

**NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, August 4, 2010**

The regular meeting of the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (“NNWPC”) was held on Wednesday, August 4, 2010 in the Reno City Council Chambers, One East First 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 (arrived at 1:33 p.m.)  
John Flansberg (arrived at 1:40 p.m.)  
Mickey Hazelwood  
John Jackson  
Rosemary Menard  
Darrin Price  
Stan Shumaker  
Wayne Seidel

Voting Members Absent:

Non-Voting Members Present:

John Bird  
Harry Fahnestock  
Kelvin Hickenbottom  
Jon Palm

Non-Voting Members Absent:

Mark Clarkson

Staff Members Present:

Jim Smitherman  
Chris Wessel  
June Davis  
John Rhodes, Legal Counsel

**2. Approval of the agenda.**

Commissioner Seidel made a motion to approve the August 4, 2010 NNWPC agenda as posted. Commissioner Menard seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**3. Approval of the minutes from the June 2, 2010 meeting.**

The minutes of the June 2, 2010 NNWPC meeting were submitted for approval. Commissioner Seidel made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Ball seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**4. Public Comments.**

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

**5. Status report on development of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, including timeline and contractual services, and possible direction to staff.**

Mr. Smitherman referred to the staff report, which included the proposed schedule for completion of the Water Plan Update. He reported that comments are expected from the NNWPC on Draft Chapters 4, 6 and 8 in August. He stated that staff also expects to deliver recommendations for the policies by the end of August. He added that the draft Chapter 5 - Flood Control / Drainage Chapter will be delivered by the end of August.

Mr. Smitherman stated that at the September NNWPC meeting, changes suggested at today's meeting would be incorporated into Chapters 4, 6 and 8 and provided for further review. He added that in September staff would be working on Draft Chapters 9, 10 and 1 with delivery to the NNWPC by the end of September.

Mr. Smitherman reported that the October meeting it is expected they will review changes or edits to Chapter 5. He added by that time, Chapters 2, 3, 7 and 8 should be final. He stated that Chapters 9, 10 and 1 would be reviewed at the October meeting.

Mr. Smitherman stated that by the November meeting, it is expected that all the Chapters should be final and ready to for the Public Hearing (The Notice of Public Hearing is expected to be published November 19, 2010). The Public Hearing will be scheduled for December, with the Water Plan provided to the County Clerk's office by December 14, 2010.

Chairman Erwin asked for clarification of the milestone dates, which are scheduled at 30-day intervals. He called for questions or comments.

Commissioner DeMartini mentioned that the schedule is very tight and asked for clarification of the due date of January 2011 for the Plan Update. He stated that an update was recently performed and asked if that update would satisfy the legislative requirement for the 2011 Plan Update. Mr. Rhodes stated he did not believe it would and clarified that the last update was a partial update, which is not what is required by Statute.

Chairman Erwin asked John Enloe, ECO:LOGIC Engineering, if as the consultant for the Plan Update, he believed the update could be accomplished in this timeframe. Mr. Enloe stated that the timeline is doable.

**6. Review and discussion of revised draft Chapters 2, 3 and 7 and presentation of draft Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 8 of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan and possible direction to staff.**

Mr. Smitherman reported that Draft Chapters 2, 3 and 7 were distributed to Commissioners for review and comment. Those comments were incorporated into the latest draft versions. He briefly reviewed the edits as follows:

Chapter 2 – Water Resources

- A summary of findings has been added.
- Section 2.2.1 now reflects that Boca Dam is the main control facility regulating flow to the Truckee River from Independence, Prosser, Stampede and Boca Reservoirs.
- Section 2.2.3.1 has been updated to show current status of State Engineer hearings and decisions.

Commissioner DeMartini stated that in regard to water supply, some of the numbers appear to be optimistic (50,000 acre-feet available). He stated that we could find that we have less water due to climate change, increased growth or other factors. Mr. Smitherman stated that the numbers were developed based on the perennial yield estimates and water rights availability. He clarified that the

numbers were not constrained based on speculation because the Plan focuses on the “big picture” inventory. He added that other studies have focused on quantification of types of water use and where it could occur; however, the Plan does not get into that level of detail.

Commissioner DeMartini questioned if every five years, the Plan would be reviewed and updated as appropriate. Mr. Smitherman stated that is correct and added that every two years, the Regional Planning Commission will be updating the Consensus Population Forecast and we will be doing a comparison of available water resources in relation to the Consensus Forecast.

