

**NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION
("NNWPC")
AGENDA**

Wednesday, August 5, 2015

1:30 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE CHANGE IN MEETING LOCATION

Reno City Council Chambers
One E. First Street
Reno, Nevada

Notes:

1. Items on this agenda on which action may be taken are followed by the term "for possible action". Non-action items are followed by an asterisk (*).
2. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker and is allowed during the public comment periods, and before action is taken on any action item. Comments are to be directed to the Commission as a whole. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers. The public may sign-up to speak during the public comment period or on a specific agenda item by completing a "Request to Speak" card and submitting it to the clerk.
3. Items on this agenda may be taken out of order, combined with other agenda items for consideration, removed from the agenda, or delayed for discussion at any time. Arrive at the meeting at the posted time to hear item(s) of interest.
4. Supporting material provided to the Commission for the items on the agenda is available to members of the public at the NNWPC offices, 1001 E. Ninth St., Reno, NV, from June Davis, Administrative Secretary, (775) 954-4665, and on the NNWPC website at <http://www.nnwpc.us>
5. In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda closes three working days prior to the meeting. We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for persons who are disabled and wish to attend meetings. If you require special arrangements for the meeting, please call 954-4665 no later than 24 hours prior to the meeting.
6. In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda has been posted at the following locations: Reno City Hall (1 East First Street), Sparks City Hall (431 Prater Way), Sparks Justice Court (1675 East Prater Way), Sun Valley GID (5000 Sun Valley Blvd.), Truckee Meadows Water Authority (1355 Capital Blvd.), Washoe County Administration Building (1001 E. Ninth Street), Second Judicial District Court/Courthouse (75 Court Street), Washoe County Central Library (301 South Center St.), Washoe County Community Services Department (1001 E. Ninth St.) Galena Market (19990 Thomas Creek Rd.), Galena High School (3600 Butch Cassidy Way), South Valleys Library (15650A Wedge Parkway), the NNWPC website: <http://www.nnwpc.us> and the State of Nevada Website: <https://notice.nv.gov>

1. Roll Call and determination of presence of a quorum. *
2. Public Comments. * (Three-minute time limit per person.)
3. Approval of agenda. **(For Possible Action)**
4. Approval of the minutes from the June 3, 2015, meeting. **(For Possible Action)**
5. Report by the Desert Research Institute ("DRI") on its Cloud Seeding Operations for the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe Basins for the past water year; discussion and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission ("WRWC") for funding in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 from the Regional Water Management Fund ("RWMF") to support similar Cloud Seeding Operations for the upcoming water year – Frank McDonough, PhD, DRI. **(For Possible Action)**.
6. Report on LimnoTech, Inc. review of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe's ("PLPT") proposed changes to the PLPT Water Quality Control Plan and any possible

effects to the Nevada Water Quality Standards or Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Truckee River, and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission to send a comment letter to the PLPT, and possible direction to staff – Kerri Lanza, P.E., City of Reno. **(For Possible Action)**

7. Discussion and possible approval of a proposal and funding request not to exceed \$23,500 from the RWMF for a technical workshop concerning a study further exploring the ozone–biological activated carbon advanced oxidation process for effluent treatment; and, if approved, authorize the Water Resources Program Manager to execute a contract with the Water Reuse Research Foundation for that purpose – Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager. **(For Possible Action)**
8. Presentation of staff comments on the “Wastewater and Watershed-Based Water Quality Planning” chapter for the 2016 RWMP update; discussion and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman **(For Possible Action)**
9. Presentation of comments received on the “Water Resources” chapter for the 2016 RWMP update; discussion and possible direction to staff – Chris Wessel, NNWPC Water Management Planner. **(For Possible Action)**
10. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding any chapters of the RWMP previously reviewed by the NNWPC in relation to the 2016 RWMP update – Jim Smitherman. **(For Possible Action)**
11. Program Manager’s Report – Jim Smitherman. *
 - a. Report on the Status of Projects and Work Plan Supported by the RWMF;
 - b. Financial Report on the RWMF;
 - c. Report on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency's parcel-based population and employment modeling project;
12. Discussion regarding possible agenda items for the September 2, 2015 NNWPC meeting, and other future meetings, and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman. **(For Possible Action)**
13. Commission comments. *
14. Staff comments. *
15. Public Comments. * (Three-minute time limit per person.)
16. Adjournment. **(For Possible Action)**

*Indicates a non-action item

DRAFT - MINUTES
NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

The regular meeting of the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission ("NNWPC") was held in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Enloe at 1:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call and Determination of Presence of a Quorum

Voting Members Present: John Enloe, John Martini, George Ball, Michael Drinkwater, John Erwin (arrived at 1:42 p.m.), John Flansberg (arrived at 1:32 p.m.), Mickey Hazelwood, Danielle Henderson, Darrin Price, David Solaro, and Brian Wadsworth.

Voting Members Absent: Michael DeMartini.

Non-Voting Members Present: None.

Non-Voting Members Absent: Chris Anderson, Harry Fahnstock, Kim Davis, My-Linh Nguyen, and Cindy Turiczek.

Staff Members Present: Jim Smitherman; Chris Wessel; June Davis; and John Rhodes, Legal Counsel.

2. Public Comment

None

3. Approval of the Agenda (For Possible Action)

COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SOLARO. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. Approval of the Minutes from the May 6, 2015, Meeting (For Possible Action)

(Commissioner Flansberg arrived at 1:32 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER PRICE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MAY 6, 2015, MINUTES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BALL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.

5. Presentation by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe ("PLPT") on its triennial review of water quality standards and rationale for proposed changes to certain standards – Brian Wadsworth, PLPT Water Quality Manager.

Commissioner Wadsworth stated that the public comment period for the PLPT Water Quality Control Plan is from May 26, 2015, until August 21, 2015. A public hearing will be held on August 6, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. at the Tribal Chambers in Nixon, NV. Commissioner Wadsworth's presentation included the following topics: introduction of the PLPT; history of the PLPT Water Quality Standards; current PLPT Water Quality Program and Water Quality Standards; triennial review process; proposed changes to the PLPT Water Quality Control Plan; and a timeline of events.

(Commissioner Erwin arrived at 1:42 p.m.)

Chairman Enloe asked how well the river and the lake comply with the standards today. Commissioner Wadsworth stated there is an issue with dissolved reactive phosphorus as well as Total Dissolved Solids (“TDS”). The Water Quality Standards are goals for the system and do not have to be met at the time they are adopted.

Commissioner Flansberg asked if total phosphorus readings have been taken and how they compare to the standard. Commissioner Wadsworth stated that they do take total phosphorus readings on the river and Pyramid Lake. The lake is functioning fairly well. Since there is no standard on the Truckee River within the reservation they cannot tell how it compares unless using the State standard of 0.05 (milligrams per liter total phosphorus).

