



# MEETING SUMMARY



**Date/Time of Meeting:** Tuesday – November 19,2019

**Location:** Canyon County Paramedics, 6116 Graye Lane  
Caldwell, Idaho 83605

**Subject:** Steering Committee No.4

**Project Name:** Canyon County Hazard Mitigation Plan-Update

**In Attendance** **Attendees: 16 (see attached)**  
Phoned in: None  
**Planning Team:** Rob Flaner

**Not Present:** N/A

**Summary Prepared by:** Rob Flaner (12/6/2019)

**Quorum – Yes or No** Yes

Item	Action
------	--------

### Welcome and Introductions, Review Agenda

- Vice Chair, Ms. Ashley Newbry opened the meeting and facilitated group introductions.
- Distributed handouts included: Agenda; SC Meeting # 3 meeting summary, objectives exercise, FEMA “Lifelines” fact sheet, proposed critical facilities/Infrastructure definition, Hazard mitigation survey.
- The agenda was reviewed, and no modifications were made.
- No members of the public were present
- Meeting facilitation was turned over to Rob Flaner, the lead project planner from Tetra Tech.

### Old Business

- Meeting Summary. The meeting summary from Steering Committee Meeting # 3 was reviewed and approved by the SC (motion-Mark Wendelsdorf, 2<sup>nd</sup> -Roxanne Wade)
- Planning partner status. Rob informed the SC that the Core Planning team (CPT) was in receipt of 6 letters of intent to participate (LOI’s) as follows:
  - Canyon County
  - City of Caldwell
  - City of Nampa



## Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ City of Greenleaf</li> <li>○ Canyon Co Ambulance District</li> <li>○ Southwest District Health</li> </ul>	County OES to continue to pursue LOI's from non-committed planning partners

COMPASS has also provided a letter of intent to participate as a stakeholder in the process. Rob explained that this level of commitment is well short of what participated in the 2014 planning effort. Rob explained that the target would be at a minimum, to get an LOI from at least all of the Cities within the County. There was discussion on how to achieve this goal and when the CPT should stop trying. Rob explained that to meet the planning partner participation requirements as defined for this project (see planning partner expectation document from SC meeting #1), LOI's must be received prior to deploying the phase 1 Jurisdictional Annex process. It was determined that the time up to the next SC meeting would be used to lock in the planning partnership

### New Business

- **Objectives exercise.** Rob apologized to the committee that the electronic version of the objectives was not distributed to the SC as was stated at the last meeting. Rob explained that tetra tech had been seeing better results with the exercise as a facilitated exercise during a SC meeting, rather doing it remote via electronic means. Therefore, the CPT had decided to make the exercise as part of this meeting.

So, Rob then presented the exercise. The SC was provided with a catalog of 54 objective statements along with the 5 goals the SC had confirmed at the last meeting. Each SC member was asked to review each of the 54 statements, and determine which of the 5 goal statements, each objective met. The object of the exercise is to identify a cadre of objective statements that meet the most goals, based on the average for the exercise. To facilitate discussion amongst the SC for this exercise, the attendees were split into 2 groups. Each group took half of the statements and completed the exercise as a group. Once the exercise was completed, each group would report out the entire committee, the results of which were recorded by the CPT. The CPT will tally the results of this exercise, identify those objective statement that fall above the average, and the SC will consider those statements for refinement at the next SC meeting.

CPT to Tally objectives exercise results for presentation to the SC at the next meeting

- **Critical facilities/Infrastructure.** Under this segment of the meeting, Rob explained to the SC that it is a principle objective



### Item

### Action

of any local hazard mitigation plan to assess risk to identified critical facilities/infrastructure as defined by the planning process. Rob noted that the 2013 plan did not formally define CF/CI facilities but did inventory facilities typically considered as “essential” by FEMA BMP’s. To increase the versatility of this plan update, Rob recommends that the SC clearly define CF/CI as it pertains to the planning area. This will allow for an expansion of scope for projects that benefit identified CF/CI as mitigation projects, which is a priority for FEMA HMA grant funding.

Rob also introduced the SC to the FEMA community “Lifelines” construct. FEMA developed the community lifelines construct to increase effectiveness in disaster operations and better position the Agency to respond to catastrophic incidents. The lifelines construct will become the epicenter of new FEMA initiatives, most notable, the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) initiative. A fact sheet on the lifelines construct was provided to the committee.