Commissioner Menard reiterated Mr. Smitherman’s comments that based on Washoe County Ballot Question 3 (“WC-3”), the availability of water rights for the updated Consensus Forecast would be updated every two years.

Chairman Erwin reminded members that the chapters would still be available for further review and comment to staff.

Chairman Erwin referred to page 11 of 30, fourth bullet and suggested that the first sentence be changed to read, “Change petitions (filed 2004) were heard in July 2010; with a ruling expected by late 2010 / early 2011 by the California State Water Resources Control Board to change the water rights for Boca, Prosser Creek and Stampede Reservoirs, and for Independence Lake.”

#### Chapter 3 – Water Purveyors and Other Water Providers

- Sections on purpose and scope, summary of findings and an introduction have been added.
- Section 3.1 has been revised to include only Public Purveyors. Other providers of water are discussed in Section 3.2.
- Section 3.1.1 now summarizes the approximate yearly percentage of Truckee River water diverted by TMWA in normal and drought years, and includes a paragraph on the Mogul by-pass pipeline.
- Section 3.1.5.2 is a new section on STMGID’s assessment of alternatives with respect to the public purveyor consolidation analysis required to be in the RWMP.

Chairman Erwin invited questions or comments related to Chapter 3. Commissioner Shumaker stated that he had provided comments and updates to staff; however, it is not necessary to review them at this meeting.

#### Chapter 7 – Water Conservation Plan-Efficient Use of Water

- The summary of findings and other sections as appropriate show that TMWA has succeeded in its meter retrofit program and has implemented 3-day-a-week watering.
- Table 7-2 shows that SVGID continued the toilet retrofit program until 2009.
- Section 7.4.1 now has a paragraph on the National Energy Policy Act.
- Section 7.4.2 now includes updated paragraphs on local plumbing code changes and local landscape codes. Old versions of these paragraphs have been moved from Section 7.5.7.
- Section 7.6 now has a section on gray water systems.

Chairman Erwin called for questions or comments related to Chapter 7.

Harry Fahnestock, representing the Nevada Landscape Association (“NLA”) as a non-voting NNWPC member, referred to Table 7-1 (Base Case Conservation), Drought Measures. He stated that the NLA is not hugely concerned; however, they requested changing or deleting the references to “once a week lawn watering” and “prohibit planting of new lawns”. He explained that years ago “once a week watering”

resulted in significant damage to landscapes (both public and private). He added that the most significant damage occurred to mature trees and shrubs.

Mr. Fahnestock stated that TMWA's 2010-2030 Water Resource Plan includes new drought standards. He reiterated that he would like to see the items removed or altered.

Commissioner DeMartini mentioned that several decades ago during a drought, the Bay Area enacted a ban on all lawn watering, which resulted in a complete loss of landscaping. Mr. Fahnestock added that it also contributed to the disastrous Oakland fire. Commissioner DeMartini asked if removing the comment related to "once a week" could result in such a ban. Mr. Fahnestock stated that the local councils, commissions, NNWPC and WRWC would be the entities that would make such decisions. John Rhodes, Legal Counsel, agreed and reiterated it would be up to the entities to enact ordinance or code changes. Mr. Fahnestock stated he understands that issue; however, he still suggested softening the language based on public perception.

**Chairman Erwin thanked Mr. Fahnestock for his comments and suggested possibly replacing the language with, "Increased restrictions on landscape irrigation and/or installation of lawns". Commissioner Ball made a motion to accept Chairman Erwin's suggestion. Commissioner DeMartini seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

Mr. Smitherman stated that in addition to draft Chapters 2, 3 and 7, staff distributed by e-mail to Commissioners for review, Draft Chapters 4, 6 and 8 of the 2011 Water Plan on July 26. Some sections of these draft chapters are under development. Sections completed for review are summarized below.

#### Chapter 4 – Wastewater and Watershed-based Water Quality Planning

Mr. Smitherman reviewed the staff report and stated that this chapter consists of 2 parts. Sections 4.1 through 4.5 cover wastewater service providers and facility planning, and Sections 4.6 through 4.10 focus on watershed management planning and programs, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") storm water permit program. He reported that ECO:LOGIC Engineering was hired to assist with the section on service providers and facility planning. He added that staff from City of Reno (Terri Svetich and Lynell Garfield) provided most of the text for Sections 4.6 through 4.10. He added that some sections of the watershed management portion of this chapter are still being developed, as noted in the text. He asked John Enloe to provide an overview of Chapter 4 through Section 4.5

Mr. Enloe provided briefly reviewed the following sections:

- Sections 4.1 and 4.2 describe wastewater service providers and water reclamation facilities, respectively. Mr. Enloe stated that these sections basically provide a "current state of affairs" for each of the facilities.
- Section 4.3 discusses regional wastewater facility planning efforts, including the 2007 City of Reno and Washoe County Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) / Future Service Area (FSA) Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan by ECO:LOGIC, the 2008 City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan by Stantec, and the collaborative wastewater planning initiative for the North Valleys ("North Valleys Initiative"). This section also includes a description of Reno's advanced treatment pilot study.

