

**NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 1, 2010

The regular meeting of the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (“NNWPC”) was held on Wednesday, September 1, 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
Jerry Schumacher, Vice-Chairman
George W. Ball, Jr.
Michael J. DeMartini
John Flansberg
Mickey Hazelwood
John Jackson
Darrin Price
Stan Shumaker
Wayne Seidel

Voting Members Absent:

Rosemary Menard

Non-Voting Members Present:

Harry Fahnestock
Jon Palm

Non-Voting Members Absent:

John Bird
Mark Clarkson
Kelvin Hickenbottom

Staff Members Present:

Jim Smitherman
Chris Wessel
June Davis
John Rhodes, Legal Counsel

2. Approval of the agenda.

Commissioner Price made a motion to approve the September 1, 2010 NNWPC agenda as posted. Commissioner Flansberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

3. Approval of the minutes from the August 4, 2010 meeting.

The minutes of the August 4, 2010 NNWPC meeting were submitted for approval. Commissioner Flansberg made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Seidel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

4. Public Comments.

Chairman Erwin called for public comments.

John Enloe, ECO:LOGIC Engineering, stated that he and ECO:LOGIC have been working with the Water

Planning Commission for years and have enjoyed the relationship. He reported that on September 15, 2010 ECO:LOGIC is merging with Stantec Consulting. He explained that the process has been ongoing for 8 to 9 months. He added that Stantec asked ECO:LOGIC to take a leadership role in the water and wastewater group for the western United States, which is a great opportunity for ECO:LOGIC's 100 employees. He expressed his hope that the two companies can combine and expand their capabilities. He summarized that he looks forward to continuing his relationship with the Commission and wanted to make the announcement rather than members hearing it "on the street".

Mr. Enloe also encouraged members to drive by the Glendale Diversion site that is under construction. The project is funded by Truckee Meadows Water Authority and has been in the design phase for years to replace the existing diversion weir. He added that the project is very impressive to see.

Chairman Erwin thanked Mr. Enloe and called for further public comments and hearing none, closed the public comment period.

5. Report by the Desert Research Institute ("DRI") on its Cloud Seeding Operations for the Truckee and Tahoe Basins for the past water year, and status of its Cloud Seeding Coalition efforts; discussion and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission for funding in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 from the Regional Water Management Fund to support such Cloud Seeding Operations for the upcoming water year.

Chairman Erwin invited Arlen Huggins to present this item. Dr. Huggins, Associate Research Scientist for DRI, stated that Greg Bortolin, Director of Communications for Governmental Affairs, was also present to answer questions. Dr. Huggins referred to a PowerPoint presentation with the following highlights:

- In 2010 DRI received its primary funding through the Truckee River Fund, in the amount of \$65,000; along with supplemental funding from the Western Regional Water Commission in the amount of \$45,000. DRI contributed \$66,000 for a total of \$276,000.
- The goal was to enhance snowfall from the winter storms and to increase the snowpack in the Tahoe/Truckee watersheds.
- He referred to a conceptual diagram of how cloud seeding works and provided a brief explanation. He stated that cloud seeding increases the efficiency of a winter storm to provide precipitation.
- Over the past several decades, conceptual models of seeding have been developed and validated in a number of research studies in the western U.S. An increase in the precipitation in a specific seeding plume has been documented to be from a few hundredths to more than 2 millimeters an hour in the precipitation rate. The average can be on the order of 4 to 5 millimeters per hour.
- DRI developed a method for targeting where in the snowpack the seeding had an effect by analyzing snow samples for silver.
- The American Meteorological Society made a statement that wintertime seeding has the potential to enhance the snowpack by 10% in the area of seeding.
- In DRI's seeding projects in the Sierra, Elko, and Walker River areas, the annual average shows an increase of approximately 60,000 acre-feet of snow water.
- In the Tahoe/Truckee watershed there are five seeding generators. He explained how the generators work and the common plume directions.
- He explained how the optimal seeding opportunities are tracked and utilized. He stated that the past winter season DRI seeded 56 storm events utilizing 1,120 hours of generator operation, with 72% generator operational efficiency. The estimated snow water from the 56 events was a little over 20,000 acre-feet. He stated that the dollar amount from the sponsors divided by the acre-foot increase results in approximately \$10.40 per acre-foot.

