

**NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Wednesday, May 5, 2010

The regular meeting of the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (NNWPC) was held on Wednesday, May 5, 2010 in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

- 1. Roll Call and determination of presence of a quorum** – Chairman Erwin called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. There was a quorum present.

Voting Members Present:

John Erwin, Chairman
George W. Ball, Jr., Vice-Chairman
Michael J. DeMartini (arrived at 1:33 p.m.)
John Flansberg
Mickey Hazelwood
Darrin Price (left at 3:40 p.m.)
Jerry Schumacher
Wayne Seidel

Voting Members Absent:

John Jackson
Rosemary Menard
Stan Shumaker

Non-Voting Members Present:

John Bird
Jon Palm

Non-Voting Members Absent:

Mark Clarkson
Harry Fahnestock
Kelvin Hickenbottom

Staff Members Present:

Jim Smitherman
Chris Wessel
June Davis
John Rhodes, Legal Counsel

2. Approval of the agenda.

Commissioner Flansberg made a motion to approve the May 5, 2010 NNWPC agenda as posted. Commissioner Ball seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

3. Approval of the minutes from the April 7, 2010 meeting.

The minutes of the April 7, 2010 NNWPC meeting were submitted for approval. Chairman Erwin referred to page 6 of 8 and stated that the possible increased revenue mentioned under the Manager's Report should be 4.5% rather than 4.4%. Commissioner Seidel made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Commissioner Ball seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Commissioner Flansberg abstained from voting.

4. Public Comments.

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

5. Election of New Vice Chairman for the term April 2010 to April 2011, and possible direction to staff.

Chairman Erwin reported that he received a notice of resignation from Commissioner Ball from the position of Vice-Chairman (for the term of April 2010 to April 2011), in order to allow another Commissioner to serve in the role.

Commissioner Ball nominated Jerry Schumacher as Vice Chairman and made a motion to close nominations. Chairman Erwin called for discussion or further nominations. He called for a second on the motion to close nominations. Commissioner Price seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Chairman Erwin called for a vote on the nomination of Commissioner Schumacher to serve Vice Chairman, which was seconded by Commissioner Price. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Status report and activity update for the Central Truckee Meadows (Groundwater) Remediation District Program, Chris Benedict, Washoe County Department of Water Resources (DWR).

Chris Benedict, Program Manager for the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District (CTMRD), thanked the NNWPC for the opportunity to provide an update.

Mr. Benedict provided a PowerPoint presentation that included the history of the program, the areas of tetrachloroethene (PCE) groundwater contamination, and the treatment program. He stressed the need to treat PCE as near the source as possible. (*Note: The PowerPoint presentation is available with the agenda packet posted at <http://www.NNWPC.us>.)* Some of the highlights include:

- The CTMRD program was created in 1995 and is implemented by Washoe County Department of Water Resources (DWR) on behalf of the Board of County Commission (BCC) and in coordination with a stakeholder group that includes NDEP, Reno, Sparks, TMWA, DWR and the Washoe County Health District (WCHD).
- Groundwater monitoring program has been in place since 2003. He added that over 200 wells in the Central Truckee Meadows are monitored.
- Principal goals of the project are to prevent, protect, and mitigate PCE contamination in accordance with the Remediation Management Plan, which includes:
 - Protect and treat the resource needed to meet municipal water demands
 - Ongoing groundwater monitoring and investigations – Chairman Erwin asked if there is continuing increases at the center of the plume (related to a map shown by Mr. Benedict of the outlined focus area). Mr. Benedict stated there is evidence (2008 / 2009) that there are PCE discharges into the wastewater collection system from some PCE-using businesses. He added that ongoing work is being done with Reno and Sparks to try to remedy the problem. Chairman Erwin reiterated his question of whether there were plans to address the center of the concentration. Mr. Benedict reported that plans are underway to install active soil gas wells to better characterize the problem. He added that based on the results, if remediation is warranted, a remedial investigation and feasibility study to mitigate PCE will be initiated.
 - PCE source management and potential source area investigations
 - Update the RMP to reflect new information and ways to work with stakeholders to better prevent, protect, and mitigate PCE contamination.