Commissioner Erwin requested clarification on the proposed numeric standards of water quality, in particular a depth notation concerning total nitrogen. He asked whether depth is measured in feet or meters. Commissioner Wadsworth explained that when the standards were originally adopted the units were micrograms per liter and since many other standards are in milligrams per liter the micrograms were converted to milligrams. That standard applies from 0 to 20 meters depth of the lake and the depth average of 0.115 is for the full water column, which is 100 meters. Commissioner Erwin suggested using Commissioner Wadsworth’s description as a notation on the depth average.

No action was taken.

6. Presentation on data collection and possible recommendations for the “Finance & Costs” chapter of the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan (“RWMP”) update; discussion and possible direction to staff – Catherine Hansford, Hansford Economic Development. (For Possible Action)

Catherine Hansford, Hansford Economic Development, presented an update on the “Finance & Costs” chapter of the 2016 RWMP. The Truckee River Flood Project was included in the 2011 version and Ms. Hansford is recommending that it be pulled out and discussed separately in its own chapter. Ms. Hansford put together a master CIP list of all the water related capital improvements for the next five years. Ms. Hansford reviewed a handout titled “Comparison of 2011 and 2016 Five Year CIP Funding Sources”.

Commissioner Price asked if the grants column is anticipated revenue. Ms. Hansford stated it is secured grants.

Ms. Hansford reviewed the next steps in the Scope of Work and suggested an additional item that is not in the scope of work but that she feels can be accomplished within the current approved budget. That suggestion is to complete a fee burden analysis looking at not only the water related fees associated with development but it would add up all the development costs and fees to determine total cost of development for different types of housing or non-residential in different parts of the County. This could be a helpful analysis and tool to understand developer incentives to develop in certain areas and to coordinate with the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (“TMRPA”) for potential to create incentives for development in particular areas such as the Transit Oriented Corridors. Ms. Hansford will prepare a proposal for a fee burden analysis for consideration at a future time.

No action was taken.

7. Presentation of comments received on the “Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow” chapter for the 2016 RWMP update; discussion and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager. (For Possible Action)

Jim Smitherman stated that there are no significant updates or revisions to report on this chapter. No action was taken.

8. Presentation of staff comments on the “Water Resources” chapter for the 2016 RWMP update; discussion and possible direction to staff – Chris Wessel, NNWPC Water Management Planner. (For Possible Action)

Chris Wessel stated that staff is not anticipating a lot of changes to the “Sources of Water” section of this chapter. There will be some significant changes to the “Factors Affecting Water Resource Sustainability” section. Most of those changes will come from TMWA’s Water Resource Plan.

Commissioner Drinkwater asked if there is an official definition or criteria for a water emergency. Commissioner Erwin confirmed that there is criteria and a plan embedded in the RWMP. Clarity can be added to that information if needed.

No action was taken.

9. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding any chapters of the RWMP previously reviewed by the NNWPC in relation to the 2016 RWMP update – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

No action was taken.

10. Discussion and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”) to revise the schedule to review and adopt the 2016 RWMP update, and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman stated that the public purveyor’s consolidation affects the timing of the development of TMWA’s Water Resources Plan. The snow pack next winter is going to potentially affect TMWA’s water resources planning. Due to these two factors, Mr. Smitherman requested a revised schedule to review and adopt the 2016 RWMP.

In addition to those factors, effluent management planning is becoming increasingly complex. More time to complete some of the detailed analyses of the management alternatives for effluent would make for a better regional water management plan too.

Mr. Smitherman recommended a revised schedule consisting of two timetables. In the first timetable staff can complete the review of the existing 2011 RWMP by the end of the year and compile a review report that the NNWPC can review and recommend to the WRWC detailing the review and what is expected as far as revisions for an update. The second timetable takes nine months to get through actually compiling all of the pieces that will be missing at the end of the year into the plan update and then go into the plan adoption process.

John Rhodes, Legal Counsel, confirmed that language in the statute says that the review has to be completed five years after the initial plan is updated or adopted. The review will be completed in conformance with the law and amendments will then be prepared as quickly as possible and brought for adoption.

COMMISSIONER PRICE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE NEW SCHEDULE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FLANSBERG. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

11. Discussion and possible approval of funding in an amount not to exceed \$20,356 from the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”) for approximately half the

cost of technical assistance from the Desert Research Institute (“DRI”) for effluent management planning; and if approved, authorize the Water Resources Program Manager to execute a contract with DRI for that purpose – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman stated that members of the working group were referred to an individual at the DRI who is skilled at linear optimization programming. The working group is proposing that the NNWPC recommend sharing the cost with the other entities in the working group. \$20,000 would come from the RWMF and the remaining \$20,000 would be split by TMWA, Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County by way of a joinder agreement.

Mr. Smitherman explained the complexities of the problems being faced in managing the effluent from the different sources considering the different constraints and variables. DRI has agreed to compile the model in an Excel spreadsheet so that staff could continue to input variables and data and continue to make model runs.

Chairman Enloe further explained that the linear programming that DRI can provide is a matrix algebra method and is a way to solve multiple equations simultaneously. DRI was requested to make a presentation at a future NNWPC meeting.

COMMISSIONER FLANSBERG MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ERWIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

12. Review and possible approval of the WRWC Routine Operating Budget for non-staff services for Fiscal Year 2015-2016, and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

COMMISSIONER ERWIN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

13. Report on legislative activities, including Bills pending in the 2015 session of the Nevada Legislature that may affect or are of interest to the WRWC/NNWPC – John Rhodes, WRWC/NNWPC Legal Counsel.

Mr. Rhodes reported that SB 423 (Cloud Seeding) and AB 353 (Competitive Bidding on professional service contracts) both died in committee. SB 70 (Open Meeting) did pass and became effective as of May 27, 2015. SB 70 requires written documentation by the person who posts notice of meetings and it requires that meeting minutes be approved within 45 days of the meeting or at the next meeting of the public body, whichever is later.

Public Comment – Cathy Brandhorst spoke.

14. Program Manager’s Report – Jim Smitherman.

- a. Report on the status of projects and work plan supported by the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”);

Report included in the meeting packet.

- b. Financial report on the RWMF;

Mr. Smitherman is expecting to finish the fiscal year in good shape with cash in reserve to cover any under-collection in the revenue from the fees and earned interest.

- c. Report on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency’s parcel-based population and employment modeling project;

The TMRPA staff is meeting today with their consultant on the Residential Housing Growth Study and Mr. Smitherman will report back at the next NNWPC meeting.

15. Discussion regarding possible agenda items for the July 1, 2015, NNWPC meeting, and other future meetings; and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman stated there is nothing time sensitive to address at a July meeting.

COMMISSIONER PRICE MADE A MOTION TO CANCEL THE JULY NNWPC MEETING, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ERWIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Chairman Enloe requested a status or summary report from the Remediation District on their CIP activities and where they are going with the program.