Dr. Huggins reported that the current cloud seeding program status is as follows:

- Southern Nevada Water Authority agreed to fund seeding the Ruby Mountains in 2011.
- A proposal with the Bureau of Reclamation (“BOR”) is in the NEPA process under the Desert Terminal Lakes Project for a five-year seeding program for the Walker Basin, with assistance from the Walker Irrigation District.
- An Advisory Board has been convened to advise DRI on different types of funding options available.
- A funding request for \$260,000 will be submitted to the Truckee River Fund for 2011.

Dr. Huggins stated that the funding requests have not yet been submitted but if all funding is approved, it would provide for the same program as 2010 (five generators operating November through April). Options to the plan would include an aircraft component that would cost an additional \$55,000 and additional ground seeding units, which would bring the additional funding need to about \$125,000 on top of the \$260,000.

Dr. Huggins summarized that as the presentation shows, very successful results have been realized. He reiterated that the basic program cost is about \$260,000, of which he is requesting an amount not to exceed \$100,000 from the Western Regional Water Commission. He welcomed questions from commissioners.

Chairman Erwin thanked Dr. Huggins for his presentation and invited questions or comments.

Commissioner Price asked how successful the Colorado projects have been in comparison to Nevada. Dr. Huggins stated that it is basically an “apples and oranges” comparison; however, in terms of percentage increases in annual snowfall in targeted basins, they are roughly equivalent. He added that Colorado uses a regression analysis of periods of no seeding versus those years when seeding occurred. He stated that Colorado began intermittently seeding in the 1960s and Sierra Nevada began seeding in the late 1950s.

Commissioner Price asked if the silver iodide has any impact on Lake Tahoe and whether that has been analyzed. Dr. Huggins stated that measurements are sampled and there has been no impact on the lake. Commissioner Price asked if the lake water has been sampled. Dr. Huggins stated that testing has been done on Alpine lakes and streams in other areas and the silver iodide has no impact on water clarity or quality because it does not accumulate in the water. He added that much of the silver found in streams or lakes is naturally-occurring.

Commissioner Flansberg stated that the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (“NNWPC”) is being asked to recommend funding in the amount of \$100,000 and asked what other funding options are being explored. Dr. Huggins reiterated that a funding request in the amount of \$260,000 will be submitted to the Truckee River Fund (“TRF”) in their request for proposal (“RFP”) process, which is due out in September. He stated that it is unknown whether the funding will be approved.

Chairman Erwin referred to the graphic of the Snotel sights, which covers an area of approximately 38 square miles. He asked of that area how much of the precipitation is captured. Dr. Huggins stated that the plume is not always the same for each storm. He added that the measurements are taken by sampling for the silver content. Chairman Erwin stated that much of the snowpack proceeds to other areas, such as the Truckee Meadows, Fernley, etc. Dr. Huggins stated that not much of the seeded precipitation accumulation goes beyond the down slope terrain just east of the crest.

Chairman Erwin asked how the measurements are taken. Dr. Huggins explained that one way is by flying instrumented aircraft back and forth through a seeding plume. He added that another way is by randomized programs that have shown certain enhancements in the overall snowpack through a winter.

Mr. Smitherman asked about the progress on decommissioning the sites. Dr. Huggins stated that one site has been decommissioned as required by the U.S. Forest Service. He added that all the other units are still in place so they will not require a lot of effort. He added that the units have been shut down since the past season and repairs are being done to one of the communication systems.