Commissioner Price referred to the notion that PCE problems are mostly associated with wastewater and asked Mr. Benedict for an estimate of what percent might be caused by people dumping into the wastewater system as opposed to PCE leaking into the system. Mr. Benedict stated he does not believe that is the case today. He added that prior to 1991 there was no drinking water standard for PCE, which has been around since 1940. He stated that the PCE contamination is much more limited currently than previously, partly due to Reno and Sparks revising their ordinances related to use and disposal of PCE. He stated that he does not believe there are any malicious PCE discharges currently.

Commissioner Price asked how long typically an investigation takes. Mr. Benedict stated that from discovery of contamination to design and installation of a remediation system, it would take 2 to 4 years.

Commissioner Price asked how a Super Fund would pay for such remediation. Mr. Benedict stated he was unsure but provided some information on Super Funds.

Commissioner DeMartini thanked Mr. Benedict for the report and asked about the big issues on the horizon regarding future PCE issues. Mr. Benedict stated that in addition to PCE, TCE is being monitored. He added that arsenic monitoring is also conducted in conjunction with TMWA.

Commissioner Seidel also thanked Mr. Benedict and mentioned that discussions with the Health Department have mentioned the possibility of banning the chemicals in the future, such as they did years ago with Freon. He asked about the program costs and rates. Mr. Benedict stated that to date, the program cost is approximately \$26 million, and that the annual CTMRD budget is approximately \$2.5 million, which includes treatment. He added that the customer rates are calculated based on benefit of remediation. He reported that the customer rate fluctuates but has decreased over the past seven years. He offered to provide further information on rates if desired.

7. Report on the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) 2009 Water Usage Review Program; discussion and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) regarding a scope of work and funding request in the amount of \$64,100 from the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”) for the 2010 Water Usage Review Program, and possible direction to staff – Lora Richards, TMWA.

Lora Richards, TMWA, referred to the staff report provided to Commissioners, which outlines the history of the program. She stated that she is requesting continued support and funding of the Water Usage Review Program, in the amount of \$64,100. She added that the cost for 2010 is estimated to be about the same as 2009, although the number of reviews increased approximately 8%. Ms. Richards offered to provide more information or answer any questions.

Chairman Erwin stated this item is included in the NNWPC budget. He invited questions.

Chairman Erwin made a motion that “The Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission supports the program and recommends to the Western Regional Water Commission that \$64,100 is allocated for the 2010 Water Usage Review Program that TMWA sponsors.” Commissioner Seidel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

8. Presentation and discussion of final report entitled “Marlin and Lemmon Channels, Floodplain Analysis & Improvement Alternatives” prepared by Manhard Consulting, and possible acceptance of the report; consideration and discussion of a funding request by Washoe County in the amount of \$15,000 from the RWMF to prepare a FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Application, and possible recommendation to the WRWC - Walt West, P.E., Washoe County Public Works.

Mr. Smitherman reported Walt West and Dan St. John from Washoe County Public Works were present. Mr. Smitherman reported that an updated staff report was provided to Commissioners at today’s meeting from what was initially distributed. Chairman Erwin clarified that at the end of the presentation, Commissioners would be asked to support \$15,000. He asked if the amount is set aside in the budget. Mr. Smitherman stated it is not specifically reflected in the budget; however, there are sufficient funds available.

Walt West referred to the staff report. He reported that in February Manhard Consulting finalized the “Marlin and Lemmon Channels, Floodplain Analysis & Improvement Alternatives”. He stated that the area receives persistent flooding, with the most recent occurrence in December 2005. He added that the WRWC approved funding in the amount of \$50,000 for the study in January 2009.

Mr. West provided information on the project, including the area affected, alternatives analysis, existing system capacities, possible improvements, and a benefit-cost analysis on the Marlin Channel. He stated that the report identified a peak flow of 552 cubic-feet per second (cfs). He stated that there are approximately 54 parcels in the flood zone. Commissioner Price asked for clarification that the cost analysis benefits 54 homes, which Mr. West stated is correct.

Mr. West reported that the alternatives for the Marlin Channel included piping the 100-year event (which is very cost-prohibitive), upsizing the Marlin Channel and culverts to pass the 100-year event, or a detention facility. He stated that the most cost-effective solution was determined to be a detention basin (sized to pass the existing system capacity). He clarified that basically no improvements would be done downstream; there would be a culvert upgrade, and an approximate 14- to 15-acre detention basin.

Mr. West referred to the benefits, which include containment of the 100-year flood channel, which reduces the flood potential to 54 parcels. He added that the calculated benefits from the damage avoidance were estimated to exceed \$7 million.