Commissioner Price requested a report on the efforts being made by DRI to pursue funding from other agencies that are benefiting from the cloud seeding efforts.

16. Commission Comments

Commissioner Ball stated that he is stepping down as the NNWPC representative on the Truckee Meadows Water Authority Standing Advisory Committee.

Mr. Rhodes stated that selection of another representative would require action by TMWA. There has been talk about TMWA eliminating that position because there are 2 TMWA representatives on the NNWPC already.

17. Staff Comments

Mr. Smitherman reported that staff will be holding a brief workshop on the RWMP review and update process on Tuesday, June 9, 2015, from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at TMWA.

18. Public Comment

Cathy Brandhorst spoke on several topics.

19. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Approved by:

John Enloe, Chairman

APPROVED BY COMMISSION IN SESSION ON _____, 2015.

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Report by the Desert Research Institute ("DRI") on its Cloud Seeding Operations for the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe Basins for the past water year; discussion and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission ("WRWC") for funding in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 from the Regional Water Management Fund ("RWMF") to support similar Cloud Seeding Operations for the upcoming water year

SUMMARY

Since 2009, DRI has conducted its cloud seeding program for the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe Basins using funds provided by either the Truckee Meadows Water Authority ("TMWA") or the Truckee River Fund, and the RWMF. DRI staff has provided a Proposal and Scope of Work including a budget for \$100,000 (attached) from the RWMF to partially fund and continue cloud seeding operations for water year 2015-2016. Dr. Marc Pitchford of DRI will provide a presentation about the water year 2014-2015 program and proposed operations for the coming year.

The WRWC budget for FY 2015-2016 includes \$100,000 for the proposed cloud seeding operations in addition to \$25,000 for ongoing work under a separate interlocal agreement with DRI for additional precipitation gauges to improve evaluation of cloud seeding results.

BACKGROUND

Wintertime cloud seeding is focused on enhancing snowfall in mountainous regions to increase the snowpack, resulting in more spring runoff and water supplies in the surrounding areas. The DRI cloud seeding program has been in operation for more than 25 years. DRI estimates that, for the Truckee River Basin, cloud-seeding has boosted water in the snowpack by an average of 18,000 acre-feet a year over the last 10 years.

DRI funding cuts in 2008 threatened to eliminate its cloud seeding operations such that outside financing was necessary to continue the program. In response, DRI applied to the Truckee River Fund ("TRF") in 2009 to support the operation of five cloud-seeding generators in the Sierra Nevada. DRI received approval for partial funding from the TRF and the RWMF for the 2009-2010 water year. DRI has applied for and received funding from the TRF, and more recently TMWA, and the RWMF to cover operations in each successive water year.

DRI has convened a cloud seeding program advisory board for the purpose of developing long-term funding alternatives involving entities that benefit from the program.

PREVIOUS ACTION

None

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact to the RWMF, should this item be approved, will be \$100,000. Budget authority is located in Fund Group 766, Fund 7066, Account Number 710100, Professional Services, Cost Object WP310100.3.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC consider the proposal from DRI and provide a recommendation for approval to the WRWC regarding the funding request for the 2015-2016 cloud seeding program.

JS:jd

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager
Kerri Lanza, P.E., Engineering Manager, City of Reno

SUBJECT: Report on LimnoTech, Inc. review of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe's ("PLPT") proposed changes to the PLPT Water Quality Control Plan and any possible effects to the Nevada Water Quality Standards or Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Truckee River, and possible recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission to send a comment letter to the PLPT, and possible direction to staff

SUMMARY

On May 26, 2015, the PLPT released documents related to its triennial review of water quality standards ("WQS"), including rationale to support updates to certain WQS. On June 3, 2015, Commissioner Wadsworth gave a presentation to the NNWPC on the triennial review and proposed WQS changes. The rationale document and other triennial review documents were distributed in the agenda packet for that meeting.

Since 2008, the WRWC has provided funding to the City of Reno to reimburse it for technical services provided by LimnoTech, Inc. ("LTI") related to the review of WQS and total maximum daily loads ("TMDL") conducted by the State and review of WQS by the PLPT. LTI has reviewed the PLPT triennial review documents and provided a report to the City of Reno, which is summarized below.

LTI's major findings relate to proposed changes to the PLPT's dissolved reactive phosphorus ("DRP") criterion for the Truckee River downstream of the Tribal boundary. The PLPT is proposing to reduce the DRP criterion from 0.05 mg/L to 0.022mg/L. This is a significant change. Although the rationale document states the justification for the change is to provide equivalence with the existing State total phosphorous ("TP") criterion, no justification is provided on the appropriateness of the State's current criterion.

City of Reno project management staff has been advised by LTI that it may be more appropriate for the PLPT to maintain the current DRP criterion and support a revision to the existing NDEP TP criterion.

The City of Reno asserts that this change will cause significant repercussions to the Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility ("TMWRF") member agencies and citizenry.

The majority of other proposed changes to the PLPT WQS have little to no impact to the region, however LTI provided comments of a peer-review.

BACKGROUND

The Cities of Reno and Sparks, Washoe County and the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (“TMWA”) are working with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (“NDEP”) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“USEPA”) to review and potentially modify the Truckee River WQS and TMDLs for nutrients. LTI has developed two water quality models being used for the review process; the first is one that simulates nutrient loading inputs from the watershed given various conditions. The second is a model that looks at the relationships between nutrient inputs, river conditions, and WQS. These water quality models for the Truckee River have been calibrated and verified and are being used for the WQS review process. This is a regulatory process that requires extensive involvement by stakeholders. The WRWC has agreed to fund a continuation of this work. Last year, the NDEP and USEPA conducted a review of the Lahontan reservoir WQS in conjunction with the review of Truckee River WQS. This year, LTI review and provided comments on the PLPT’s review of its WQS and proposed changes. LTI has the technical expertise to update these models and run various scenarios as well as knowledge of regulatory considerations and stakeholder communications for WQS and TMDLs. The outcome of the WQS review process has implications for regulating, permitting and monitoring the discharges to the Truckee River.

PREVIOUS ACTION

None

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC consider the report and recommend to the WRWC its endorsement of the attached letter and request that the Chairman sign and send the letter to the PLPT prior to the close of its comment period.

JS:jd

Attachment

August 21, 2015

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
Attn: Tribal Secretary
PO Box 256, Nixon, NV 89424

SUBJECT: Agency comments on Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe's Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards, May – August 2015

This letter provides comments from our review of documents you released to support rationale for updates to the Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards (WQS): May 26, 2015 through August 21, 2015. Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide you with these comments and concerns compiled by staffs of our member agencies together with assistance from water quality consultant LimnoTech (Laura Weintraub P.E., Dave Dilks Ph.D).

