

**NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

The regular meeting of the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (NNWPC) was held on Wednesday, June 4, 2008 in the Washoe County Department of Water Resources Community Meeting Room, 4930 Energy Way, Reno, Nevada.

- 1. Roll Call and determination of presence of a quorum** – Chairman Price called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. There was a quorum present. Ernie Nielsen stated he was present to represent the Washoe-Storey Conservation District.

Voting Members Present:

George W. Ball, Jr. (arrived at 1:56 p.m.)
Michael Cameron
Michael J. DeMartini
Greg Dennis
Neil Mann
Rosemary Menard
Darrin Price
Jerry Schumacher (left at 4:45 p.m.)
Wayne Seidel (arrived at 1:55 p.m.)
Lori Williams

Voting Members Absent:

John Jackson

Staff Members Present:

Jim Smitherman
Chris Wessel
June Davis
John Rhodes, Legal Counsel

- 2. Approval of the agenda.**

Commissioner Schumacher made a motion to approve the June 4, 2008 NNWPC agenda as posted. Commissioner Menard seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

- 3. Approval of the minutes from the April 30, 2008 meeting.**

The minutes of the April 20, 2008 NNWPC meeting were submitted for approval. Commissioner Dennis made motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Schumacher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

- 4. Public Comments.**

Chairman Price called for public comments and hearing none, closed the public comment period.

- 5. Establish a location for regular meeting of the Commission.**

Chairman Price referred to the item included in the agenda packet. He summarized that the Sparks City Council Chambers or Washoe County Commission Chambers are available on the regular meeting day of

the NNWPC; however, Reno is available for all but two dates. He added that previously the Regional Water Planning Commission (RWPC) met at Washoe County Commission Chambers, which worked quite well. Mr. Smitherman reported that staff is familiar with the audio-visual equipment at the County.

Commissioner Williams made a motion to hold future meetings at Washoe County Commission Chambers. Commissioner Schumacher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Chairman Price confirmed that the next meeting as well as future meetings would be held at the County Chambers.

6. Status report on the Truckee River Flood Project and the proposed regional hydrologic model.

Chairman Price introduced Paul Urban, Project Manager for the Truckee River Flood Project. Mr. Urban stated that since the NNWPC is a new body, he would provide a background of the Flood Project. He provided the history of the work done by the Army Corps of Engineers beginning in 1957. He reported Senator Reid received authorization for a General Re-evaluation Report, which is currently in process. He added that a Community Coalition Group was formed that continues to meet. In 2002, the Community Coalition Group developed a concept plan; however, the Corps was unable to fund the plan.

Mr. Urban reported that in 2005, the Flood Project Coordinating Committee (FPCC) was formed. Its members include two elected officials from City of Sparks, City of Reno and Washoe County; two University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) representatives and fifteen non-voting members. The non-voting membership is made up of public works staff, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (Tribe), Storey County and working group representatives.

Mr. Urban stated that the FPCC set up an early land acquisition project, under which they currently own 139 acres. He reported that in 2006, they initiated the Truckee River Action (TRAction) Project, which includes flood projects that could be initiated without impacting the Truckee River Flood Project, for which he provided a description.

Mr. Urban reported that the FPCC is in the last phase of their goal of getting a reauthorized project from congress. He added that the Corps is working on the finishing touches of the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) and the draft general re-evaluation report. He stated they anticipate a draft EIS to be released to the public in August or early September.

Mr. Urban explained that in order to be considered for funding, it is necessary to ensure that planning or future development does nothing to reduce the level of protection expected from the Flood Project. He stated that to date the Corps' hydraulic model has been used to estimate elevations of the flood pool. He reported that the regional hydrologic model is needed to make sure there is no net adverse impact on water levels in the critical flood pools based on new development displacing fill.

Mr. Urban summarized that he sees the three top benefits of the hydrologic model as:

- To educate the public and elected officials on how land use changes effect hydrology downstream of development
- Use of the model to develop uniform building code recommendations on how a development can mitigate runoff
- A model would be available into which land use plans (20 to 30 years out) can be entered and examined for their potential impact to flooding.

Mr. Urban reported that a request for qualifications (RFQ) has been distributed to firms. He added that in four weeks, a selection committee will review and screen the qualifications and narrow it to three. He stated that once a model is developed, calibrated and a user manual developed, it would enable better determinations and decisions on how to mitigate the impacts of flooding and costs of facilities for future growth. He welcomed questions from commissioners.