Mr. Enloe stated that one outcome of the Facility Planning effort was an understanding of some of the potential future imbalances in water supply, wastewater treatment and disposal capacity. Based on the need to plan for the imbalances, a group was formed as the "North Valleys Initiative" or "NVI".

He added that staff from all the representative agencies were included in the group, which was supported by ECO:LOGIC.

Mr. Enloe reported that the NVI examined Stead, Lemmon Valley, and Cold Springs as a “test case” to examine cooperative regional planning efforts for wastewater treatment and disposal issues for areas identified as needing additional disposal capacity. He added that over the years, this Commission has performed numerous studies of alternatives to address the issues in the North Valleys.

Mr. Enloe stated that the NVI focused on different alternatives for new or expanded use of the reclaimed water resource. He reported that the effort focused primarily on residential landscape irrigation (front and/or back yard irrigation) and a high level of treatment that would allow for groundwater recharge of the treated effluent.

Mr. Enloe reported that numerous meetings were held along with fieldtrips to California, and meetings with the regulatory entities to discuss the residential landscape irrigation concept. He stated that one of the findings is that it is a feasible alternative; however, the regulatory, monitoring, enforcement and inspection components would be very intensive.

Mr. Enloe stated that a parallel process was examined in coordination with City of Reno to pilot test an alternative treatment technology that will allow for direct recharge of highly purified effluent into the groundwater table. He added that a number of other states (including California and Arizona) are currently using the technology with reverse osmosis and high energy ultraviolet disinfection.

Mr. Enloe reported that the technology provides a very high level of treatment; however, there are associated issues, such as what to do with the concentrated waste stream. He added that in California there is the option of ocean discharge.

Mr. Enloe stated that ECO:LOGIC continues to work with the City of Reno to develop an alternative treatment approach using filtration, ozone and biological activated carbon (“BAC”), which biodegrades or absorbs much of the remaining contaminants. Mr. Enloe summarized that after two years and about a million dollars in pilot testing and lab results, it has been clearly demonstrated that the technology is highly effective in treating wastewater at a lower capital cost and lower energy cost without producing the waste stream. He added that a draft report is being finalized for City of Reno and will be provided in the next few weeks. He stated that Washoe County might continue the effort, with a possible small scale recharge project to demonstrate the feasibility of the technology.

Mr. Enloe reported that the coordinated effort focused on three alternatives:

1. Provide water, which is used once, treated and disposed
2. Expanded use of reclaimed water to augment potable water supplies in the future, reducing potable water demand for irrigation purposes
3. High level of treatment for groundwater recharge

Mr. Enloe stated that the “Cost of Service Evaluation” for the three scenarios included the total costs. He added that the conclusion was that the cost would be about the same for each of the alternatives; however, the realization was that if the same amount of money is to be spent to treat the water, the best use of the reclaimed water should be pursued. He added that Jon Palm, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (“NDEP”) was present to answer questions. He explained that NDEP’s regulations currently do not allow for residential irrigation with reclaimed water because of the difficulty to regulate, enforce and inspect individual systems. He added that NDEP would probably

be more receptive to the groundwater recharge concept because it could be monitored at the treatment plant.

Mr. Enloe clarified that the alternative does not have to be one or the other. He added that Sparks has a huge investment in their reclaimed water system; however, some areas have different irrigation demands to support such a project.

Mr. Enloe referred to some of the other Regional Wastewater Facility Planning opportunities, such as “Interconnection of Reno-Stead Water Reclamation Facility (“RSWRF”) to Spanish Springs Valley”, “Interconnection of TMWRF to South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (“STMWRF”)”, and others.

- Section 4.4 describes wastewater planning in the lower Truckee River Canyon, Warm Springs Valley, Washoe Valley, unincorporated parts of Spanish Springs Valley, and portions of Lemmon Valley not served by community sewers.