In summary, major findings of our review relate to proposed changes for the dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP) criterion in the Truckee River:

Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus (DRP)

- The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (PLPT) is proposing to reduce the dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP) criterion from 0.05 mg/L to 0.022 mg/L. We hold this is a significant change to the criterion for the Truckee River.
- The *Rationale* document states the justification for the change is to provide equivalence with the existing Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) Total Phosphorus (TP) criterion; however, no justification is provided on the appropriateness of the current NDEP TP criterion. The relationship assumed for converting the NDEP total phosphorus standard to DRP was provided by NDEP (R. Pahl, Bureau of Water Quality Planning); however, details for the basis of the relationship are not provided.
- In the DRP section of the *Rationale* document, the justification provided in the italicized paragraph only justifies the form of phosphorus used for the criterion, not the numeric value of the criterion.
- The *Preliminary Summary Report* summarizes exceedances of existing criteria based on historical data but no discussion is provided to relate the data to the appropriateness of existing criteria or justification for proposed changes to criteria. We find the conclusions provided are weak. The documents states “the water quality standards were analyzed for appropriateness”; however, the

information provided in all available documents do not support an evaluation of the appropriateness of the DRP criterion. Provided documents do not describe link between phosphorus and dissolved oxygen and modeling work conducted to support the ongoing NDEP WQS Triennial Review is not noted.

- If the objective of the phosphorus change was to attain consistency with NDEP WQS, were the proposed revisions to NDEP’s phosphorus standards considered? PLPT could also achieve their apparent objective of equivalent standards by maintaining the current DRP criterion and supporting the revision to the existing NDEP TP criterion, currently under consideration.

Additional findings of the review relate to proposed changes for the fecal bacteria criteria:

Fecal Bacteria

- The proposed fecal bacteria criteria are based on 2012 USEPA Recreational Water Quality Criteria (RWQC) guidance for Escherichia coli (E. coli).
- In the Fecal Bacteria section of the *Rationale* document, no justification is provided as to why 2012 RWQC values of Estimated Illness Rate: 36/1000 was used for the Truckee River whereas 2012 RWQC values of Estimated Illness Rate: 32/1000 was used for Pyramid Lake. Please provide justification.
- For the Truckee River bacteria criteria, the use of “annual geometric mean” is inconsistent with “geometric mean” used for Pyramid Lake. USEPA guidance suggests the use of a 30-day interval when calculating geometric means. Please provide justification for using an annual interval instead of a 30-day interval.
- The proposed changes note that the single value criterion for E. coli is the equivalent to the Statistical Threshold Value (STV) in the 2012 RWQC, and shall be interpreted to mean a “do not exceed value”. However, USEPA recommends “There should not be greater than a ten percent excursion frequency of the selected STV magnitude in the same 30-day interval”. Footnote “I” should be modified to reflect this allowance for a ten percent excursion frequency, or justification should be provided for the use of a more stringent “single sample max” interpretation.

Comments on Proposed Changes Water Quality Control Plan

We have reviewed each red-lined comment provided in the Draft *Proposed Changes Water Quality Control Plan* Triennial Review, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; our comments are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary Table of Comments on PLPT DRAFT Proposed Changes Water Quality Control Plan

Water Quality Control Plan Section	Revision	Justification for Revision	Comment
Table II.1 (Pyramid Lake)	Clarity: New criterion of $\leq 0.25 \text{ m}^{-1}$ to be consistent with the Antidegradation Policy of the PLPT WQ Control Plan. No change to beneficial uses or current clarity criterion of $\leq 0.45 \text{ m}^{-1}$	Historical Pyramid Lake clarity data recorded 1989-2014 ²	Table should more clearly state that added criterion is an antidegradation criterion. In <i>Rationale</i> report ² (p. 16-17), please note which data in Figure 2 are PAR measurements and which are derived from secchi depth.
Table II.1 (Pyramid Lake)	Fecal Bacteria (E. Coli): Geometric Mean reduced to $\leq 100 \text{ cfu}/100 \text{ mL}$; Single Value increased to $\leq 320 \text{ cfu}/100 \text{ mL}$	2012 USEPA Recreational Water Quality Criteria (RWQC) guidance for Escherichia coli (E. coli) [Federal Register 2012-28909; technical document EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0466; associated documentation]. Single Value for E. coli is the equivalent to the Statistical Threshold Value (STV) in the 2012 RWQC, and shall be interpreted to mean a “do not exceed value.” ¹	Criterion used USEPA <i>Recommendation 2 – Estimated Illness Rate 32/1,000</i> . Neither the <i>Proposed Changes</i> ¹ or the <i>Rationale</i> ² documents note why this method is preferred over the <i>Recommendation 1 – Estimated Illness Rate 36/1,000</i> criteria. Please provide justification. EPA recommends: “There should not be greater than a <u>ten percent excursion frequency</u> of the selected STV magnitude in the same 30-day interval.” Please modify Footnote “1” to reflect this allowance for a ten percent excursion frequency, or provide justification for the use of a more stringent “single sample max” interpretation.

Water Quality Control Plan Section	Revision	Justification for Revision	Comment
Table II.1 (Pyramid Lake)	Total Phosphorus [TP]: units change from µg/l to mg/l. Numeric value for 0-20 m depth average is the same. Numeric value for full water column depth average <u>decreased</u> from ≤ 140 to ≤ 115.	No justification provided for change in <i>full water column depth average</i> value.	It appears to be a typographical error, as the new value is a duplicate of the DRP value. If so, the error should be corrected. If not, please provide justification for change.
Table II.2 (Truckee River – Wadsworth to Dead Ox)	Fecal Bacteria (E. Coli): Units change from No./100 ml to cfu / 100 ml. Numeric value of criteria is the same. <u>Annual</u> Geometric Mean ≤ 126 cfu/100 mL; Single Value ≤ 410 cfu/100 mL	2012 USEPA Recreational Water Quality Criteria (RWQC) guidance for Escherichia coli (E. coli) [Federal Register 2012-28909; technical document EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0466; associated documentation]. Single Value for E. coli is the equivalent to the Statistical Threshold Value (STV) in the 2012 RWQC, and shall be interpreted to mean a “do not exceed value.” ¹	Use of “ <u>annual</u> geometric mean” is inconsistent with “geometric mean” used for Pyramid Lake. USEPA guidance suggests the use of a 30-day interval when calculating geometric means. PLPT Please provide justification for using an annual interval instead of a 30-day interval. Criterion used USEPA <i>Recommendation 1 – Estimated Illness Rate 36/1,000</i> . Neither the <i>Proposed Changes</i> ¹ or the <i>Rationale</i> ² documents note why this method is preferred over the <i>Recommendation 2 – Estimated Illness Rate 32/1,000</i> criteria. Please provide justification. EPA recommends: “There should not be greater than a <u>ten percent excursion frequency</u> of the selected STV magnitude in the same 30-day interval.” Please modify Footnote “1” to reflect this allowance for a ten percent excursion frequency or provide justification for the use of a more stringent “single sample max” interpretation.