Commissioner Williams asked if there are other uses for the model, i.e., water quality or other factors to make its use broader. Mr. Urban stated that is possible. He added that non-point source pollution and sediments resulting from development could also be included in the modeling. He stated the model would be dynamic and constantly updated. Commissioner Williams asked if those components were included in the RFQ. Mr. Urban stated that they did request scalability and changeability of the model. Commissioner Dennis stated he does think the model has additional value as questioned by Ms. Williams. He added the Steamboat Creek restoration is a good example to be updated.

Jim Smitherman stated that prior discussion called for the model to utilize existing data where necessary. Mr. Urban stated that the RFQ does specify that use. Mr. Smitherman asked what the timeframe and funding amount would be. Mr. Urban stated the timeframe is approximately 18 to 24 months and the cost estimate (based on Clark County) is \$1 to \$1.5 million. Commissioner Menard asked how the project would be funded, i.e., from the 1/8-cent sales tax, RWMF, etc. Mr. Urban stated the hope was to secure funding partners; however, with the economy as it is, the FPCC is prepared to pick up the total cost.

Chairman Price thanked Mr. Urban for his presentation. Mr. Urban provided Truckee Meadows Flood Control fact sheets.

7. Discussion of scope of work on the regional water conservation plan, and possible direction to staff.

Chris Wessel reported that at a previous meeting, staff was directed to begin working on an outline for how to approach a regional water conservation plan. He referred to the staff report, which included Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 531 that outlines the commission's power related to conservation. He reported that he convened a group of individuals from Washoe County Department of Water Resources, Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) and Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID), all of which currently have a conservation plan in place (and submitted to the State).

Mr. Wessel referred to Chapter 8 – the Water Conservation chapter from the Regional Water Management Plan. He also referred to a handout on “Discussion Points”, which was an outcome of the group meeting. He reported that the top elements to be updated are:

- Recommend ordinance revisions to better coordinate land-use planning/community development standards with water planning goals and objectives
- Review and update landscape ordinances
- TMWA Demand Analysis to provide information related to:
 - Switch from flat-rate to metered rate
 - Potential alternate watering schedules
 - Landscape incentives

Mr. Wessel reviewed conservation benefits, which include:

- Reduced purchases of raw or finished water
- Reduced peak demand
- Reduced operation and maintenance costs
- Deferred, downsized or eliminated new capital facilities
- Benefits to the environment

Mr. Wessel referred to “State Conservation Plan Elements and Requirements Summarized”. He focused on two items that were not part of chapter 8:

- Measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan or joint plan
- For each conservation measure specified in the plan or joint plan, an estimate of the amount of water that will be conserved each year as a result of the adoption of the plan or joint plan, stated

in terms of gallons of water per person per day

Commissioner Mann asked if it was intended that all the water purveyors would provide in-kind services to address the conservation efforts. Commissioner Williams stated that she believes all of the jurisdictions would need to be involved due to the need to examine land use and development codes. She mentioned another important key resource for the community that needs to be included in the conservation plan is reclaimed water.

Commissioner Menard stated that recently work has been done by the Regional Planning Agency, Reno, Sparks, Washoe County, TMWA and others to examine the growth projections. She summarized that good working relations have been established and land use and code requirements could be better aligned.

Commissioner Cameron asked why the NNWPC is revisiting the Conservation Chapter. Mr. Smitherman explained that the formation of the NNWPC and Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) shifted the emphasis on conservation from an element of the Water Plan to a plan that is directly under authority of the WRWC.

Mr. Wessel stated that the anticipation is to use the current conservation plans as a basis and then to expand on them. He reiterated the need to work with land use planners and community development. Commissioner Cameron asked if the review would include a review of the effectiveness of current programs. Mr. Smitherman stated that issue has been discussed. He added that with TMWA's system being almost completely metered billing; they will be able to collect and evaluate data.

Commissioner Williams stated that she did not believe chapter 8 would be revised prior to requesting adoption of the updated Water Plan by the WRWC. She summarized that the NNWPC's work would continue to evaluate what is working and what needs to be revised.

Commissioner Menard stated that the community needs to understand that conserved water does not get reissued for new growth; it gets stored. She suggested focusing on reducing peak demands and reshaping demand for the benefits associated with decreased needs for expanded or new facilities based on lower water use.