Commissioner Price asked Jeff Tissier, TMWA Chief Financial Officer, about TRF's matching fund requirement. Mr. Tissier reiterated that the TRF did require a match last year although it is confusing because more than one funding option is being sought by DRI. He stated that funding from the WRWC would provide additional funding and matching funds would be requested from DRI. He added that last year there was some confusion over the funding so some changes would be made for the next year.

Chairman Erwin asked from where additional funding would come if it is not approved by the WRWC and TRF. Mr. Tissier stated he is not sure but reiterated that the Advisory Board was established to seek funding from stakeholders. He added that Mr. Bortolin could expand on the membership of the Advisory Board; however, he was happy to report that Andrew Strain, Vice-President of Heavenly Valley – Vail Resorts, recently offered strong support of the program.

John Rhodes, Legal Counsel, asked for clarification of the request to the NNWPC to recommend WRWC funding in an amount not to exceed \$100,000. He asked if that recommendation is made and then the TRF approves \$260,000 in funding, would the \$100,000 be used to augment an enhanced program or would the request be withdrawn. Mr. Tissier stated that the \$260,000 would fund the base program; any additional funding would be used for the enhanced program.

Mr. Bortolin reported that current funding sources include:

- Southern Nevada Water Authority in the amount of \$300,000 for the next year for the Rubies
- A proposal has been made to BOR for funding in the amount of \$1.5 million over five years for the Walker Basin, for which DRI is very optimistic.

Mr. Bortolin referred to the Advisory Board and stated that the group has met twice this year. He stated that the representatives include Dr. Steve Wells, DRI President, Joe Guild, Commissioner John Breternitz, Bruce Moore, SNWA, Ken Spooner, Walker Irrigation District, the Cattlemen's Association of eastern Nevada, Mervin Wright, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Jeff Tissier, and hopefully Andrew Strain, Heavenly Valley. He stated that staff from DRI also participates.

Chairman Erwin thanked the presenters. Commissioner Price asked for clarification of the additional funding for the aircraft component and asked if it would only cover the Tahoe area. Dr. Huggins stated it would not necessarily cover only the Tahoe area, unless it was specified for Tahoe only.

Commissioner DeMartini asked whether the beneficiaries of the generated water have been identified and if they have been approached to provide funding in the future. Dr. Huggins stated that is the reason for meeting with groups such as the NNWPC and WRWC and others, such as the ski areas.

Commissioner Shumaker asked if sufficient funds are available for the project and how much is currently in the Regional Water Management Fund ("RWMF"). Mr. Smitherman stated that \$100,000 was budgeted for the cloud seeding project for this Fiscal Year.

Commissioner Price asked if DRI is actively pursuing other funding options. Mr. Bortolin stated that is

precisely why the ski industry is being targeted for involvement since they benefit from the program. He added that the ski industry sees value in the program and have expressed interest. Commissioner Price asked about others, such as Nevada Division of Wildlife, the U.S. Forest Service, or other benefactors. Mr. Bortolin agreed and reiterated that was the purpose of developing the Advisory Board. He reiterated that the BOR has been approached for funding the Walker basin. He summarized that other benefactors are being asked for funding assistance.

Commissioner Price made a motion to approve a recommendation to the WRWC for approval of an amount not to exceed \$100,000. Commissioner DeMartini seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

6. Review revised Draft Chapters 4, 6 and 8 and presentation of Water Balance Model section of Chapter 6, Policies section of Chapter 1, and Chapter 5 of 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan and possible direction to staff.

Mr. Smitherman reported that Draft Chapters 4, 6 and 8 were distributed to Commissioners for review and comment at the last meeting. He referred to the additions and revisions that were outlined in the staff report and stated that the focus today would be on additions to Chapter 6, including the Regional Water Balance Model that was developed by ECO:LOGIC Engineering. Mr. Smitherman referred to the model, which he added Mr. Enloe would review. He stated that Chapter 8 is partially complete but needs more work on wastewater and reclaimed water issues and alternatives. He stated that the Water Balance Model includes projections for 2030 based on the calibrated Population Consensus Forecast. He added that the same type of model will be presented for the 2010 projections. He turned the presentation on the water balance model over to Mr. Enloe.