Water Quality Control Plan Section	Revision	Justification for Revision	Comment
Table II.2 (Truckee River – Wadsworth to Dead Ox)	Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus: A-Avg reduced from ≤ 0.05 to ≤ 0.022 mg P/l	No justification stated in <i>Proposed Changes</i> document ¹ . <i>Rationale</i> document ² states basis for change is to provide equivalence with the existing NDEP TP criterion. Assumed TP : DRP ratio of 2.3 (statistical mean value of observed data for Truckee River at Derby Dam, 1988-2010).	No justification is provided on the appropriateness of current NDEP criterion. Provided documents ^{1,2,3} do not describe link between P and DO and modeling work conducted to support the ongoing NDEP WQS Triennial Review is not noted. PLPT could also achieve their apparent objective of equivalent standards by maintaining the current DRP criterion and supporting the revision to the existing NDEP TP criterion, currently under consideration. Figure 3 in <i>Rationale</i> document is unreadable ² .
Table II.2 (Truckee River – Wadsworth to Dead Ox)	Temperature: Jul-Oct value is now specified as Avg ≤ 21 °C	None provided. Previously the notation “Avg” was omitted.	Is this a typographical correction? The criterion is now consistent with the criterion specified for the Dead Ox to Pyramid Lake reach within the 2008 WQ Control Plan.
Table II.2 (Truckee River – Wadsworth to Dead Ox)	Total Dissolved Solids: No change in numeric criteria. Beneficial Use was changed from WES to WSES (Water of Special Ecological Significance).	None provided.	Is this a typographical correction? There is no “WES” Beneficial Use listed in the document, and the criterion is now consistent with the criterion specified for the Dead Ox to Pyramid Lake reach within the 2008 WQ Control Plan.

Water Quality Control Plan Section	Revision	Justification for Revision	Comment
Table II.3 (Truckee River – Dead Ox to Pyramid Lake)	Fecal Bacteria (E. Coli): units change from No./100 ml to cfu / 100 ml. Numeric value of criteria is the same. <u>Annual Geometric Mean</u> ≤ 126 cfu/100 mL; <u>Single Value</u> ≤ 410 cfu/100 mL	2012 USEPA Recreational Water Quality Criteria (RWQC) guidance for Escherichia coli (E. coli) [Federal Register 2012-28909; technical document EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0466; associated documentation]. Single Value for E. coli is the equivalent to the Statistical Threshold Value (STV) in the 2012 RWQC, and shall be interpreted to mean a “do not exceed value.” ¹	<p>Use of “<u>annual</u> geometric mean” is inconsistent with “geometric mean” used for Pyramid Lake. USEPA guidance suggests the use of a 30-day interval when calculating geometric means. Please provide justification for using an annual interval instead of a 30-day interval.</p> <p>Criterion used USEPA <i>Recommendation 1 – Estimated Illness Rate 36/1,000</i>. Neither the <i>Proposed Changes</i>¹ or the <i>Rationale</i>² documents note why this method is preferred over the <i>Recommendation 2 – Estimated Illness Rate 32/1,000</i> criteria. Please provide justification.</p> <p>EPA recommends: “There should not be greater than a <u>ten percent excursion frequency</u> of the selected STV magnitude in the same 30-day interval.” Please modify Footnote “1” to reflect this allowance for a ten percent excursion frequency, or provide justification for the use of a more stringent “single sample max” interpretation.</p>

Water Quality Control Plan Section	Revision	Justification for Revision	Comment
Table II.3 (Truckee River – Dead Ox to Pyramid Lake)	Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus: A-Avg reduced from ≤ 0.05 to ≤ 0.022 mg P/l	No justification stated in <i>Proposed Changes</i> document ¹ . <i>Rationale</i> document ² states basis for change is to provide equivalence with the existing NDEP TP criterion. Assumed TP : DRP ratio of 2.3 (statistical mean value of observed data for Truckee River at Derby Dam, 1988-2010).	No justification is provided on the appropriateness of current NDEP criterion. Provided documents ^{1,2,3} do not describe link between P and DO and modeling work conducted to support the ongoing NDEP WQS Triennial Review is not noted. PLPT could also achieve their apparent objective of equivalent standards by maintaining the current DRP criterion and supporting the revision to the existing NDEP TP criterion, currently under consideration. Figure 3 in <i>Rationale</i> document is unreadable ² .

¹ Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe – Draft *Proposed Changes Water Quality Control Plan*

² Triennial Review, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe – Draft *Rationale for Proposed Water Quality Standard Changes*

³ Triennial Review, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe – Draft *Preliminary Summary Report*

Comments on Draft *Rationale for Proposed Water Quality Standard Changes*

The following comments relate to review of the PLPT document “Draft *Rationale for Proposed Water Quality Standard Changes*”:

- Pages 16-17: Rationale for Clarity criterion. It would be helpful to note which data in Figure 2 are PAR measurements and which are derived from secchi depth.
- Pages 18-19: Rationale for DRP criterion.
 - The justification provided in the italicized paragraph only justifies the form of phosphorus used for the criterion, not the numeric value of the criterion.
 - The rationale for the revision to the DRP criterion is for equivalency with the existing NDEP TP criterion; however, no comment is provided on the appropriateness of the current NDEP TP criterion.
 - The assumed TP : OP (Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus) ratio was provided by NDEP (R. Pahl) based on a statistical median; however, details for basis of relationship are not provided.
 - The graphic quality of Figure 3 is poor making it difficult to read
- Page 20: Rationale for Fecal Bacteria criteria. No justification is provided as to why 2012 RWQC values of Estimated Illness Rate: 36/1000 was used for the Truckee River whereas 2012 RWQC values of Estimated Illness Rate: 32/1000 was used for Pyramid Lake.

Comments on Draft *Preliminary Summary Report*

The following comments relate to review of the PLPT document “Draft *Preliminary Summary Report*”:

- Page 4 – The definition provided for 7Q10 is not clear.
- Table 1 – Painted Rock (Nevada) (Non-Tribal Water Quality Data)
 - No comment provided regarding the significant difference in violations between DO (0%) and TP (100%). i.e., violation of NDEP TP criterion does not correlate with violation of the DO criterion.
- Table 2 – Wadsworth and Nixon (Non-Tribal Water Quality Data)
 - There was no calculation of exceedances with the proposed DRP criterion. Only a calculation with the existing criterion was provided. Please provide both calculations.