Commissioner Cameron stated that previously the RWPC heard a presentation on new technologies available for residential landscapes. He suggested a presentation on updated technology. Commissioner Williams agreed that developers should be required to implement that type of technology and ensure that they are installed properly.

Chairman Price asked Mr. Wessel if a regional submittal of the Plan meets the State requirements. Mr. Wessel stated that the requirement refers to "a plan" or "a joint plan". He asked Ray Davis, State Engineer's Office, for his opinion. Mr. Davis stated that one plan for multiple suppliers is acceptable. Commissioner Menard suggested that the Conservation Plan could be the "base plan"; however, each jurisdiction could require additional elements.

Chairman Price summarized that land use and ordinances would be addressed moving forward. He suggested that staff begin making those contacts. Commissioner Williams suggested including the landscape representatives, Harry Fahnestock and others. Commissioner Menard agreed and suggested discussing the issues with land use planners and community development staff. Mr. Smitherman suggested as the process moves forward, including developers, landscape architects, etc.

8. Discussion, direction, and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) regarding a proposal to develop an integrated water resources management plan for the North Valleys, including water supply, wastewater, reclaimed water,

storm water and flood control, and including a recommendation for funding in the amount of \$172,448 from the Regional Water Management Fund (RWMF) to support a related professional services agreement.

Mr. Smitherman reported that Terri Svetich, Senior Civil Engineer for City of Reno has been chairing core group meetings for the North Valleys Initiative and turned the presentation over to Ms. Svetich. Ms. Svetich referred to the economic downturn and the impacts on new development and stated if there is a “silver lining”, it provides an opportunity to plan and prepare. She stated that as growth continues, the wastewater treatment plants will need to be expanded, which will result in more treated effluent.

Ms. Svetich reported that with the increase in effluent, alternatives for disposal must be examined. She added that Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and TMWA are facing that challenge. She reported that the directors recognize that there is an opportunity to effectively and conjunctively use reclaimed water on a regional basis to provide flexibility and efficiencies. She stated that a master planning effort has been ongoing in the North Valleys, recognizing that with imported water and growth, the Reno-Stead Water Reclamation Facility will require expansion resulting in additional effluent. She added that TMWA, Washoe County and City of Reno all have customers in the North Valleys. She stated that City of Sparks is interested in additional reclaimed water resources. She summarized that each of the purveyors has a vested interest in the North Valleys.

Ms. Svetich thanked the entity directors and members of the core group, which includes Mike Drinkwater, Stan Shumaker, Terri Svetich, Janelle Thomas, JoAnn Meacham, Joe Howard, John Buzzone, Ron Penrose, Mark Foree and Jim Smitherman. She stated that the group categorized the issues into four components:

1. Policy
2. Regulatory
3. Technical
4. Financial

Ms. Svetich summarized that the core group recognized the need for assistance with collecting and disseminating information from discussions and developing technical reports on the integration of all the concepts. She stated that ECO:LOGIC Engineering was selected as the consultant for the project. She referred to the scope of work and reported that ECO:LOGIC has been performing much of the master planning effort for City of Reno, providing them with full knowledge of the water resources and future needs. She summarized that meetings would be scheduled at least twice a month. She stated that they anticipate a year for completion of the scope, although some elements might take longer. She explained that the hope is for some draft ordinances for adoption recognizing reclaimed water’s benefit to the region.

Ms. Svetich reported that the funding request for the scope of work is \$172,448 and requested a recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Mann requested identification of commercial or industrial types of new development that could benefit from the reclaimed water beyond irrigation, i.e., processed water or cooling water. He suggested that such industries might be attracted to the area and recommended including that component in the scope. Ms. Svetich stated that issue has been discussed and recognized.

Commissioner Price referred to the regulatory issues that state “Current NDEP regulations do not allow residential reuse...” He asked if there are other statutes or codes that might be affected by such changes. Ms. Svetich stated that the scope of work also includes a sub-consultant task with John Gaston, CH2M Hill. She explained that Mr. Gaston’s role would focus on meeting with the regulators to determine the issues related to utilizing reclaimed water in different applications.

Commissioner Williams stated the regulators might desire a higher level of treatment for particular applications. Commissioner Menard stated that in addition to front and back yard irrigation, the potential to use reclaimed water for recharge is also a possibility.