Mr. Enloe referred to the “Mustang and Patrick / Tracy Areas” and stated that many are aware of the proposed industrial park on the Washoe County side of Patrick. He added that the land owner and developer are in the process of trying to obtain approvals, one for year-round use of reclaimed water for cooling purposes for an onsite power generation facility. He stated that the project could provide economic benefits to the community.

Commissioner Ball mentioned that years ago, Irvine Ranch in California began using reclaimed water for residential use and asked if that is still occurring. Mr. Enloe stated yes and added that a fieldtrip with the NVI group was taken to Serrano Development in the Folsom area that has been successfully using reclaimed water for residential front and back yard irrigation for the last ten years. He added that there were initial problems; however, they have been overcome and therefore, El Dorado Irrigation District was able to meet some critical water resource obligations.

Commissioner Ball referred to the use of reclaimed water for cooling and mentioned the Ormat Geothermal plant, which recently set up an experimental project to cool their chambers, possibly using wastewater from a freeway construction project nearby. Mr. Enloe added that City of Sparks is well-suited for high-technology industries; however, the high cost of power is prohibitive.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher referred to the Cold Springs facility using basins and asked if they are onsite. Mr. Enloe stated that Cold Springs does use onsite rapid infiltration basins (“RIBs”). Vice-Chairman Schumacher asked how soon Cold Springs would be able to use reclaimed water for common areas. Mr. Enloe stated he does not think the County has any plans to provide irrigation water to Cold Springs and added that the RIBs would probably be suitable for the next ten to twenty years. He added that the treatment facility is running at about .35 million gallons per day (“MGD”) and is permitted for .7 MGD.

Chairman Erwin referred to page 10 of 42, “Findings”, which are very generic, and asked if the cost analyses would be blended into the Chapter 9 financial section so there is a scenario path or if it is limited to the North Valleys facility. Mr. Smitherman stated that the scope of work with ECO:LOGIC is fairly general to perform the financial analysis; however, the NNWPC can direct inclusion of various scenarios. He offered to discuss the issue with Mr. Enloe regarding such options. Chairman Erwin stated he is not advocating more work; however, he is questioning the narrative for North Valleys, which includes all the options for dealing with wastewater disposal. Mr. Smitherman stated that in the past a more linear approach with one set of options has been included in the probable cost estimates.

Mr. Enloe stated that in the Findings section, there was a reference to the total cost of service being roughly equal between the three options that was inadvertently removed. He offered to add similar language to the section.

- Section 4.5 covers septic systems.
- Section 4.6 begins with definitions for point source and non-point source pollution and discusses some provisions of the federal Clean Water Act. It goes on to discuss Truckee River water quality issues, including water quality standards and Total Maximum Daily Loads (“TMDLs”).
- Section 4.7 is on river and stream restoration efforts on the Truckee River and some tributary creeks, and includes results of tributary creek assessments.
- Section 4.8 covers special projects including Chalk Creek and Alum Creek water quality projects.
- Section 4.9 is on the Truckee Meadows Regional Storm Water Quality Management Program. Most of this section is under development.
- Section 4.10, also under development, covers land use planning and other programs, including public outreach programs.

Mr. Smitherman briefly reviewed Sections 4.6 through 4.10. He referred to the section on the “Truckee River Coordinated Monitoring Program”, and explained the program was in response to the legislature’s Senate Concurrent Resolution (“SCR”)-2. He added that the Truckee River Information Gateway (“TRIG”) is associated to that issue, and provides a regional information access website.

Mr. Smitherman stated that the section on the Lower Truckee River Restoration and other restoration efforts would also be included in Chapter 5 related to flood control and stormwater.

Mr. Smitherman referred to the updated Tables 4-3 through 4-5, which are the latest watershed assessments for the tributaries to the Truckee River. He welcomed questions or comments.

Commissioner Ball referred to Section 4.5 – Septic Systems and stated as he recalled there was a report completed by Department of Water Resources and asked if it would be incorporated into the section. Mr. Wessel stated that the report would be referenced in the Plan Update and would also be available online.

Chairman Erwin referred to page 16 of 42 and asked if the section “The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality” and its LaPine project and asked if it is needed in the Water Plan. Mr. Smitherman stated that it was included in a previous update based on its similarity to a proposed regional project at the time of the update; however, he agreed that it could probably be deleted at this point.