- For DRP exceedances, it does not make sense that there would be fewer exceedances with the low flow filter as compared to exceedances without the low flow filter. Please explain.
- Tables 3, 4, 5 – Dissolved Oxygen, Temperature, pH (Non-Tribal Water Quality Data)
 - Not clear if fifth column of table (% of sample days exceeded) is with or without the low flow filter.
 - No comment is provided regarding the higher violations at Marble Bluff as compared to upstream sections of river.
- Table 6 – Truckee River (PLPT data)
 - Table does not indicate if 10% flow filter was used. Inconsistent with previous tables.
 - There was no calculation of exceedances with the proposed DRP criterion. Only a calculation with the existing criterion was provided. Please provide calculations for both.
 - There are no nitrogen data shown. Is this an error?
- Table 7 – Pyramid Lake at Station 96 (PLPT data)
 - Table does not indicate if 10% flow filter was used. Inconsistent with previous tables.
 - There are no data shown for temperature, clarity, suspended solids, and total nitrogen. All of these constituents have WQ criteria. Is this an error?
- P. 10 - Conclusion
 - The report summarizes exceedances of existing criteria based on historical data but no discussion is provided to relate the data to the appropriateness of existing criteria or justification for proposed changes to criteria.
 - Related to the proposed changes for the DRP criterion, the conclusions provided are weak. The Summary documents states “the water quality standards were analyzed for appropriateness”; however, the information provided in all available documents do not support an evaluation of the appropriateness of the DRP criterion.
- Appendices A, B, C

- All graphs showing DRP (p. 11, 14, 17) do not clearly note which DRP standard is plotted, the existing criterion or proposed criterion. Please plot both.
- Appendix E
 - Graph showing DRP (p. 23) does not clearly note which DRP standard is plotted, the existing criterion or proposed criterion. Please plot both.
 - Graphs showing DO violations (p. 26) do not clearly indicated what is plotted. Daily average? Hourly? Daily minimum? Please improve labeling of graphs.
- Appendix G
 - Graphs showing DO violations (p. 29, 30) do not clearly indicate what is plotted. Daily average? Hourly? Daily minimum? Results seem to differ from those on p. 26 which is confusing. Please improve labeling of graphs.

In closing, based on technical analysis our water quality consultant has conducted, we find that the proposed Water Quality Standards changes, particularly as they relate to the reduction of DRP to 0.22 mg/L could result in major implications to operations, and require unplanned and significant upgrades at the Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility. We find the State's standard is also lacking justification and so may not be an appropriate target to match. On January 6, 2011, NDEP issued notice of intent to conduct a triennial review of nutrient water quality standards in the Truckee River. This effort is still ongoing and was not acknowledged in the PLPT WQS Triennial Review documentation. Per the October 10, 1996 water quality settlement agreement, condition 9, Tribe's water quality Standards, part b. states the Tribe will not adopt water quality standards for the lower Truckee River or for Pyramid Lake which have the effect of substantially negating the value of the Truckee River Water Quality Settlement Agreement.

This concludes our comments. Again, we thank you for the opportunity to provide these for your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact Kerri Lanza, P.E, City of Reno (775) 334-2683.

Cc: Randy Pahl, NDEP

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible approval of a proposal and funding request not to exceed \$23,500 from the Regional Water Management Fund for a technical workshop concerning a study further exploring the ozone-biological activated carbon advanced oxidation process for effluent treatment; and, if approved, authorize the Water Resources Program Manager to execute a contract with WateReuse Research Foundation ("WRFF") for that purpose.

SUMMARY

WRRF, in partnership with Stantec Consulting, Inc. ("Stantec") and American Water, will be conducting a research study on the Optimization of Ozone-BAC (biological activated carbon) Treatment Process for Potable Reuse Applications (WRRF Project 15-10, the "Project"). Funding for the Project will be provided by the project team (\$30,000), WRRF (\$120,000) and in-kind support from the remaining partners (\$60,000).

The Project will provide further analysis of the ozone-BAC process. This process is a promising technology for the advanced treatment of wastewater treated effluent for reuse applications, notably indirect potable reuse ("IPR"). The currently accepted advanced treatment technology for potable reuse applications is reverse osmosis ("RO"). RO, however, is very costly and has limited viability in inland areas, such as the Truckee Meadows, where the disposal of process residuals (brine) is difficult.

The WRRF/Stantec/American Water team proposes to convene a workshop in the Reno area to be attended by nationally recognized scholars and experts, state regulators and local agency representatives to discuss the Project and anticipated outcomes. However, WRRF does not have sufficient financial resources to include this workshop in the Project and the Project's proponents are seeking \$23,500 in financial assistance from interested parties to convene the workshop in the Reno area.

BACKGROUND

WRWC member agency staff and other local agency staff have identified IPR as an important effluent and resource management strategy with significant potential application in the region. Treated wastewater effluent is identified as a water resource in the 2011 Regional Water Management Plan ("RWMP") and IPR, if implemented, would improve water resource

management flexibility, increase potable water supply, and provide a source of groundwater recharge with possible indirect water quality benefits to the Truckee River. In the RWMP, Table 9-2 Issues and Prioritized Action Items, identifies the Western Regional Water Commission ("WRWC") as an active participant in a number of wastewater effluent management priorities. Since adoption of the RWMP, the WRWC has invested, and continues to invest, a significant amount of staff time and funding in effluent management and IPR planning activities consistent with those priority action items. The proposed workshop is not only consistent with RWMP priority action items, but is particularly timely as local agency staff is currently engaged with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection ("NDEP") in the review of current effluent management regulations and possible revisions to the regulations that would allow the implementation of IPR in the region.

The City of Reno, in partnership with Stantec, previously conducted a pilot study of the ozone-BAC process at the Reno/Stead Water Reclamation Facility to assess the process's ability to remove contaminants of concern. This previous study and subsequent studies performed by others have demonstrated the technology's ability to remove contaminants of concern and confirmed ozone-BAC as a viable advanced treatment process for IPR applications.

This new WRRF/Stantec/American Water project builds upon these previous efforts and is intended to provide the data and information needed to prepare a guidance manual for the design and operation of ozone-BAC systems. This guidance manual will be a valuable tool in helping local efforts to establish ozone-BAC as an accepted advanced treatment technology suitable for IPR projects.

PROPOSAL

An important element of the Project is a workshop to be attended by nationally recognized scholars and experts, state regulators (including the NDEP), and local agency representatives to discuss the current state of the technology; what additional data and information is needed to further validate the technology; what data and operational information is needed to develop a design and operations guidance manual; and how to design a pilot study that obtains the required data and information.

Agency staff is in general agreement that the proposed workshop is an important step towards the possible implementation of local IPR projects, because it engages NDEP early in the process. Staff further agrees that supporting the Project and holding the workshop is in the interest of the regional water resource planning community. Agency staff is committed to the Project and have offered to host the piloting equipment at the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF) and provide other support as possible, including surplus control equipment, operator support, and technical assistance.