Mr. Enloe reported that at the last meeting Chapter 6 was reviewed, which included the water projections and wastewater flow projections for each of the different planning areas. He stated that a number of technical staff from the different agencies have reviewed the 2030 Regional Water Balance diagram and offered comments. He stated that the Water Balance concept was developed about a year and a half ago, which was an outcome of the North Valleys Initiative (“NVI”) process. He explained that the Water Balance examines the different water supply sources, i.e. local groundwater, surface water, local tributary creeks, imported water, etc., and compares the sources to the projected demands based on the Consensus Forecast.

Mr. Enloe stated that based on the projected demands, the model generates estimated wastewater flows. The flows are then compared to the treatment and disposal capacity within each of the five planning areas, which are consistent with the Truckee Meadows Service Area (“TMSA”) boundaries. He explained that some planning areas were lumped together, specifically Sparks and Spanish Springs.

Mr. Enloe reported that the intent of the Water Balance is to identify water supplies, demands, wastewater flows and disposal capacity and to then identify areas where there might be imbalances. He referred to page 13 of the Chapter 6 handout, which explains the assumptions used in the development of the Water Balance. He stated that potential water demands from domestic well conversions (if all the domestic wells within a particular planning area were converted to a municipal system) were included. He added that the same assumptions were analyzed for conversion of septic systems to the municipal system and the resulting wastewater flows.

Mr. Enloe stated that perennial yield estimates in the groundwater basins were updated to be consistent with the Water Baseline.

Mr. Enloe referred to the diagram and pointed out categories, such as “undetermined supply” or “undetermined disposal” if there are imbalances within an area. He explained that the demand

imbalances could be made up between different areas. He stated that the basic conclusion is that from the water resource standpoint, as a region, ample water resources exist to meet the projected demands in 2030. He added that TMWA's Water Resource Plan and population forecast numbers were included.

Mr. Enloe stated that in Cold Springs, Stead / Lemmon Valley and the County-portion of the Spanish Springs portion of the Sparks planning area, there are water supply imbalances associated with the cumulative demands of the domestic wells and municipal water pumping on the resources as compared to the perennial yield of those basins. He provided some examples of imbalances, which he clarified is not an immediate issue but rather a long-term issue.

Mr. Enloe reported that there are options to mitigate the water supply imbalances, such as water from the Fish Springs Water Supply Project being available to Cold Springs over the long-term in order to meet the "wet water" requirements. He referred to the Truckee Meadows planning area and stated those areas do not have a water supply imbalance between TMWA, Washoe County, South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District ("STMGID") and local resources to meet the projected demands; however, there are some localized imbalances within the planning areas (for instance those areas with domestic wells). He reiterated that the problem is not a resource availability issue but an issue of how to address some of the effects of utilizing the resource and who shares in the cost to mitigate the impacts.

Mr. Enloe stated that demands for the wastewater flows and disposal have slowed dramatically since the housing boom a couple of years ago in the North Valleys. He explained that currently the Cold Springs and Reno/Stead planning areas have sufficient disposal capacity to meet the 2030 projected flows. He clarified that in ten years or so, when the flows start increasing, the areas will need to identify alternative disposal options. He stated that the focus is on Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility ("TMWRF") and South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility ("STMWRF"), for which the region has been exploring options. He added that one of those options is for TMWRF to be allowed to release additional effluent to the river provided the water quality objectives are met and the Tribe is agreeable.

Mr. Enloe reported that the constraints for TMWRF are hard to quantify but the big picture number of 32,600 acre-feet includes a number of different limiting factors for discharge to the river. He stated that the 2030 additional capacity required for TMWRF is estimated at 7,700 acre-feet, which could be addressed by a combination of alternatives such as additional flow to the river and/or additional use of reclaimed water for irrigation purposes in Sparks and Reno. He added that the proposed industrial park in the Patrick area is interested in reclaimed water for cooling purposes year-round, which is an option. He stated that another alternative is additional treatment of the wastewater to allow for groundwater recharge.

