concerning the Lake Powell Pipeline, USACE will be issuing its larger individual permits, specifically for the hydroelectric portion. The rest of the project, the pipeline itself, has very minor, temporary impacts across drainages, plus the intake at Lake Powell. This requires a different authorization through USACE as well. USACE is reengaged after ten years, and getting up to speed on the project. USACE is a cooperating agency with FERC. FERC took jurisdiction over those small pieces of the project but their environmental documents can cover the entire project. BLM and other agencies should be able to tier the recommended decisions off that EIS.
  + USACE met with the proponents of the Utah Lake Restoration project, an informal application meeting, to understand what USACE’s process would be. An EIS will be prepared led by USACE. The proponents told USACE that the project is contingent upon funding. The project has resided with FFSL. USACE will not be involved until the proponents submit an application
  + Jason would like to coordinate with anyone who has any ideas or connections with the Utah Inland Port Authority. USACE’s analysis of that area includes about 25 percent aquatic resources, especially the lower quarter, which could delay projects, 16,000 acres, because it would require permits. The concept USACE used in Sacramento has been to do a comprehensive analysis of the aquatic ecosystem through an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and then create a permitting process based off the EIS as opposed to one piece at a time, which tends to lead to significant, cumulative impacts. Jason has yet to contact anyone or to obtain a point of contact within the Utah Inland Port Authority to have these discussions.
* Elizabeth Hora reported the following from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO):
  + Elizabeth introduced Don Hartley, SHPO’s new director,
  + Brad Westwood is now SHPO’s senior public historian.
  + SHPO expects to have online the new portal viewers for its historic buildings and (The Hub) archeological records (Sego) soon. Call SHPO if you would like to know more about the status of the online portal viewers. It will be the same kind of system, but easier to navigate through the layers.
  + Programmatic Agreements (PA) are designed to streamline the consultation process under U.C.A. 9-8-404; all state agencies are required, prior to expending state money or working on state lands, to go through a process that is similar to the Section 106 process. Consult with SHPO about what kinds of archeological and architectural resources might be impacted by your project.
* Don Hartley reported the following from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO):
  + Don Hartley stated that he has been an architect with SHPO for 29 years.
  + The Rio Grande Depot houses the Utah Division of State History; and the Division of Arts and Museums, which are part of the Department of Heritage and Arts. The Department of Heritage and Arts is planning and funding for a combined art and artifacts management facility. The Department of Heritage and Arts is not looking to build a museum. It will have a little exhibition space, but it really is in response to the [disaster mitigation] issues articulated so well today by Bradley Bartholomew, UDEM.
* Jan Morse reported the following from the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (DOGM):
  + Natasha Ballif is the new legislative and planning coordinator.
* Hans Millican, reported the following from the Division of Environmental Response and Remediation (DERR):
  + DERR has a munitions investigation project on Utah Lake November 12 at the Provo Encampment. The National Guard fired some rounds out into the lake for a couple of weeks. There could certainly be some live munitions in the lake. It will not be intrusive work, but there will be a boat that has a sonar looking for items. The project will take a week to complete.
* Tyler Ashcroft, Forest Service liaison, reported the following from the Forest Service:
  + Two new supervisor positions at the Forest Service have been filled. Ryan Neal is the Forest Supervisor for the Manti-LaSal National Forest and Mike Elson is the Forest Supervisor for Fishlake National Forest.
  + As far as leadership in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service, Jim Hubbard was sworn in as the new Under Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment that oversees the Forest Service and Vicki Christiansen was sworn in as the Forest Service Chief.
  + The Forest Service sage-grouse planning effort covers five states and is similar to the BLM’s planning effort. The primary goal is to have a closer alignment with the states’ efforts. The draft EIS has been released for public comment that closes January 4th. The Forest Service has scheduled public meetings December 11, 12, and 13 to be held in Cedar City, Vernal, and Tooele, respectively. The Forest Service works closely with folks from UDWR and PLPCO on this planning effort.
  + The Bears Ears National Monument management plan is being led by BLM, but the Forest Service is a very engaged Cooperating Agency. The comment period closes November 15th.
  + The Manti-LaSal National Forest Plan Revision is transitioning from the assessment phase to the planning phase. The next Cooperating Agency meeting is November 29th.
  + The Forest Service has done significant work to the burnt areas in an emergency response of the recent fires on Bald Mountain, Pole Creek, and Trail Mountain, such as constructing support to infrastructure to prevent flooding, landslides and erosion.
* Bradley Bartholomew, reported the following from the Division of Emergency Management (UDEM):
  + UDEM has its full-scale, yearly exercise this month. This year it is split up between two days. It is unknown what the exercise will be this year. It is usually an earthquake. Some of your agencies will be involved.
  + UDEM is working with many state agencies to up-date the *Continuing of Operations Planning* (COOP).

**Other Business**

Next meeting: February 7, 2019

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:02 a.m.