The workshop is proposed to be a two-day event at a local hotel. To attract highly qualified experts, it may be necessary to offer travel assistance and hotel accommodations to some attendees. The workshop is being planned for 40 people. Of which, travel assistance and hotel accommodations will be provided for approximately 15 people. Special efforts will be made to encourage participation by NDEP representatives.

The proposed budget for the workshop is \$23,500. If approved, 100% of the funding provided to WRRF will be used for the workshop. A breakdown of the budget is provided in the following table.

Workshop Budget Detail

Item	No of People	Estimated Cost
Venue (including meals and setup)	40	\$9,500
Travel Assistance	15	\$11,000
Hotel Accommodations (two nights)	15	\$3,000
Total Budget		\$23,500

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact to the RWMF, should this item be approved, will not exceed \$23,500 in FY 2015-16. Budget authority is located in Fund Group 766, Fund 7066, Account Number 70100, Professional Services and Cost Object WP 310300. This expenditure is not included in the FY 2015-16 Budget. Funding would come from one or more projects not expected to expend their FY 2015-16 budget allocations.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff has discussed this proposal with local agency staff working on effluent management planning and, with their support, recommends approval of the proposal and authorization for the Program Manager to execute an agreement with WRFF to fund the workshop.

JS:jd

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015
TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (“NNWPC”)
FROM: Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager
SUBJECT: Presentation of staff comments on the “Wastewater and Watershed-Based Water Quality Planning chapter for the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan (“RWMP”) update; discussion and possible direction to staff

SUMMARY

The following review notes are the result of a preliminary staff review of the existing chapter. Coordination with the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, Washoe County, Sun Valley GID, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority, and Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency is ongoing and expected to yield information on which to base revisions to the chapter.

A list of sections and subsections including notes on anticipated revisions appears below:

Introductory Sections: Update all sections with current information.

- 4.1 Wastewater Service Providers:** Review with service providers, no major changes anticipated.
- 4.2 Water Reclamation Facilities:** Add discussion of TMWRF Joint Coordinating Committee to section 4.2.1.
- 4.3 Regional Wastewater Facility Planning:** Review with service providers, significant updates are anticipated.
 - 4.3.1 North Valleys Planning:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.3.2 Interconnection of Reno-Stead Water Reclamation Facility to Spanish Springs Valley:** N major changes anticipated.
 - 4.3.3 Interconnection of Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility to South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility:** Significant planning is ongoing, update using most current information.
 - 4.3.4 Decommissioning of the Gold Ranch Wastewater Treatment Facility:** Delete section.
- 4.4 Wastewater Planning for Other Areas:** Review and update subsections as necessary, no major changes anticipated.
 - 4.4.1 Lower Truckee River**
 - 4.4.2 Warm Springs**
 - 4.4.3 Washoe Valley**
 - 4.4.4 Spanish Springs**
 - 4.4.5 Lemmon Valley and Golden Valley**

- 4.5 **Septic Systems:** Review and update as necessary, no major changes anticipated.
- 4.6 **Watershed Management Programs to Protect the Availability and Quality of Water Resources:** Review and update subsections as necessary.
 - 4.6.1 **Regulatory Considerations:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.2 **Truckee River Modeling for Water Quality:** Significant changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.3 **Coordination with the PLPT's Water Quality and Quantity Goals:** Significant changes anticipated considering PLPT's triennial review of water quality standards and proposed changes.
 - 4.6.4 **Truckee Meadows Regional Storm Water Quality Management Program:** Review with Reno staff, consider new permit, update as necessary.
 - 4.6.5 **Truckee River Coordinated Monitoring Program:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.6 **Truckee River Information Gateway:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.7 **Truckee River Water Quality Monitoring Data:** Update using most current information.
 - 4.6.8 **River and Stream Restoration:** Update using most current information.
 - 4.6.9 **Watershed Management and Protection in the Truckee Meadows:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.10 **Watershed Management and Protection Projects:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.11 **Other Programs:** No major changes anticipated.
 - 4.6.12 **Public Outreach Programs:** No major changes anticipated..

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC accept the review notes on the Wastewater and Watershed-Based Water Quality Planning chapter of the 2011 RWMP, with or without changes, and provide direction to staff as appropriate concerning this chapter as part of the development of the 2016 RWMP update.

JS:jd

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (“NNWPC”)

FROM: Chris Wessel, NNWPC Water Management Planner
Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Presentation of comments received on the “Water Resources” chapter for the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan (“RWMP”) update; discussion and possible direction to staff

SUMMARY

Following staff’s initial review of Chapter 2 (Water Resources) of the 2011 RWMP, no further comments have been received regarding the chapter to date. As a recap, the most significant changes identified by staff will involve removing references to the Washoe County Department of Water Resources and the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District. Virtually all elements which require updating or changing will be dependent on the pending update by the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (“TMWA”) of its Water Resource Plan (“WRP”).

The following is a brief overview of areas within Chapter 2 that staff has identified for updating.

- 2.1 Sources of Water:** This section will not likely have substantial changes.
- 2.2 Factors Affecting Water Resource Sustainability:** Significant updates/changes are anticipated based on TMWA’s WRP for the following Sections: 2.2.2 *Economic Conditions and the Cost of Water Rights*; 2.2.3.1 *Truckee River Settlement and the Truckee River Operating Agreement*; 2.2.3.3 *Water Quality Settlement Agreement*; 2.2.4.1 *Weather (specifically Climate Change and Drought)*; 2.2.4.2 *Groundwater Recharge*; and, 2.2.4.3 *Aquifer Storage and Recovery*.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC accept the review notes on Chapter 2 of the 2011 RWMP, with or without changes, and provide direction to staff as appropriate concerning future review of this chapter as part of the development of the 2016 RWMP update.

CW:jd

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission
("NNWPC")

FROM: Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding any chapters of the Regional Water Management Plan ("RWMP") previously reviewed by the NNWPC in relation to the 2016 RWMP update.

SUMMARY

This agenda item is intended to be one in a series of standing items, ending upon the NNWPC's final recommendation to the Western Regional Water Commission concerning the 2016 RWMP update. Under this item, NNWPC members may discuss, and the NNWPC may direct staff on the subjects of any of the RWMP chapters reviewed, since the December 2014 meeting, in relation to the 2016 update.

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015
TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission
FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager
SUBJECT: Program Manager's Report

Attached are updated reports for items (a) and (b) for your review. A verbal report will be given for item (c).

- a) Report on the status of Projects and Work Plan supported by the RWMF;
- b) Financial Report on the RWMF; and
- c) Report on the TMRPA's parcel-based population and employment modeling project.