Mr. Enloe stated that STMWRF is in a similar situation, with a need of approximately 5,700 acre-feet of capacity by 2030. He explained that the assumption is based on the County completing lining Huffaker Reservoir, which is in the current Capital Improvement Project ("CIP") list. He stated that STMWRF currently uses a little over 2,200 acre-feet of reclaimed water. He stated that one option being explored is use of reclaimed water for cooling at the Ormat geothermal facility.

Mr. Enloe summarized that the big issues are some of the imbalances in some of the basins between domestic wells and other well owners and the management that needs to be pursued with respect to reclaimed water utilization from TMWRF and STMWRF. He invited questions or comments.

Commissioner Schumacher referred to the "future" supply needs and asked if that refers to next year or after 2030. Mr. Enloe stated that the demands and flows in this Water Balance are based on the 2030 projections from the population forecast of 590,000. Commissioner Schumacher asked what sources are included in the supply projections for South Truckee Meadows. Mr. Enloe stated that the supply includes

creek exchange and the 2030 projections show that a new surface water treatment plant would not be needed until 2030, which is inline with the recent facility plan projections.

Mr. Smitherman thanked Mr. Enloe for his presentation. He invited questions or comments related to Chapters 6, 4 and 8 and added that the chapters are still open for revisions after the meeting.

Commissioner Price referred to Chapter 4 and the sentence in the groundwater recharge paragraph at the bottom of page one, “However, in many cases, groundwater recharge provides the most efficient and productive use of reclaimed water resources” and the following sentences about higher overall water quality, etc. He suggested including an explanation of these statements, such as references to reports or studies. Mr. Smitherman stated that more information is provided later in the chapter; however, he offered to provide some of that information under the “Summary and Findings”.

Chairman Erwin stated that the only “finding” under the section is the discussion related to the indirect potable reuse. He asked if the summary was copied from another section of Chapter 4. Mr. Enloe stated that Commissioner Price is correct and explained that many of the findings were associated with work done on the North Valleys Initiative NVI project, which explored a number of alternatives for reclaimed water uses. He added that John Ruetten, who was involved in the Southern California Orange County Groundwater Replenishment District and public perception issues, was involved in the NVI process. Mr. Enloe stated that the findings were cut and pasted from a later section of the chapter and agreed that additional background information is warranted. Mr. Smitherman stated that pages 8 through 10 contain the discussion behind the findings, which could be referenced from the summary.

Chairman Erwin reported the finding from the NVI process is that further use of reclaimed water is feasible but still under study and has issues associated with NDEP and public perception. He suggested moving the “Groundwater recharge” paragraph to Section 4.3. Commissioner Price stated that he was agreeable to that suggestion.

Chairman Erwin stated that Chapter 4 is the largest reviewed by the NNWPC yet and covers many topics. He asked if the “Summary and Findings” was extracted from each section of the chapter. Mr. Smitherman stated that was the process and asked if it would make sense to reference the sections from which the findings came. Chairman Erwin stated that he would like to avoid numerous references but suggested “Findings” subheadings, such as “wastewater” followed by a bulleted list of the findings, etc.

Commissioner Price referred to Chapter 6 under the Summary of Findings and suggested adding a statement to the end of the sentence, “...demands from domestic wells and permitted municipal groundwater pumping...exceed the respective perennial yields of each basin.” *“as delineated by the State Engineer for the amount of available water within the basins”*. Mr. Smitherman agreed to add that clarification.

Commissioner Price referred to Section 6.1.3, first sentence, “...for the entire County” and suggested possibly “for all of Washoe County”.