Commissioner DeMartini stated the funding amount (\$172,448) is a large request and asked if the scope should be divided into two phases. Ms. Svetich stated that the group discussed that issue; however, it was decided that the issues were so closely related that it would be best to move forward with the four components. Commissioner Menard stated that other areas are already implementing many of the reclaimed water uses. Commissioner DeMartini stated that he designed a dual water system in 1991 that has never been built and suggested working with Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) as one of the first tasks. Ms. Svetich stated that those matters have been recognized as priorities.

Commissioner Ball asked if the scope of work includes periodic updates to the NNWPC, to which Ms. Svetich stated that updates would be provided as progress is made. Commissioner Ball requested hearing from Mr. Gaston on the previous successes he has had in dealing with the regulators.

Commissioner Menard made a motion to recommend approval of the scope of work and funding request in the amount of \$172,448. Commissioner Seidel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

9. Discussion and possible recommendation to the WRWC regarding a proposal to conduct initial research and a preliminary education phase concerning watershed-based water quality planning and a Truckee River third-party total maximum daily load (TMDL) for nutrients, including a recommendation for funding in the amount of \$340,000 from the RWMF to support a related professional services agreement.

Commissioner Dennis reported that Laura Weintraub, Senior Project Engineer with LimnoTech, would be providing a presentation on a proposed TMDL project. He explained that the Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (TMWRF) previously solely discharged to the Truckee River. He reported that in about 1980 TMWRF was running out of capacity with their ability to discharge to the river (by the State) because the plant did not have tertiary facilities. He explained that in the 1970s they had a secondary treatment plant discharging to the river. He stated that in 1994 a TMDL was put in place, which limited nitrogen and phosphorus loading under a waste load allocation to the Truckee River. He reported that at that time, they began examining effluent reuse.

Commissioner Dennis stated there is a lot of work to be done with regard to discharge to the river, sustainability and the use of reclaimed water. He added that it will be a challenge to move the process forward. He introduced Ms. Weintraub.

Ms. Weintraub referred to a PowerPoint presentation, "Proposal for: A Plan to Restore the Chemical, Physical, and Biological Health of the Truckee River – Phase I: Preliminary Stakeholder Education". She reported that she previously worked as a member of Systech Water Resources where she was heavily involved in the application of the WARMF model.

Ms. Weintraub reviewed the presentation, which included an explanation of the components of Phase I:

- Ongoing Truckee River activities
- Water quality and TMDL activities
- Data Collection
- WARMF: Watershed Model – Chairman Price asked if this modeling effort could be integrated with the regional hydrologic flood model. Ms. Weintraub stated yes and added that she planned to propose on the flood model.
- TRHSPF: River Water Quality Model – Commissioner Menard asked if water temperature could

be modeled, to which Ms. Weintraub stated yes. She added that total dissolved solids (TDS) could also be included in the model parameters.

- Technology transfer – Ms. Weintraub referred to the Water Environment Federation (WEF)'s “Third-Party TMDL Development Tool Kit”. She added that she taught “hands-on” model training in 2002 and 2005.
- Need for TMDL review
- Truckee River Water Quality Protection and Restoration: Analysis and Planning
- Truckee River health
- Progressive Truckee River watershed planning, which includes three phases:
 - Phase I – Core Education
 - Phase II – Technical Exploration
 - Phase III – Plan Development
- Why is Chemical / TMDL track completed first? Ms. Weintraub stated that the scope of work and request for funding presented today is focused on this track.
- Overall objectives, which include:
 - Scientifically comprehensive and sound
 - Transparent process
 - Broad educational foundation
 - Politically informed and involved
 - Collaborative process
 - Progressive solution
- Phase I Objectives:
 - Educate stakeholders
 - Identify regulatory issues
 - Resolve technical issues and refine tools
 - Coordinate with physical and biological tracks
 - Conduct future phase planning
- Phase II Objectives:
 - Refine stakeholder education
 - Frame a TMDL approach
 - Screen potential alternatives
 - Coordinate with physical and biological tracks
 - Conduct future phase planning
- Phase III Objectives:
 - Continue stakeholder education
 - Resolve remaining regulatory issues
 - Develop TMDL
 - Coordinate and link TMDL to physical and biological restoration plans
- Chemical / TMDL Track: Phase I Tasks:
 - Develop educational tools
 - Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) / TMDL Working Group (WG) / Stakeholder support: Education and analysis
 - NDEP coordination and collaboration
 - Technical research and model refinement
 - Phase II & Phase III planning
 - Physical and biological track coordination
- Roles and Responsibilities
 - LimnoTech – Principle technical consultant
 - Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) – Facilitate political aspects, stakeholder interactions
 - Systech Water Resources – Support for WARMF modeling
 - Technical Advisory Committee – Panel of experts to provide technical review and

- guidance
- TMDL Working Group / Stakeholders – Decision makers who determine path towards Truckee River health

Ms. Weintraub summarized that what was presented is an integrated approach that is comprehensive and educationally based. She welcomed questions from commissioners.