#### Chapter 6 - Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow

- Section 6.1 of this chapter describes the draft Washoe County Consensus Population Forecast for 2030 and explains its use as the basis for estimating future needs of the planning area. The section also describes the results of the comparison between the draft Consensus Forecast and sustainable water resources completed earlier this year.
- Section 6.2 provides more detailed projections of future water demands, including peak day capacity requirements and wastewater treatment plant capacity needs to estimate future infrastructure requirements and costs. In contrast to the County-wide comparison described in Section 6.1, analyses in Section 6.2 use service areas and a calibrated Consensus Forecast to generate water demand estimates, peak day demand estimates and wastewater flow estimates for 2030.

- Section 6.3, under development, will present a water balance model for the service areas used in Section 6.2.

Mr. Smitherman reported that ECO:LOGIC is performing work on Chapter 6 in conjunction with Shawn Stoddard from TMWA. He invited Mr. Enloe to review the chapter.

Mr. Enloe referred to Section 6.2 “Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow for Service Areas” and stated that this effort was different from those undertaken in the past. He explained that the TMSA Facility Plan was mostly based on land use and buildout population projections to 2030. He stated that the current work is being done based on the Regional Planning Commission’s 2030 Consensus Forecast Population projections. He commended TMWA for their work on their recently updated Water Resource Plan, which included projections based on new dwelling units and commercial buildings, which had not been previously used for wastewater flow projections.

Mr. Enloe reported that Mr. Stoddard took the data projections from the TMWA Water Resource Plan and disaggregated it into planning areas consistent with the TMSA planning areas. He added that the planning areas are essentially consistent with the wastewater service areas for TMWRF, STMWRF, RSWRF, etc. He stated the planning areas were broken into seven areas. He added that previous data was based on traffic analysis zones (“TAZ”). He stated the new planning areas are a good step forward in being able to more specifically project water and wastewater needs.

Mr. Enloe stated that Mr. Stoddard ran the methodology used by TMWA based on the updated geographic information system (“GIS”) boundaries to develop water demands for each planning area for 2010 to 2030. He referred to Table 6-1 “Water Demand Summary”, which shows the 2010 and 2030 water demand projections by planning area. He stated that Table 6-2 “2010 Average & Maximum Day Potable Water Consumption” included peaking factors used by TMWA and Washoe County to project the maximum day demand (“MDD”) for each of the planning areas.

Mr. Enloe reported that for TMWA the MDD was projected at approximately 126 MGD and asked Chairman Erwin if he had the actual number. Chairman Erwin stated that for the summer the MDD has been approximately 123.5 MGD. Mr. Enloe stated that from a very high-level planning methodology, they were very happy with the results. He added that the same methodology was applied to the 2030 demand factors to determine the MDD for 2030, which will then be used in the financial analysis for facility requirements.

Mr. Enloe referred to the section on wastewater flow projections and commended staff from the entities for their efforts. He stated that working together, a demand factor was developed that was appropriate for commercial/industrial properties on a per service basis. He added that the flow per service account is estimated to be 1,500 gallons per day (“GPD”) as a planning number to project wastewater flows.

Mr. Enloe reported that using the equivalent residential unit (“ERU”) demand factors for the different areas ranged from 205 GPD to 262 GPD per ERU, along with the 1,500 GPD for commercial/industrial. Table 6-4 “2010 Projected Water Demand and Wastewater Generation Summary” was developed. He explained how the numbers were cross-checked for accuracy. He added that the 2010 projections overestimate the wastewater flows at some of the treatment facilities by a moderate amount due to factors such as building vacancies. He reported that Table 6-5 includes the same information as Table 6-4; however the projections are for the year 2030.

Mr. Enloe summarized that the water demands and wastewater flows were incorporated into a Water Balance Model, which is currently under development. He explained that it will be a schematic representation of the region that shows the different planning areas, existing water demands and



wastewater flows and disposal based on existing conditions and future conditions for 2030. He summarized that based on the water balance model, areas can be identified that might be deficient in water supply and disposal capacity. He added that entity staffs are currently reviewing the model with comments due and a meeting scheduled for next week. He welcomed questions or comments.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher referred to WC-3 and stated that the water demands are shown but asked where the supply is shown. Mr. Enloe stated it would be presented in the Water Balance Model, which identifies the supply sources. He added that for the South Truckee Meadows the sources are local groundwater, creek water, and TMWA wholesale water.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher referred to the planning areas, specifically “Truckee Meadows” and asked what area that includes. Mr. Enloe stated that is a good point and offered to provide a map that shows the planning areas by name, i.e. “Spanish Springs” refers to the Washoe County portion of Spanish Springs.