Mr. West summarized that \$15,000 is being requested of the WRWC to enable pursuance of a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant. The application process would occur in two phases, the first of which would include a detailed survey of the properties and fine-tune the cost-analysis to determine that it is a viable pre-disaster project. The second phase would be the actual application process, which is quite involved.

Mr. West reported that the Lemmon Channel study conducted by Manhard, included a hydrologic analysis, which determined a peak flow of 1,206 cfs. It was determined that the safe system capacity was 636 cfs, which equates to approximately a 20-year storm event. He reported that alternatives included piping of the channel (again very cost-prohibitive), a detention facility, or culvert upgrades (at an estimated cost of \$10 million). Other less-expensive alternatives included installation of a trash rack or application for a letter of map revision (LOMR).

Mr. West welcomed any questions and added that Denny Peters from Manhard was available.

Commissioner Price asked if the infrastructure was installed, how the County would pay for the operation and maintenance (O&M). Mr. West stated it would come from the County's O&M budget. He added that a later agenda item addresses the potential establishment of a Stormwater Utility District, which would cover such expenses. Commissioner Price asked what other grant possibilities have been investigated and added surely there are others. Mr. West stated that the County knows it has a shot at the Pre-Disaster Grant and has not explored others at this time. Commissioner Price stated that in his mind, the funding of \$15,000 is a gamble; i.e. the County may or may not receive the Pre-Disaster Grant.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher referred to the phrase in the letter from Manhard that states, "Manhard will not exceed this fee estimate without prior written authorization from the County." Mr. West stated that is normal contract language, meaning that authorization would be necessary if the contract were to be exceeded. John Rhodes, Legal Counsel, clarified that if the NNWPC approved the funding request, they would be recommending that the WRWC approve the funding. He added that if approved by the WRWC, the WRWC would enter into an Interlocal Agreement with Washoe County in an amount not to exceed \$15,000.

Chairman Erwin referred to the Manhard modeling project and asked who owns the property on which the discharge basin is located. Mr. West stated that it currently belongs to a private owner. He stated that if the grant were received, Public Works would have to initiate acquisition of the property.

Chairman Erwin asked what would happen if the grant money were not available. Mr. West stated there are other potential options, such as the aforementioned stormwater utility.

Chairman Erwin suggested the need for two motions; one to accept the report, and the other to approve funding. Commissioner Price made a motion to accept the report. Commissioner Flansberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Chairman Erwin invited a motion to approve funding in the amount of \$15,000, which was not made. He thanked Mr. West for his report.

9. Informational Status Report on the “West Spanish Springs Hydrologic Analysis” prepared by Gray and Associates, Walt West, P.E.

Mr. West referred to the staff report and a PowerPoint presentation and mentioned the following highlights. During 2002 and 2005 significant thunderstorm events were experienced in the valley. Based on associated flooding, a request was made to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to authorize a study. He stated that Gray and Associates was selected to perform the study, which was completed in December 2008.

Mr. West reported that recommendations from the study included drainage basins or culvert upgrades. He referred to the different drainage basins and associated costs for each. He reported that the next steps are to make application to Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for acquisition of two basins. He added that the potential stormwater utility fee could possibly help pay for culvert upsizing.

Mr. West welcomed any questions or comments from Commissioners. Commissioner DeMartini asked if the possibility of building a detention basin has been considered in coordination with City of Sparks. Mr. West stated it is not appropriate because the primary purpose of the basin is sediment control.

Commissioner Ball asked how the County plans to fund the \$2.23 million needed for the project. Mr. West stated that during planning, the alternatives will be examined, such as 100-year storm event or a lesser design.

Chairman Erwin stated this is an informational item only and thanked Mr. West for his update.

10. Informational Status Report on Stormwater Management efforts in Washoe County and discussion regarding the potential establishment of a Stormwater Utility District for unincorporated Washoe County, Dan St John, P.E., Director, Washoe County Public Works, and Walt West, P.E.

Dan St. John, Washoe County Public Works Director, reported that Washoe County does not have a dedicated funding source, which results in a challenge in solving the issues as addressed in the previous two agenda items. He stated that the County’s current Stormwater Utility District fund is upside down and needs to be fixed.