Commissioner DeMartini referred to Chapter 4, page 16 of 52, Section 4.4.3 – Washoe Valley, “At concentrations above 10 mg/L as nitrogen, nitrate becomes a drinking water concern; however...” and suggested wording it “...concentrations as it approaches 10 mg/L become a drinking water concern and at 10 mg/L it is not useable for drinking purposes for domestic supply...” Mr. Smitherman stated that the water is actually useable by a domestic well because the Federal Safe Drinking Water Standards do not apply. Commissioner DeMartini stated that in his mind it is related to any use of the water. Mr. Smitherman stated that the section is pertinent only to Washoe City, which is served by domestic wells

but agreed that the sentence could be revised. Commissioner DeMartini suggested contacting the District Health Department.

Chairman Erwin opened discussion of Chapter 8. Mr. Smitherman reported that the changes to Chapter 8 were to the latter part, specifically to Section 8.7 – Groundwater Resource Development and Impact to Domestic Wells, and Section 8.12 – Groundwater Remediation. He added that additional information is needed for some of the sections.

Commissioner Schumacher referred to page 16 of 21, the bullet, “WCDWR and STMGID have provided for domestic well owners to connect to existing municipal water systems in the South Truckee Meadows” and suggested noting that the process is ongoing. Mr. Smitherman agreed to revise the statement.

Chairman Erwin asked if there is a reason the table of contents are located at the end of the chapters. Mr. Smitherman explained that with all the revisions, it is easier to include it at the end during this stage of the process; however, they will be moved to the beginning for the final document.

Chairman Erwin opened discussion of Chapter 1. Mr. Smitherman stated that this chapter consists of background discussion and Policies, which are organized according to goals and objectives. He stated that the background discussion was revised to bring the chapter current with the creation of the NNWPC and Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”). He reported that the Policies and Criteria were an outcome of the 2002 Settlement Agreement over the Regional Plan, for which the Water Planning Commission was directed to develop. He stated that the Settlement Agreement expired a number of years ago so the “Criteria” section is not required by law.

Chairman Erwin suggested if “Criteria” is removed for any of the policies, it be included in the “Discussion” section, with which Mr. Smitherman agreed. Mr. Smitherman added that if some of the criteria are no longer valid, they could be removed. He stated that the most substantial changes were made to:

- Policy 1.2.a related to conjunctive management of surface water and groundwater to withstand a 9-year drought cycle, which was changed to reflect the recommendation of the Regional Water Planning Commission during the 2005 update to the Water Plan and to be consistent with TMWA’s Water Resource Plan.
- Policy 1.2.b, Water Resource Investigation, was revised to reflect the sustainable water resources in relation to the Consensus Population Forecast.
- Policy 1.2.c, Emergency Water Supply Standard, was revised to be consistent with TMWA’s Water Resource Plan.
- Policy 1.3.c, New Water Resources / Importation, was revised to reflect the sustainable water resources in relation to the Consensus Population Forecast.
- Policy 3.1.h, Adoption of Storm Water Drainage Guidelines, was revised to include that the updated *Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual* was adopted by Reno, Sparks and Washoe County Public Works departments and are being used in addition to development codes.

Mr. Smitherman reported that some policies need further review and revision, particularly those related to regional floodplain management, floodplain storage within and outside the Truckee River watershed, and Truckee River restoration. He stated that as progress is made on Chapter 5 – Flood Management and Stormwater Drainage, those policy updates will be made.

Chairman Erwin referred to Policy 1.1.e on Water Meters and asked if there was supposed to be information. Mr. Smitherman stated that the language should be there and he will make the revision.

Commissioner Schumacher stated that the outside reader most likely will not understand the acronyms used in the Water Plan. Mr. Smitherman stated that the first time a name appears in a chapter with the acronym, it will be noted. He added that the Introduction would also include a glossary of acronyms.

Mr. Rhodes asked commissioners for their preference for the name of the plan, i.e. Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Water Plan, Regional Water Plan, etc. Commissioner Ball suggested that his preference is, "Regional Water Plan". Chairman Erwin suggested, "2010-2030 Regional Water Plan" ("2030 RWP"), sic "2011 Regional Water Plan" ("2011 RWP"). Mr. Smitherman stated that is a good suggestion.