Chairman Price thanked Ms. Weintraub for her presentation. Commissioner Dennis stated that a lot of input has been received on the project and added that a watershed approach will be a considerably difficult process.

Commissioner Cameron referred to the chemical track and the mention of coordination of the physical and biological tracks and asked if they would occur simultaneously. Ms. Weintraub stated they would occur simultaneously but under separate efforts.

Commissioner Williams stated that the proposal is primarily focused on the chemical track. She raised her concern that such processes can get far ahead of one another and encouraged creation of the linkages and timing of the other aspects of the project for which the stakeholders will be concerned. She asked when a proposal for the other aspects would come forward.

Commissioner Dennis stated he totally agreed and stated that he believed Commissioner Menard would take the lead with regard to the biological aspects and Chad Gourley, The Nature Conservancy and other experts would take the lead on the physical aspects. He added that the Work Group would determine how to develop the work plan and any associated scopes of work. He stated that processes would be in place before the educational process is complete.

Commissioner Menard referred to the TAC and stated her understanding from CCP's assessment is that the TAC is a panel of experts from the stakeholders. Commissioner Dennis stated that any technical individual could participate in the TMDL TAC. Commissioner Williams stated it was her understanding that stakeholders, such as the Tribe, Nevada Department of Fish & Wildlife, etc. would appoint their experts to the TAC. Chairman Dennis stated that the TAC needs to have transparency rather than appearing one-sided. Commissioner Menard suggested it should be a "technical summit", with which Commissioner Dennis agreed.

Commissioner Menard asked what the role of the CCP would be in this project. Commissioner Dennis stated that the plan is for Dave Ceppos, CCP, to act as facilitator and ensure that the project (all three tracks) is moving forward.

Commissioner Mann referred to the slide referring to roles and responsibilities and asked if the funding request includes all the entities. Ms. Weintraub stated that Systech's contract is included in that amount; however, CCP's contract would be separate.

Commissioner DeMartini asked what the basic driving force behind this project is, including the Phase I and future work, i.e., to achieve a greater quality of the present river to maintain the status quo. Commissioner Williams stated that we certainly do not want to backslide and added that there are opportunities to enhance the quality of the river. She mentioned that the project could also provide recognition of some of the benefits being contributed to the river.

Commissioner DeMartini referred to the new water quality standards on which the Tribe was working. Commissioner Williams stated that issue is a motivator for this project. Ms. Weintraub stated that a lot of the work has been done previously as far as having a good understanding of the science, tools, and numerical models related to the TMDL. Commissioner Williams stated that staff has discussed how all

the items are interlinked, which is a challenge to address.

Commissioner Menard proposed that funding be recommended to the WRWC for approval of the elements that are associated with the stakeholder education and engagement, which she calculated to be \$197,500. She added that her proposal includes allocating an additional \$142,500 to fund CCP's work as the facilitator and project manager. She recognized that she did not include in her proposal funding for NDEP Coordination and Collaboration (\$70,000) and Technical Research and Model Refinement (\$60,000). She stated she sees the need for those elements but suggested that funding come from another source. She summarized that she hoped her proposal would set a policy direction that the RWMF funds should be used to fund neutral stakeholder engagement processes.

Commissioner Williams asked when CCP's proposal would need to be delivered. Commissioner Menard stated her understanding is the CCP is currently working on a proposal that would integrate the steps and hopefully we would have it before June 9, 2008, which is prior to the WRWC's meeting on June 13, 2008.

Commissioner Menard clarified that her proposal includes funding half the Project Management element (\$12,500 of the total \$25,000). Commissioner Cameron asked if Commissioner Menard's proposal would jeopardize any milestones or timeframes for the project.

Commissioner Mann stated that Reno and Sparks have been solely funding much of the model work on behalf of TMWRF and its customers and would continue that portion of funding.

Commissioner Seidel stated that the project benefits the entire watershed education program and suggested funding the project in full. He added that the Water Plan is totally focused on the watershed.