Mr. St. John reported that the County has been working on rates for quite some time; in March 2000 an ordinance was passed to establish stormwater and flood control rates. He added that a Stormwater Utility District was established in 2002 for the North Spanish Springs Valley and in 2007 the County Manager established a Stormwater Management Team within the County. He stated that the BCC directed moving forward with the concept of a Stormwater Utility District. He added that such a program requires a very robust public information process. He added that the hope is to utilize the NNWPC and WRWC as venues to assist in that process.

Commissioner Price stated there is a good opportunity to relate the program to the water quality program. Mr. St. John stated that it will be necessary to make sure that every County sector benefits from the program. He added that the concept is being coordinated in conjunction with the Truckee River Flood

Project. He stated that to ensure no duplication of efforts, the same consultant and data were used for both projects.

Mr. St. John reported that work has been done on the following:

- Development of “Issue Papers” - includes stormwater rate studies, including imperviousness, on-site mitigation, need for Stormwater Utility District (public outreach and coordination with entities)
- Development of the capital improvement plan (CIP) (which will include the projects mentioned today, as well as others)
- Compilation of the customer planning-wide database
- Initiation of the financial analysis, which includes examination of the existing North Spanish Springs Special Utility District rates, as well as the overlay of the Truckee River Flood Project
- Implementation of the documentation and public process

Mr. St. John reported that his hope is to introduce the concept of the rate in the spring of 2011. He summarized that the purpose of today’s presentation was to create awareness of the upcoming proposal. He welcomed questions or input from Commissioners.

Commissioner Price asked when the rate study would be completed, to which Mr. St. John replied probably the November/December timeframe. He stated that a couple of scenarios would be included in the rate study.

Chairman Erwin asked Mr. St. John to explain the difference between stormwater and when it becomes a flood problem (for the benefit of the viewing audience). Mr. St. John agreed that it will be a very difficult message to portray to the public. He stated that the Flood Project is very finite and does not include items such as Spanish Springs detention basins. He reported on a broad basis, he would characterize stormwater management as dealing with stormwater quality issues under the Clean Water Act and the collection and conveyance of stormwater to its final destination. He stated he is very open to suggestions on how to address the issue.

Commissioner Ball stated that this is a good example of the nation’s infrastructure problems (on which the American Society of Civil Engineers [ASCE] concentrated). He added that Mr. St. John and Mr. Martinez (State Division of Water Resources) went to Washington DC to emphasize the infrastructure issue to Congress. He stated that the two appeared on the latest cover of the ASCE newsletter and commended them for their work.

Chairman Erwin stated that in the update of the Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, hopefully the stormwater work mentioned can be incorporated. Mr. Smitherman stated that is already in process.

11. Review and possible approval of the fiscal year 2010-2011 routine operating budget for non-staff services, and possible direction to staff, Jim Smitherman, WRWC Water Resources Program Manager.

Chairman Erwin referred to the last page of the report and welcomed questions or comments from Commissioners regarding the amounts that have already been approved for routine expenses.

Commissioner Ball made a motion to approve the routine expenses as presented. Commissioner Seidel seconded the motion. Commissioner Price asked if \$3,000 is sufficient for regional training. Mr. Smitherman stated that amount only pays for tuition and registration fees. He added that the associated \$7,000 for travel would cover the remainder of the training cost. Chairman Erwin called for a vote on the motion, which carried unanimously.

12. Status report on the Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”) and NNWPC websites; and possible direction to staff, Chris Wessel, WRWC Water Management Planner.

Mr. Wessel reported that funding was approved in February 2009 for a website for NNWPC and WRWC. He provided a brief history of the websites, which were hosted by Washoe County and TMWA respectively. He reported that the goal was to produce a website that would serve as a valuable resource tool.

Mr. Wessel referred to the new website, which now includes dropdown menus and links to other sites. He summarized that the websites will not only be helpful to Commissioners but to the public as well. He added that links to the agenda, packets, minutes, Water Plan and other documents would be easily accessible from the website. He showed how the “search” works. He mentioned that staff is working on making additional documents available.

Commissioner Seidel commended Mr. Wessel for a very reasonable website, without being excessive. He asked if the recently approved \$20,000 would cover maintenance of the website. Mr. Wessel stated that to date, approximately \$10,000 has been spent. He reported that sufficient capacity on the County’s server was purchased to allow storage of large documents and files.

Commissioner Schumacher asked if streaming video is available on the website. Mr. Wessel stated it is not available at this time; however, it could be in the future.