Chairman Erwin opened discussion of Chapter 5. Mr. Smitherman stated that Chapter 5 was almost a complete rewrite of the previous chapter because so much has changed since the 2005 update. He stated he is pleased with the progress on the chapter and input from Truckee River Flood Project Director Naomi Duerr and staff.

Mr. Smitherman stated that Sections 5.1 and 5.2 provide a brief history of flooding in the planning area. He briefly reviewed the subsequent sections of the chapter, which he stated need further work and clarification of some comments and numbers. He invited questions or comments.

Commissioner Ball referred to references to rehab or redevelopment of the ecosystems along certain segments of the lower Truckee River and asked if cost estimates for the projects would be included. He suggested that users of the Water Plan would most likely desire an estimated cost and schedule for the proposed improvements. Mr. Smitherman stated that the Flood Project had a very detailed cost analysis performed and that work with ECO:LOGIC will include those costs in the Financial Analysis chapter. He offered to request a tentative schedule from Ms. Duerr. He added that the rule of thumb cost for the type of restoration performed at McCarran Ranch was approximately \$1 million per mile.

Commissioner Seidel suggested adding discussion of the "Local Project" rather than the federal project, at a reduced price of \$525 million as opposed to \$1.6 billion. He added that he has not had an opportunity to review the chapter. Mr. Smitherman stated that there is a placeholder for such discussion.

Chairman Erwin asked about the relationship between the Flood Project planning and the Water Plan. Mr. Rhodes explained that the Flood Chapter is one component of the Water Plan required by statute.

Commissioner Price asked for legal clarification of a suggested motion for this agenda item. Mr. Rhodes stated that a number of edit suggestions have been made today with no apparent objection; therefore, an appropriate motion would be to direct staff to edit the document as requested by Commissioners. He clarified that such a motion does not constitute final approval of the chapters.

Commissioner Price commended staff's work to date, with the exception of Chapter 5, which he feels is incomplete.

Commissioner Price made a motion that staff incorporate the edits from commissioners today and that the NNWPC have the opportunity to see the chapters on a future agenda. Commissioner Schumacher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Smitherman stated that at the last meeting, discussion was held regarding additional work that may be needed to complete the Water Plan update. He stated that ECO:LOGIC Engineering has a current contract for technical assistance. He added that he requested some back-up tables to explain the data behind the Water Balance Model by planning areas. He stated that he could also use ECO:LOGIC's assistance in developing the issues associated with wastewater and reclaimed water in Chapter 8 and the

related policies. He stated that once the issues are developed, they need to be compiled into a prioritized list that will be used to develop the work plan for future years. He added that development of the Executive Summary would be much easier with technical assistance. He summarized that he would like to bring forth a recommendation for an amendment to the existing agreement to close out the scope of work prior to November.

Chairman Erwin asked if the current contract is out of money. Mr. Smitherman stated no; however, the remaining budget is committed to the Financial Analysis chapter. Chairman Erwin stated he has no problem with the request but expressed his concern over the timing. Commissioner Ball asked if monthly meetings would be sufficient for completion of the update by the deadline and stated he does not believe it is. Commissioner Price asked if the additional amount requested would be greater than Mr. Smitherman's signing authority. Mr. Smitherman stated it is not; however, since there is an existing agreement for \$49,000, he cannot sign an amendment to it. He summarized that the cost would be in the \$15,000 range.

Commissioner Price agreed that the timing issue is significant and asked if there was any way to approach a recommendation today. Mr. Rhodes asked if there was another way to approach the amount under another area of the existing budget that has been approved by the Commission. Mr. Rhodes offered to review the options with Mr. Smitherman.