Chairman Erwin referred to page 2 of 11, Section 6.1.2 – “Water Resources” and asked if it is necessary in this chapter since it is covered under the Water Resource chapter. He next referred to Section 6.1.4 – Conclusions and the reference to “TMWA has over 142,900 acre feet...”. He stated that the number in Table 6-1 is 116,400 and suggested adding a brief explanation of why the numbers are different. He next referred to the phrase, “approximately 183,200 acre feet per year” and asked if that number is simply a mathematical example. Mr. Enloe stated that is correct and offered to provide an explanation.

Chairman Erwin referred to page 9 of 11, Table 6-4 and the Total “Estimated Flow to Each Wastewater Treatment Facility (MGD)” and the number of 29.07 for TMWRF. He asked Commissioner Shumaker how accurate that number is. Commissioner Shumaker stated that the number is actually 27.5 and he is comfortable with the projection for this exercise.

Chairman Erwin thanked Mr. Enloe for his presentation and explanation.

## Chapter 8 - Issues Identification and Proposed Alternatives

Mr. Smitherman reported that this chapter discusses issues and problems identified in preceding chapters, identifies linkages with other subjects of the Plan, describes actions taken to address the issues or problems and identifies future actions and recommendations as appropriate. The topics covered so far in this chapter pertain generally to the subjects of Chapters 2, 3 and 7. Additional subjects will be added as more chapters are completed and reviewed.

Mr. Smitherman briefly reviewed the sections. He reported that Section 8.1.1 – Central Truckee Meadows Municipal Water Resources, was taken directly from TWMA’s Water Resource Plan. He briefly reviewed the “Recommendations”, which he stated will likely show up in the Plan Update as policy statements, which will be provided for review at the next NNWPC meeting.

Mr. Smitherman referred to Section 8.1.2 – South Truckee Meadows and stated that the section was developed based on the recent update of the South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan. He stated that the next update was Section 8.1.3 – Stead / Lemmon Valley, which was taken from the latest update of the North Valleys Facility Plan. Section 8.1.4 – Cold Springs was developed based on information from the City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Facility Plan. He added that it needs some review and editing. Section 8.1.5 – Spanish Springs was updated based on the TMSA Facility Plan. He briefly reviewed some of the new information.

Chairman Erwin referred to the bullets on page 8 of 15 and stated some of the references date back to 1996. He asked if the historical information should be kept in the Plan or only an explanation of what has

changed since the last Plan. Mr. Smitherman stated that the Chapter could be shortened by only including the incremental changes but asked about the importance of preserving the history. Commissioner Price suggested preserving the historical with a comparison of the incremental changes that have occurred.

Mr. Smitherman stated that updates were also made to the sections on the Lower Truckee River, Washoe Valley, Reliability of Water Service in Response to Contamination Event on Truckee River or Tributaries, and Water Conservation. He reported that additional work is needed as noted in the Chapter. He stated that he hopes to bring the "to be developed" sections to the next meeting. Chairman Erwin stated there are a number of items "to be developed" and requested that they be distributed with ample time for review prior to the meeting. Mr. Smitherman stated he would do his best. He commended staff from the other entities for being responsive in providing information and input.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher referred to Commissioner Price's comment and agreed that it is important to preserve the history.

#### **7. Informational report on the second 2010 meeting of the Legislative Committee to Oversee the Western Regional Water Commission.**

Mr. Wessel referred to the staff report, which outlines the seven topics of discussion at the meeting, which was held on July 15, 2010. The topics covered include:

##### **Review of June 17, 2010, Nevada Supreme Court Opinion in Great Basin Water Network v. State Engineer, 126 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 2. Presenter: Kevin C. Powers, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legislative Counsel Bureau.**

The presentation summarized the holding in the above Opinion, wherein the Court concluded that the State Engineer violated his statutory duty under NRS 533.370, by ruling on certain Applications filed by the Southern Nevada Water Authority ("SNWA") in 1989 in Spring Valley, Cave Valley, Dry Lake Valley, and Delamar Valley, well beyond the one year limitation set forth in the statute as it existed at the time of filing. The Court further concluded that the proper remedy is for the State Engineer to re-notice the Applications and reopen the protest period. In response to the Opinion, the State Engineer issued an interpretation, posted on the website at <http://water.nv.gov>, stating which pending applications will be subject to republication.