Commissioner Williams asked if the modeling would be used for all tracks, to which Ms. Weintraub replied yes, most likely it would.

Commissioner Williams suggested that Commissioner Menard could modify her proposal to specify that the funding recommendation is for Phase I, the funding approval for Phase II would be down the road and the funding for CCP would be separate. Ms. Weintraub stated she believes there is a sense of urgency to move forward with the NDEP coordination, as well as the Technical Research and Model Refinement, in preparation to support the educational effort. Commissioner Mann agreed with Ms. Weintraub on the sense of urgency to keep the momentum going. He clarified that he supports Commissioner Menard's recommendation for the funding split.

Commissioner Ball asked if Commissioner Menard's proposal is adopted would it extend the timeline of the project. Ms. Weintraub stated that the proposed timeline is 18 months to 3 years and she does not believe the funding split would slow Phase I. Commissioner Dennis stated he would be happy to receive any funding. Commissioner Williams asked if it is acceptable to City of Reno for TMWRF to continue funding some of the modeling and direct efforts to pursue the TMDL. Commissioner Mann stated yes it is acceptable to the level discussed today.

Commissioner Ball asked what the finished product of the project would be, i.e., a better understanding of the various parameters that are impacting TMDL in the river and then develop approaches for reducing the load to the river. He stated he sees a long time and a lot of money on a complicated project.

Commissioner Williams stated that is why planning is done. She added that the cycle never ends; that some items would be implemented and measured for the benefit and the planning cycle would continue. She mentioned climate change, which in the future might impact the river. She stated that she believes the NNWPC would be tasked with addressing the issues.

Commissioner DeMartini stated that he understands the project to partially maintain the status quo and partly to implement additional effluent capacity at TMWRF. He stated that hook up fees are intended to fund expansion of the plant and suggested those fees could fund 50% of the project and the Cities of Reno, Sparks and Washoe County would fund the other 50%. Commissioner Menard stated there currently are no hook up fees.

Commissioner Dennis stated that we do facilities planning in order to determine what type and treatment level of facilities to build, whether chemical, physical or biological constraints will be in place, which is why planning is necessary. Commissioner Williams used the example of what if the sewer folks decide it is too expensive to treat and dispose the water to the river so instead it will be taken to a wetland. That would require 30,000 acre-feet of return flow water rights in the Truckee River so it would have to be determined from where that water would come. She reiterated that it is necessary to have the best available information, which requires planning.

Commissioner Menard made a motion to recommend to the WRWC allocating \$340,000 from the RWMF, with \$197,500 for the LimnoTech scope and the remaining \$142,500 to be allocated for the CCP scope that is forthcoming and involves the stakeholder process. Commissioner Dennis seconded the motion.

Chairman Price asked if a motion should be made to allocate the funding for the CCP proposal before it has been received and reviewed. Commissioner Dennis stated that he is confident the CCP proposal will cover the facilitation process to move the three phases forward. He stated that a White Paper was provided on the Truckee River Watershed / Water Quality Improvement Program. Ms. Weintraub added that she has worked in coordination with Mr. Ceppos to ensure that LimnoTech's scope is in alignment with CCP's process.

Commissioner Schumacher asked what the balance of the RWMF is currently. Mr. Smitherman stated the fund has approximately \$92,000 in encumbered projects that are ongoing; two projects totaling \$127,000 that were approved by the WRWC; the North Valleys Initiative and this project total \$512,000 for a total of \$730,000, leaving a balance of approximately \$870,000. Commissioner Williams asked if that balance includes the money that was in the bank, which it does not. Mr. Smitherman agreed there is approximately \$2 million in savings.

Commissioner Cameron stated it is fascinating to see the change in this commission from the RWPC. He added that there is a lot of work being done by the local purveyors and local governments outside the meetings. He clarified that he thinks that is great; however, he stated he sees a disadvantage because he is not involved in any of those meetings and discussions so he does not understand some of the budgeting. He added that his vote would be based on the motion being seemingly acceptable to the entity staff.

Commissioner Menard stated she completely appreciates Commissioner Cameron's comment and asked if he, Commissioner DeMartini and Commissioner Ball were onboard with the process and how it is moving forward. Commissioner Williams stated that staff is also trying to examine issues that make sense to go to the agencies for staff work. She added that the RWMF will not go very far if in-kind staff is not utilized to the level possible.