Following this discussion, Rob presented a recommended definition for CF/CI that incorporates the lifeline construct terminology. After a review and discussion on this proposed definition, the SC approved the formal definition for CF/CY for this plan update as follows (Motion-Angie Michaels, 2<sup>nd</sup>- Ashley Newbry):

***A structure, facility or other improvement that, because of its function, service area, or uniqueness, provides service that enables the continuous operation of critical business and government functions, and is critical to human health and safety, or economic security. For the purposes of this hazard mitigation plan, the following categories of lifelines are defined as critical facilities:***

- 1. Safety and Security: Law Enforcement/Security, Search and Rescue, Fire Services, Government Service, Responder Safety, and Imminent Hazard Mitigation***
- 2. Food, Water and Sheltering: Evacuations, schools, Food/Potable Water, Shelter, Durable Goods, Water Infrastructure and Agriculture***



Item	Action
<p><b>3. Health and Medical: Medical Care (Hospitals): Patient Movement, Public Health, Fatality Management, Health Care and Supply Chain</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Energy: Power (Grid), Temporary Power and Fuel</b></p>	
<p><b>5. Communications: Infrastructure, Alerts, Warnings, Messages, 911 and Dispatch, Responder Communications and Financial Services</b></p>	
<p><b>6. Transportation: Highway/Roadway, Mass Transit, Railway, Aviation, Maritime and Pipeline</b></p>	
<p><b>7. Hazardous Materials: Facilities, Hazardous Debris, Pollutants and Contaminants</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● <b>Public Engagement.</b> Under this segment of the agenda, The Steering Committee reviewed the hazard mitigation survey that was revised based on comments received at the last meeting. Rob walked the SC through those changes. The SC was asked if any more changes desired. None were presented, so the Survey is considered to be final. The CPT will finalize the survey for deployment. The CPT will coordinate with Joe Decker to get the survey deployed. Rob asked that all SC members make an effort to distribute the survey by whatever means, to whatever groups they have access to. A survey is only as good as the number of responses that we get. So, we need to get the word out.</li></ul>	<p>CPT to finalize the survey for distribution.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● There was discussion on setting up an HMP website for information on this update process. The website is still not updated to reflect this plan update process. Rob asked for help in getting this done. This will need to be coordinated through Joe Decker. Christine Wendelsdorf stated that she would reach out to Joe to check on the status of website updates.</li></ul>	<p>Christine Wendelsdorf to coordinate with Joe Deck on status of website update.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Media release. As soon as the revised website is up and running, a media release will need to be made by the County that advertises both the website and the survey.</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● <b>Action Items.</b> Rob asked the Committee if they wanted to postpone SC meeting # 5 until January due to the Holidays. It was the consensus of the group that they did not want to delay the process and determined that SC # 5 would be held on December 10, 2019, at the usual time and location.</li></ul>	

Meeting was adjourned at 2:59 PM



## Meeting Summary

---

Item	Action
------	--------

The next meeting will be Tuesday, December 10, 2019, at Canyon County Paramedics, 6116 Graye Lane, Caldwell, Idaho 83605; from 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM.



# SUMMARY



# MEETING

Attachment: Sign-in Sheet

### Canyon County Hazard Mitigation Plan-Update SC meeting #4, November 19, 2019

Name	Representing	Phone	E-mail
Adam Gonzalez	Payette Co EM	208-741-2828	agonzalez@payettecountyr.org
Clay Long	City of Nampa	208-468-5401	longc@cityofnampa.us
Liisa Heenan	COMPASS	208-47-2291	littmen@ compassidaho.org
Christine Wendelsdorf	CCSO emeg mgt	208-989-2132	Cwendelsdorf@ canyonco.org
Roxanne Wade	CCSO Dispatch	208-455-5975	RWade@ canyonco.org
TJ Wilson	EMT	208-455-5326	terry.wilson@phd3. idaho.gov
Mark Wendelsdorf	CFD	208-455-4706	Mwendelsdorf@ cityofcaldwell.org
Heidi Novich	IOEM	208-954-2432	hnovich@ind.idaho.gov
JosL McIntosh	IOEM	208-608-1579	JMcIntosh@Ind.idaho.gov
Angela Mideals	Flood District #10 + #11	208-870-9495	angie@ewsio.com
Michael Stowell	CCP	208-573-3795	mstowell@ccparamedics.com



Canyon County Hazard Mitigation Plan-Update  
SC meeting #4, November 19, 2019

Name	Representing	Phone	E-mail
Ashley Newbry	City of Caldwell	208-455-4672	anewbry@cityofcaldwell.org
David Schorzman	Canyon County Sheriff	208-989-6475	dschorzman@icloud.com
Stephane Huiley	Canyon County	208-454-7254	shuiley@cayencounty.org
Anita Christman	Koon's NSD	208-468-4600	achristman@nsd181.org
Keri K. Smith-Sigman	+ Community Citizen of Destination Caldwell	208-960-4811	kerikay@hotmail.com