##### **Update on Proposed Consolidation of Washoe County Division of Water Resources (DWR) and Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA). Presenters: Rosemary Menard, Director, DWR and Mark Foree, General Manager, TMWA.**

Ms. Menard gave a PowerPoint presentation on the status of the TMWA / DWR Integration/Consolidation (copies distributed in NNWPC agenda packets and discussed under the next agenda item).

##### **Presentation Regarding WRWC Staff Review of Consensus Population Forecast to Determine Adequacy of Identified Water Resources to Meet Anticipated 2030 Population: Presenter - Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager, WRWC**

The presentation on the identified sustainable resources to meet the projected Consensus Population Forecast included the information previously presented to the NNWPC. The Truckee Meadows Regional Plan was amended to accommodate provisions of the voter initiated Washoe County Question 3 to require local government land use plans to be based upon, and in balance with, identified sustainable water resources available in Washoe County.

##### **Presentation on Collection and Use of Water Quality Monitoring Data in Truckee Meadows Relating to Planning, Decision-Support, Regulatory Compliance, and Other Relevant Activities. Presenters: John Buzzone, Senior Licensed Engineer, DWR; Terri Svetich, P.E., Engineering Manager,**

*City of Reno; Birgit Widegren, Branch Supervisor for Non-Point Source, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Water Quality Planning.*

A presentation summarizing the development of a coordinated Monitoring program for the Truckee River Watershed was provided by representatives of the key stake holders. A Memorandum of Understanding for the Development of a Truckee River Coordinated Monitoring Program was agreed to amongst the various stake holders. The City of Reno submitted a proposal for a 319(h) Grant and was awarded the amount of \$65,000 for the development of the program.

**Discussion of Drinking Water Quality Issues in the Truckee Meadows Focusing on Constituents in Water Not Regulated Under Federal Law. Presenters: Paul Miller, Manager, Water Operations & Quality, TMWA**

The presentation covered two topics which are summarized as follows:

1) Constituents Not Regulated Under the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (“SDWA”) – Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products (“PPCP’s”). The key message of this presentation is that the PPCP’s are not currently listed on the Contaminant Candidate List developed every five years by the Environmental Protection Agency nor are they currently regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

2) TMWA Under Attack From The Environmental Working Group (“EWG”). This presentation was a discussion of the status of TMWA’s follow up concerning EWG’s incorrect allegations that TMWA water quality was low.

**Status of Implementation of Provisions of Assembly Bill 54 (Chapter 325, Statutes of Nevada 2009)**

**A. Financing Certain Costs Associated With Conversion From Domestic Wells and Septic Tanks to Municipal Water and Sewer Systems in Washoe County; B. Update on the Truckee Meadows Flood Project’s Financing Program for Home Elevation and Flood Proofing. Presenters: Rosemary Menard, DWR and Naomi Duerr, Director, Truckee River Flood Project Department**

The 2009 Legislature Approved AB 54 which authorizes a program to provide financial assistance to persons to connect to a public water or sewer system under certain circumstances. The proposed Water and Sanitary Sewer Financial Assistance Program will assist property owners by offering financing for on-site and public right of way costs including: Connection fees, line extension fees, meter set fees; on-site trenching and plumbing needed to transfer from on-site to community systems; required abandonment of septic systems and domestic wells.

In addition, AB 54 authorizes a program to provide financial assistance to owners of public or private property to make such property resistant to flood damage. At present the Flood Project is looking to use this authorization to help minimize the financial burden to home owners needing to elevate homes within the critical flood zones as a type of flood mitigation.

**Informational Overview of Domestic Well Issues in the Truckee Meadows Service Area Including Approaches to Mitigating Impacts of Municipal Pumping on Domestic Wells: Presenters: Rosemary Menard, DWR and John Erwin, Director, Natural Resources, TMWA**

Presentation on mitigation of domestic wells affected by municipal well pumping included a discussion on factors which affect domestic wells including: Drought conditions, especially several dry years in a row, which reduces the amount of annual aquifer recharge; a significant concentration of domestic wells in a relatively small area; hydrogeologic conditions, such as fractured granite make some areas less suitable sources of water for either domestic or municipal wells; domestic wells may have been initially drilled relatively shallow making them sensitive to changes in the level of the water table. The Groundwater Task Force recommended creating the Well Mitigation Hearing Board (“WMHB”) to independently evaluate domestic well mitigation claims and advise the County Director of Water Resources on responding to such claims.

Chairman Erwin thanked Mr. Wessel for his presentation.