Commissioner Ball asked if private enterprise assistance was retained in the development of the website. Mr. Wessel stated that proposals for the website were solicited, with two received (in addition to the County). The bid range was \$12,000 to \$20,000 (the County bid was \$4,400 to develop the website).

Commissioner Price stated he thinks the functionality of the new website is awesome. Chairman Erwin agreed that it was great and commended staff.

13. Review proposed updated NNWPC Policies and Procedures, including procedures for meeting cancellations, and possible direction to staff, John Rhodes, Legal Counsel.

Mr. Rhodes reported that he had provided proposed Administrative Policies and Procedures for the NNWPC in the agenda packet. He stated that distributed to Commissioners at the meeting was a slightly different, cleaned up version, which included some highlighting. He explained that the items highlighted in yellow are those that are required by the Western Regional Water Commission Act, which have been adopted by the NNWPC.

Mr. Rhodes referred to page 5 which includes:

- How to place an item on the agenda after the previous meeting has been closed
- Procedure for canceling meetings, which includes that if staff in its best judgment determines that a meeting is not necessary or justified, they will notify the chairman (or in his/her absence, the vice-chairman), who shall have the authority to cancel or not

Chairman Erwin asked if the only new language relates to meeting cancellations. Mr. Rhodes stated that the original policies and procedures were very “bare bones” (which were highlighted in yellow). He stated the remainder was new in some form, and includes such items as the role of chair and vice-chairman, how to run a meeting, procedure for meeting when neither chairman nor vice-chairman is available, decorum, addressing the Commission and other issues. He explained that the policies and procedures were adapted from the WRWC’s rules.

Commissioner Price referred to the policy that the chairman could call a Special Meeting or three Commissioners could call a special meeting to deal with emergency circumstances. Mr. Rhodes stated that is correct. Commissioner Price mentioned the “quorum” policy, which states “unless a larger proportion is required by the Act”, and asked what specifically in the Act requires a larger proportion. Mr. Rhodes stated nothing requires it; however, because the Act says so, he included it.

Chairman Erwin referred to a “hand vote” or “roll call” and asked to what the latter refers. Mr. Rhodes stated that a vote could be clarified by a show of hands or by asking each member on the roll to specify. He added that the only time either procedure is used is when a voice vote is unclear. He offered to add an explanation of the normal “voice voting” to the policies and procedures.

Commissioner Price referred to page 4 of 6 and asked Mr. Rhodes to explain the “Amendments” section. Mr. Rhodes stated that the section was updated, which previously required a motion to make amendments, which is probably correct according to Roberts Rules of Order. He explained that he updated it to provide no more than one amendment to an amended motion with the consent of the motion maker. He stated that after that point, the original or a new motion would be required. Commissioner DeMartini asked if an amendment to a motion requires a second. Mr. Rhodes explained the process has always been to allow the motion maker to accept or not accept an amendment. If it is not accepted, the person requesting the amendment could make a new motion.

Commissioner Price referred to meeting cancellations and asked if staff would provide the notification. Mr. Rhodes stated that staff posts a notice of cancellation in all the places where the original agenda would be posted, including providing it to members.

Commissioner DeMartini referred to the assignments of chairman, vice-chairman, or presiding officers and stated it appears that the presiding officer has more assignments than the others. He asked if the chairman and vice-chairman are automatically considered presiding officers. Mr. Rhodes referred to Section 6, which refers to the duties of the chairman and vice-chairman (which serve as the presiding officer when present). Chairman Erwin stated it was covered under Section 6 and read the pertinent language.

Commissioner Ball commended Mr. Rhodes on the much needed Administrative Policies and Procedures. He referred to page 5, regarding the “motion to reconsider” and asked for clarification. Mr. Rhodes stated it refers to when a matter fails, it could be brought up as a “motion to reconsider” at a subsequent meeting. It could be brought up under future agenda items.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher asked if there is any provision for a “Closed Session”. Mr. Rhodes stated that it is not necessary since personnel or other issues requiring a closed session are not part of the NNWCP.

Commissioner Schumacher made a motion to “accept and adopt staff’s recommendation for Administrative Policies and Procedures (with the direction provided by Commissioners)”. Commissioner Flansberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

14. Status report on development of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, including Chapter 2, 3 and 7 outline, timeline and contractual services, and possible direction to staff, Jim Smitherman.