Commissioner DeMartini asked if the entire \$340,000 were approved, how much would be spent the first year. Ms. Weintraub stated that most likely it would all be spent on Phase I, which is estimated at approximately 18 months for completion.

Chairman Price stated there is a motion and second on the floor and called for the vote, which carried unanimously. Commissioners thanked Ms. Weintraub for an excellent presentation.

10. Discussion, possible approval and possible input to the WRWC concerning the revised WRWC work plan and budget through the 2008-2009 fiscal year, and possible direction to staff.

Chairman Price suggested hearing number 11 prior to this item, with which Mr. Smitherman agreed.

Mr. Smitherman reported that staff most recently presented the work plan to the WRWC on May 16, 2008. He stated that in general the WRWC is supportive of the topics; however, some members requested more detailed timeframes and budget amounts. He reported that based on the approval of the two items today, the North Valleys Initiative and the TMDL project, he could add more detail to the work plan. He added that Mr. Wessel has also been working on the scoping for the conservation efforts and that information will be updated. He summarized that he has quite a bit of information that can be added to the revised work plan that can be presented to the WRWC at the July meeting.

Mr. Smitherman referred to the edits made to the work plan and stated that he believes that the utility directors had discussed possible approaches for the items, “scheduling and delivery of water resources”, “conjunctive use”, and “establishment of future service territories”.

He requested direction on whether to include the available information and present it in an updated work plan in July or to wait until further information on approaching the issues is available. Commissioner Williams suggested waiting until possibly September to include additional information rather than piecemeal. Commissioner Menard recommended presenting what is available in July with an explanation of what is forthcoming in September. Chairman Price asked what the WRWC’s expectation was on the timeframe. Mr. Smitherman stated that Mayor Martini had mentioned providing enough time to complete the work plan. Mr. Smitherman offered to provide a verbal update at the July meeting.

Mr. Smitherman stated that he heard Paul Urban state that the FPCC offered to fund the regional hydrologic flood model in full. Members agreed that they also heard that.

Commissioner Menard made a motion to “morph” item number 7, “Develop a regional hydrologic model” into coordination of efforts and collaboration to link the models from the Flood Project and water quality work. Commissioner Dennis stated, “When synergy can occur, make sure it does.” He seconded the motion. Commissioner Seidel stated that Sparks is concerned with the governance of the model, i.e., who owns and maintains it. He suggested that issue be examined.

Chairman Price clarified that by approving the motion, the new project would not be approved; the motion is to revise the work plan to reflect the updated item. Mr. Smitherman added that the work plan would continue to evolve and change.

Commissioner DeMartini referred to the hydrologic model and stated that when it was envisioned, it was to be a model that would be useable for the cities’ drainage management, as well as providing information to the Flood Project to ensure it is not impacted. He added that what he is hearing is that if the FPCC is solely funding the model, it would be designed to meet their needs. Commissioner Menard stated that the people involved in the selection of the model and direction of its development, include people from the Flood Project TAC, which includes the Cities, County and other entities. Commissioner DeMartini stated if the model is focused on upstream detention, storm drainages, etc., he doubts the Flood Project would be willing to spend another \$500,000 to satisfy the needs of the other entities. Commissioner Cameron suggested reviewing the scope of work when it is available and if it seems too narrow, possibly the scope could be expanded.

Jeanne Ruefer stated she is a member of the Flood Project TAC and she attends all the FPCC meetings. She stated the intent of the hydraulic model is so the jurisdictions can use it for their development

purposes so whether it is paid by the 1/8-cent sales tax or partially by the RWMF, we will all be able to benefit from it.

Chairman Price reiterated that we are not approving the budget or the plan. Commissioner Cameron referred to the last page of the work plan and the wording of the climate change item. He stated whether or not it is induced by human activities is a separate issue. Mr. Smitherman agreed and offered to remove the wording referring to human activities.

Commissioner Dennis referred to the item on conservation and suggested that it should include consistent enforcement policy.

Chairman Price called for the vote on the motion, which carried unanimously.