**Status Report of Projects and Work Plan
Supported by the Regional Water Management Fund**

	Project Name	Contractor / Provider	Amount	Balance Remaining	Percent Complete	Target Completion Date	Notes
1	Certified Landscape Technician Program 2014-2016 FY	Nevada Landscape Association (NLA)	25,000	12,500	50%	6/30/16	Work is in progress PO ends 9/30/16
2	Cloud Seeding - Additional Precip Monitoring Equipment	(DRI) Desert Research Institute	25,000	1,074	96%	9/30/15	Awaiting final invoice
3	Cloud Seeding Program for Water Year 2015	(DRI) Desert Research Institute	100,000	28,277	72%	3/31/16	Work is in progress
4	Effluent Management (Huffaker Reservoir Effluent Interconnection Pipeline Eval)	City of Reno / Stantec	20,000	1,658	92%	9/8/15	Work is in progress
5	Effluent Management Strategy	Stantec	25,000	25,000	0%	12/31/15	Work is in progress
6	Effluent Management - Linear Programming	(DRI) Desert Research Institute	20,356	20,356	0%	12/31/15	Work is in progress
7	Envision Videographers of WRWC meetings	Envision	1,200	180	85%	9/30/15	Work is in progress
8	Highland Canal Improvements	City of Reno	250,000	250,000	0%	1 yr from Effective Date	Awaiting signatures from Reno
9	Optimizing Investments in the Truckee River Watershed	The Nature Conservancy	57,787	57,787	0%	12/31/16	Work is in progress
10	Regional Data Development and Analytical Program (FY 2011-2012)	Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency	486,000	322,167	34%	6/30/16	Work is in progress
11	Regional Storm Water Quality Management Program (Third Amendment)	City of Reno	262,500	105,835	60%	9/30/15	Awaiting final invoice
12	Regional Storm Water Quality Management Program (Third Amendment)	City of Reno	262,500	262,500	0%	6/30/16	Work is in progress
13	RWMP 2016 Cost & Finance Chapter Update	Hansford Economic Consultant	23,575	13,669	42%	12/31/15	Work is in progress

**Status Report of Projects and Work Plan
Supported by the Regional Water Management Fund**

	Project Name	Contractor / Provider	Amount	Balance Remaining	Percent Complete	Target Completion Date	Notes
14	RWMP 2016 Update - Water Balance Update	Stantec	25,000	25,000	0%	9/30/15	Work is in progress
15	Septic - Phase II	County - CSD	150,000	128,795	14%	Amending to 6/30/16	Work is in progress
16	Sosu TV Videographers of NNWPC meetings FY 2014-15	Sosu TV	3,500	1,925	45%	9/30/15	Work is in progress
17	Sosu TV Videographers of NNWPC meetings FY 2014-15	Sosu TV	3,000	3,000	0%	6/30/16	Work is in progress
18	TMDL Phase I Fifth Amendment	City of Reno (LimnoTech)	75,000	63,269	16%	9/30/15	Work is in progress
19	TMDL Phase I Sixth Amendment	City of Reno (LimnoTech)	75,000	75,000	0%	6/30/16	Waiting for new PO
20	TRIG Website Support FY 2014-2015	City of Reno	7,500	1,880	75%	9/30/15	Awaiting final invoice
21	TRIG Website Support FY 2015-2016	City of Reno	7,500	7,500	0%	6/30/16	Awaiting return of ILA from Reno
22	Truckee River Corridor Management Plan	Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful	22,000	22,000	0%	6/30/16	Work is in progress
23	TROA - 6,700 AF water rights purchase	TMWA	2,700,000	215,948	92%	Open Ended	Work is in progress
24	Washoe ET Project Maintenance	DRI (Desert Research Institute)	10,000	3,150	69%	9/30/15	Work is in progress
25	Water Usage Review Program 2015	TMWA	100,000	100,000	0%	12/31/15	Awaiting final signatures on ILA
26	Washoe ET weather station upgrades	(DRI) Desert Research Institute	29,050	25,000	14%	9/30/15	Work is in progress

7/30/2015
 Fund 766
 Report 400/ZF15
 Fiscal Year 2015; Period 1 through 13

**Financial Report on the
 Regional Water Management Fund**

Accounts	Plan Budget	Actual (Revenue & Expenses)	PO Commit (Remaining PO Balance)	Actual + PO	Available (Budget Minus Actual + PO)	Avail%	PreCommit (PO's Requested)	Available (Budget Minus PO Requisitions)	Avail%
Interest-Pooled Inv.	27,760.00-	20,793.96-		20,793.96-	6,966.04-	25-		6,966.04-	25-
RGL Pooled Inv.		306.91		306.91	306.91-			306.91-	
URGL Pooled Inv.		1,596.39		1,596.39	1,596.39-			1,596.39-	
Water Surcharge 1.5%	1,533,311.00-	1,417,847.92-		1,417,847.92-	115,463.08-	8-		115,463.08-	8-
** REVENUE	1,561,071.00-	1,436,738.58-		1,436,738.58-	124,332.42-	8-		124,332.42-	8-
Professional Services	1,703,700.00	828,080.27	771,661.69	1,599,741.96	103,958.04	6		103,958.04	6
WRWC Staff & Legal	462,000.00	453,831.35		453,831.35	8,168.65	2.46		8,168.65	2.46
Fin Consult Services	10,000.00	8,500.00	8,500.00	17,000.00	7,000.00-	70-		7,000.00-	70-
Invest Pool Alloc Ex		1,518.61		1,518.61	1,518.61-			1,518.61-	
Lobbying Services	600.00	600.00		600.00					
Office Supplies		597.51		597.51	597.51-			597.51-	
Pmts to O Agencies	514,000.00	426,648.00	267,148.00	693,796.00	179,796.00-	35-		179,796.00-	35-
Telephone Land Lines		63.21		63.21	63.21-			63.21-	
Seminars and Meetings	1,000.00	420.69		420.69	579.31	58		579.31	58
Support Service - Reim		13,112.01		13,112.01	13,112.01-			13,112.01-	
Advertising	1,000.00	398.00		398.00	602.00	60		602.00	60
Undesignated Budget	28,000.00	284.97		284.97	27,715.03	99		27,715.03	99
Insurance Premium		3,269.00		3,269.00	3,269.00-			3,269.00-	
Travel	1,000.00	371.00		371.00	629.00	63		629.00	63
Overhead	62,880.53	123,601.94		123,601.94	60,721.41-	4.04		60,721.41-	4.04
Build Imp nonCapital	12,000.00	10,000.00		10,000.00	2,000.00	17		2,000.00	17
** EXPENDITURES	2,796,180.53	1,871,296.56	1,047,309.69	2,918,606.25	122,425.72-	4-		122,425.72-	4-
*** Total	1,235,109.53	434,557.98	1,047,309.69	1,481,867.67	246,758.14-	20-		246,758.14-	20-

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 30, 2015

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Report on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (“TMRPA”) parcel-based population and employment modeling project

Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager, will provide a brief verbal report concerning the status of the TMRPA parcel-based population and employment modeling project.

JS:jd