Commissioner Price made a motion to bring the issue back to the next meeting, as well as to direct Mr. Smitherman to authorize funding under a different approach if possible. Commissioner DeMartini seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

7. 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 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 Financial Report on the Regional Water Management Fund was provided in the agenda packets.

c. Informational report on the third and final 2010 meeting of the Legislative Committee to Oversee the Western Regional Water Commission

Mr. Smitherman reported that the agenda was fairly light and the work session included two items, one a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill ("AB") 54 to allow the creation of a revolving fund to assist residents with financing the connection fees for septic systems and domestic wells to the municipal sewer or water system. He stated that the other item was related to an amendment to the State Bond Law to allow for refinancing of existing debt using the County Bond Bank. He summarized that both items were approved.

Mr. Smitherman reported that Rosemary Menard provided a brief status update on the Truckee Meadows Water Authority/Department of Water Resources ("TMWA/DWR") consolidation efforts, as well as activities of the NNWPC and WRWC. He added that Ms. Duerr also provided an update on the Flood Project.

Mr. Smitherman reported that a Flood Project update was not included in the agenda packet; however, he reviewed the last Flood Project Coordinating Committee (“FPCC”) minutes. Flood Project staff is working on a cooperative agreement to form a Joint Powers Authority (“JPA”) to oversee the Flood Project. The Flood Project is also moving forward with their Home Elevation Financial Assistance program. Discussion is also ongoing with the City of Reno regarding the Virginia Street Bridge.

Mr. Smitherman invited questions or comments.

8. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding agenda items for the October 2010, Commission meeting and future meetings.

Mr. Smitherman stated that agenda items for the meeting include:

- Continue to review Draft Chapters 4 and 5 and any outstanding issues for Chapters 8 or 1. Chapter 9 – Financial Analysis and Chapter 10 – Work Plan and Priorities and the remainder of Chapter 1, the Introduction, will be presented.
- At the November meeting, changes suggested at the October meeting (Chapters 1, 9 and 10) will be reviewed. He stated at that point the other chapters should be near completion although they are open for revision until the final meeting for review.
- 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

Mr. Smitherman referred to Commissioner Ball’s suggestion and requested that Commissioners check their schedule for possible meetings on October 20 and November 17. He summarized that upcoming meeting dates are:

- October 6
- Potentially – October 20
- November 3
- Potentially November 17

He reported that the Public Hearing Notice needs to be published on November 19, 2010 to notice the date of the December 1, 2010 NNWPC public hearing. He stated that once a recommendation is made on December 1, 2010, it will set the course for adoption by the WRWC. The draft Water Plan will be delivered to the Washoe County Clerk’s office for a 30-day public review period. A public hearing for adoption will then be scheduled for the WRWC on January 14, 2011, which satisfies the deadline for the Plan update. He added that an open house would also be scheduled for public review and comment.

Chairman Erwin asked when the next WRWC meeting will be held following the NNWPC public hearing. Mr. Smitherman reported that the next regularly scheduled meeting for the WRWC would be December 10, 2010.

Mr. Smitherman stated that he believes the meeting schedule will allow sufficient time for completion and added that the entities are working on the missing sections and feels that the process is moving along satisfactorily.

Chairman Erwin suggested that staff check the availability of the meeting locations for the potential extra meetings. Commissioner Ball noted that on October 6, the AWWA and APWA are both holding

conferences. June Davis agreed to poll Commissioners as to their availability for the upcoming meeting schedule.

Chairman Erwin reiterated the above comments and made a motion to direct staff as discussed. Commissioner Seidel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Smitherman reported that he contacted Ron Penrose, TMWA, who agreed to provide an update on the Glendale Diversion project at the next meeting. Chairman Erwin suggested postponing the update until after completion of the Water Plan update. Mr. Smitherman stated that one possibility would be a field trip to the site.

9. Commission Comments.

None

10. Staff Comments.

Mr. Smitherman reported that Peggy Bowker passed away recently.

11. Public Comments.

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

12. Adjournment.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Niki Linn, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on _____ 2010.

John Erwin, Chairman