11. Update on status of projects supported by the Regional Water Management Fund. (Heard out of order)

Mr. Smitherman provided an updated table of the ongoing projects funded by the RWMF. He gave a brief overview of the revisions, which included:

- Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual – Finalized
- Flood Storage Volume Mitigation – Phase II – Report finalized with comments sent to the author with approximately \$2,000 remaining in the contract
- WaterWise Program – Finalized
- Groundwater Monitoring Program – Project in its second year with approximately \$29,000 remaining
- Minutes for Water Planning Commission meetings – Ongoing with approximately \$4,000 remaining
- Minutes for WPC subcommittee meetings – Ongoing contract with approximately \$8,000 remaining
- North Valleys Flood Storage Mitigation – Phase II - Finalized
- Sparks TMSA/FSA Facility Plan – Finalized with \$105,716 remaining that will be returned to the fund balance
- Plan Update Assistance – Ongoing contract with approximately \$7,600 remaining
- Plan Update and Formatting – Contract amended so Niki Linn can provide same services for the Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual with \$20,000 remaining
- Nevada Field Guide for Construction BMPs – Ongoing with lump sum of \$10,000 contract
- Washoe ET Program – Ongoing contract with approximately \$15,000 remaining

Chairman Price thanked Mr. Smitherman for his update and moved back to item 10.

12. Discussion and possible action to adopt a policy and procedure for allowing the addition of items to the agenda of the next meeting without a vote of the Commission.

Mr. Smitherman stated he discussed this issue with John Rhodes and one alternative would be to approve a motion authorizing the chairman at his sole discretion to place items on the agenda that perhaps were not discussed previously. He stated that Mr. Rhodes clarified there is no duty or requirement for the NNWPC to set its agendas at a public meeting. He explained that the RWPC did that previously.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the RWPC had a Jurisdiction and Agenda Committee, which set the agenda for the RWPC meetings. He added that any member could request an agenda item at any time. He stated that once rules or procedures are adopted for this commission, the issue will be covered. He reiterated that the chairman and vice-chairman have the authority to add agenda items. He added that the standing agenda item for future agenda items would remain on the agenda.

Commissioner DeMartini made a motion that any item being placed on the agenda be delivered to staff verbally or in writing and staff make the contact with the chairman or vice-chairman. Commissioner Menard seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

13. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding agenda items for the July 2, 2008 commission meeting and future meetings, and possible cancellation or rescheduling of the July 2, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Smitherman reported that this agenda item is worded for possible cancellation or rescheduling of the July 2, 2008 meeting. He stated if it is to be rescheduled, it should be scheduled earlier, possibly June 25, 2008. Commissioner Williams asked if there are agenda items planned for that meeting. Mr. Smitherman stated the following items would be placed on an upcoming NNWPC agenda:

- Presentation of the updated work plan
- Possibly presentation of the proposal from CCP

Commissioner Dennis made a motion to cancel the July 2, 2008 meeting with the next meeting scheduled for August. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Chairman Price clarified that the meeting date would be August 6, 2008. Commissioner DeMartini suggested that if any important item comes up, a special meeting could be scheduled.

Chairman Price restated the motion to cancel the July 2, 2008 meeting and called for the vote, which carried unanimously.

14. Commission Comments.

Chairman Price expressed his sympathy over hearing that Peter Krenkel, former Chairman and long-time member of the RWPC, passed away on June 1, 2008. He added that Dr. Krenkel had been an outstanding contributor to the water community. Mr. Smitherman stated that services were scheduled for June 5, 2008 at 4:00 p.m. at St. Luke's Lutheran Church.

Commissioner Ball requested that since meetings are scheduled monthly, not having anything emailed to commission members within the week prior to the meeting. He stated that with a busy schedule, it is hard to find time to review packet items when they arrive late.

Mr. Wessel stated that the WRWC requested receiving the agenda packets electronically and staff followed suit for the NNWPC. Commissioner Ball agreed that is a good idea and clarified his request refers to late-arriving packet items and suggested having a cut-off date in place unless there is an emergency item. June Davis stated the cut-off date is the Tuesday at 5:00 p.m. prior to the following week's Wednesday meeting.

15. Staff Comments.

Mr. Smitherman reported that John Jackson was appointed to the NNWPC as the Tribal representative. He added that Kelvin Hickenbottom was appointed as the State Engineer's office non-voting representative, with Ray Davis as his alternate.

Mr. Smitherman stated that apparently the Washoe-Storey Conservation District (WSCD) appointed Ernie Nielsen, who attended today's meeting. Commissioner Menard stated that the "WSCD" was a drafting error and that it should have read the "Washoe County Water Conservation District". Staff agreed to pursue and clarify the issue.

16. Public Comments.

Chairman Price called for public comments and hearing none, closed the public comment period.

17. Adjournment.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Niki Linn, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on _____ 2008.

Darrin Price, Chairman