Mr. Smitherman provided copies of the following chapters for Commissioners to review prior to the next meeting:

- Chapter 2 – Water Resources
- Chapter 3 – Water Purveyors
- Chapter 7 – Water Conservation

Mr. Smitherman reported that in addition to the chapters, he included a packet of policies and criteria (which relate to the chapters), which will be open for discussion at the next meeting. He clarified that the chapters are in draft form and include some blanks in reference to other items that have not yet been developed, as well as some sub-sections that are “to be developed”.

Mr. Smitherman stated that based on previous direction, the chapters were provided today to provide a month to review prior to the next meeting, when they will be placed on the agenda for review and discussion.

Mr. Smitherman reported that he anticipates distributing at the next meeting:

- Chapter 4 – Wastewater
- Chapter 5 – Flood Control / Storm Drainage
- Chapter 6 – Population Forecast and Projections of Water and Wastewater Demands and Flows – Mr. Smitherman reported that ECO:LOGIC is working with service providers on agreement of the methodology used to project wastewater flows and hopefully would have the draft chapter available for distribution at the June NNWPC meeting.

Mr. Smitherman stated for the public that if they wish to receive any of the items distributed today, they would hopefully be available on the new website by the end of the week. The link will be “Handouts at Meeting” or similar.

Chairman Erwin asked about the procedure for reviewing and providing input on the chapters. He suggested sending electronic versions to Commissioners, who could “redline” the chapter with their comments or edits and return to staff. Staff could then determine which are substantive. Mr. Rhodes stated that it is acceptable; however, he cautioned against Commissioners meeting as a group (comments would need to be made individually). Chairman Erwin added that the redline comments should also be available to the public. Mr. Smitherman agreed and added that the chapters would be distributed in Word format so that “track changes” could be utilized. He stated that hand written edits would also be acceptable.

15. Program Manager’s Report

Mr. Smitherman reported that he included updates on the following topics as requested or that he thought would be of interest to Commissioners. He stated that the purpose of this agenda item is for Commissioners to review the information included in the agenda packets and feel free to ask questions, make comments, or request additional information.

a. Status Report of Projects and Work Plan supported by the Regional Water Management Fund

The updated Status Report of Projects was provided in the agenda packets.

b. Financial report on the Regional Water Management Fund

The updated Status Report of Projects was provided in the agenda packets. Mr. Smitherman reported that Washoe County Department of Water Resources (DWR) and TMWA would be requesting funding from the WRWC for the feasibility analysis for consolidation (as required by the WRWC Act). He added that the next fund update would probably include one or two Interlocal Agreements for the analysis.

c. Truckee River Flood Management Project status report

Mr. Smitherman reported that a status update on the Truckee River Flood Project was included as an informational item.

d. Informational report from the NNWPC representative on the Truckee Meadows Water

Authority Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Barry Winzeler is the representative of the NNWPC on the SAC.

16. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding agenda items for the June 2, 2010, Commission meeting and future meetings.

Mr. Smitherman stated that the next regularly scheduled NNWPC meeting would be June 2, 2010. Agenda items for the meeting include:

- Review Draft Chapters 2, 3 and 7 of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, including pertinent planning policies and issues for future planning, and possible direction to staff
- Program Manager's Report
 - Status Report of Projects and Work Plan supported by the Regional Water Management Fund
 - Financial report on the Regional Water Management Fund
 - Truckee River Flood Management Project status report
 - Informational report from the NNWPC representative on the Truckee Meadows Water Authority Standing Advisory Committee
- Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding agenda items for the July 7, 2010 Commission meeting and future meetings.
- Other Informational Items

Mr. Smitherman reported that he would be on vacation during the regularly scheduled July meeting and requested rescheduling the meeting for July 14, 2010. Chairman Erwin suggested entertaining a motion to reschedule at the June meeting. Staff agreed to add the item to the agenda.

Commissioner Flansberg made a motion to approve the above agenda items for the June meeting. Commissioner Seidel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Commissioner Schumacher reported that he would not be present at the June meeting.

17. Commission Comments.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher reported that the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID) Local Managing Board has two open positions for the upcoming election and one person has filed. He added that STMGID is soliciting interest from the public (who must live in the district) and requests that they contact Laura Rose at DWR.

18. Staff Comments.

None.

19. Public Comments.

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

20. Adjournment.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Niki Linn, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on _____ 2010.

John Erwin, Chairman