**8. Informational report on pending integration/consolidation of the Washoe County Department of Water Resources and the Truckee Meadows Water Authority.**

Ms. Menard stated that copies of her presentation to the LOC on the Integration/Merger were included in the agenda packets. She added that she would not present a review of the entire presentation but welcomed questions or comments.

Commissioner Price referred to page 14 “Future Tasks”, specifically Customer Service review, HR modeling, and Financial Analysis/Modeling, and asked if those tasks would be completed this year. Commissioner Menard stated that is absolutely the plan. Commissioner Price clarified that the process would then go into the public process, which would include the TMWA Board and Board of County Commissioners, the following year. Commissioner Menard stated that the next major action is anticipated early next year. Commissioner Price asked if the intention is to wait for the economy to improve with the bond market to help defease DWR’s bonds. Commissioner Menard stated that is an issue; however, information has been circulated by some agency folks that could potentially be advantageous to TMWA and create opportunities to help solve the problem. It is still being reviewed for applicability.

Commissioner Seidel asked about maintenance mapping systems and asked if they are compatible with one another. Commissioner Menard stated that the County uses a system called MP2. She added that level of detail has not yet been explored; however, she assumes that the system used by TMWA would be retained.

Commissioner Seidel asked the same question related to asset management systems. Commissioner Menard stated that most of the County’s asset management is linked to the GIS platform, on which significant work has been performed recently.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher asked if the bottom line would be cost reductions. Commissioner Menard stated that existing costs would probably not be reduced; however, the merger would provide opportunities for future cost avoidance. She stated that the issue is still being defined. Vice-Chairman Schumacher stated there is no guarantee that customer rates will not increase. Commissioner Menard stated that rate increases are not a goal of merging the utilities but reiterated that costs will probably not decrease.

**9. 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.

**c. Truckee River Flood Management Project status report**

Mr. Smitherman reported that a status update on the Truckee River Flood Project, including an

update on the draft Joint Powers Authority (“JPA”), was included as an informational item.

**d. Informational item: Truckee River Information Gateway “TRIG” website hosting support scope of work**

Mr. Smitherman reported that the operating expense budget includes an item for website support in the amount of \$7,500 per year.

Mr. Smitherman invited questions or comments. Commissioner Ball asked if the NNWPC would have an opportunity to review the JPA for the Truckee River Flood Project. Mr. Smitherman stated that an informational update was included in the Flood Project’s update.

Commissioner Ball referred to the contract with LimnoTech for City of Reno and the TMDL work. Commissioner Shumaker stated that an update was provided to the WRWC last fall. He added that not a lot has occurred since that time.

Commissioner Ball referred to the \$550,000 to reimburse TMWA and DWR for consolidation efforts. Mr. Smitherman stated that amount is spread over two years. He added that the law requires the consolidation study and it was included in the budget.

**10. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding agenda items for the September 2010, Commission meeting and future meetings.**

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

- Review Draft Chapters 4, 6 and 8, and presentation of Draft Chapters 5, 9 and 10 of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, and possible direction to staff, Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager.
- Program Manager’s Report, Jim Smitherman
  - 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 stated that two other items (presentation from the Truckee Meadows Stormwater Committing on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) and Truckee River Flood Project update) would not be ready for the September meeting.

Vice-Chairman Schumacher requested a future item for an update on the Washoe Evapotranspiration (“ET”) program.

**11. Commission Comments.**

Mr. Fahnestock referred to handouts that were provided to Commissioners from Sarah Anderson, President of the NLA. He reported that in 2002 the NLA asked the University of Nevada, Reno (“UNR”) Cooperative Extension and the Economic Development Department to implement a study on the Green Industry. A survey was sent out in 2002 and another in 2008. The survey found that in 2002 the Green Industry in the state of Nevada:

- Contributed \$1.3 million in economic activity
- Provided \$557 million in personal income
- Provided 21,000 jobs

In 2008 the survey concluded that the Green Industry:

- Contributed \$1.8 million in economic activity
- Provided \$761 million in personal income
- Provided over 24,000 jobs

He summarized that even based on the current economy, the Green Industry continues to stay strong. He offered to provide an update on the activities and answer any questions related to the survey.

Mr. Fahnestock also offered to provide an update on the Certified Landscape Technician (“CLT”) training and certification program when time allows (after the Plan Update).

**12. Staff Comments.**

None

**13. Public Comments.**

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

**14. Adjournment.**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Niki Linn, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on \_\_\_\_\_ 2010.

---

John Erwin, Chairman