

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

Wednesday, February 1, 2017

1:30 p.m.

Washoe County Commission Chambers
1001 East Ninth 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, moved to or from the Consent Items section, 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 Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager, (775) 954-4657, 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 (775) 954-4657 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), Sun Valley GID (5000 Sun Valley Blvd.), Truckee Meadows Water Authority (1355 Capital Blvd.), Washoe County Administration Building (1001 E. Ninth Street), 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 January 4, 2017, meeting. **(For Possible Action)**
5. Review, discussion and possible direction to staff regarding comments received on the draft "Issues and Action Plan" chapter for inclusion in the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan ("RWMP") update – Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager. **(For Possible Action)**
6. Review, discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the draft Regional Water Balance for possible inclusion in the "Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow" chapter of the 2016 RWMP update – Jim Smitherman and John Buzzone, Stantec. **(For Possible Action)**

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission Agenda for February 1, 2017

7. 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)**
8. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the schedule for final review of the draft 2016 RWMP update – Jim Smitherman. **(For Possible Action)**
9. Review draft Fiscal Year 2017 – 2018 Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”) tentative budget; discussion and possible recommendation to the WRWC to approve the tentative budget – Jim Smitherman. **(For Possible Action)**
10. Program Manager’s Report – Jim Smitherman. *
 - a. Report on the status of projects and Work Plan supported by the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”);
 - b. Financial Report on the RWMF.
11. Discussion regarding location and possible agenda items for the March 1, 2017 NNWPC meeting, and other future meetings, and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman. **(For Possible Action)**
12. Commission comments. *
13. Staff comments. *
14. Public Comments. * (Three-minute time limit per person.)
15. Adjournment. **(For Possible Action)**

*Indicates a non-action item

DRAFT - MINUTES
NORTHERN NEVADA WATER PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

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 Chair Flansberg at 1:31 p.m.

1. Roll Call and Determination of Presence of a Quorum

Voting Members Present: John Flansberg, Michael DeMartini, Michael Drinkwater, John Enloe, Bill Hauck, Mickey Hazelwood, Darrin Price, John Zimmerman

Voting Members Absent: Danielle Henderson, John Martini, David Solaro

Non-Voting Members Present: Thomas Pyeatte

Non-Voting Members Absent: Cindy Turiczek, Harry Fahnestock, My-Linh Nguyen

Staff Members Present: Jim Smitherman; Chris Wessel; Donna Fagan; and John Rhodes, Legal Counsel

2. Public Comment

None

3. Approval of Agenda (For Possible Action)

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PRICE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. Approval of Minutes from the December 7, 2016, Meeting (For Possible Action)

COMMISSIONER PRICE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 7, 2016, MINUTES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HAZELWOOD. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

5. Presentation on Water Supply Outlook for 2017 – Bill Hauck, Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA).

Commissioner Hauck gave a presentation on the regional water supply outlook for 2017. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation will be filed with the minutes for the record. There were no questions from the Commissioners.

No action was taken.

6. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding review and possible revisions to the “Issues and Action Plan” chapter for inclusion in the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan (“RWMP”) update - Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman presented an overview of the staff report. This chapter is posted on the website without redline edits. Commissioners can review the chapter and provide redline comments

electronically in Word or print out a hard copy to edit by hand and send it to Mr. Smitherman. Mr. Smitherman will also accept comments for this chapter by phone if needed.

No action was taken.

(Recess at 1:46 p.m. for audio technical check. Back to order at 1:52 p.m.)

7. Review, discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the draft Regional Water Balance for possible inclusion in the “Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow” chapter of the 2016 RWMP update – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman presented an overview of the staff report and provided an update on the status of the Regional Water Balance model. Once confirmation is received from service providers on some of the details on that model, a draft final product will be prepared for review at the next NNWPC meeting.

No action was taken.

8. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding review and possible revisions to the “Cost and Financing” chapter for inclusion in the 2016 RWMP update - Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman presented an overview of the staff report for this chapter.

Commissioner Drinkwater discussed the CIP funding table and noted that it is not capturing all of the CIPs. Mr. Smitherman will follow up on that with Hansford Economic Consulting.

Commissioner Drinkwater noted that some of the language regarding the sewer connection fee implies that it discourages infill. If that is not the intent, some language about being revenue neutral would be appropriate.

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 direction to staff regarding the NNWPC schedule for final review of the draft 2016 RWMP update - Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman presented an overview of the staff report reviewing a possible schedule for Plan adoption. The schedule would allow for the NNWPC to make a recommendation for adoption to the WRWC at a public hearing on March 1, 2107. This schedule would require that all comments for changes are received by February 8, 2017. At the earliest this schedule has a final adoption date of April 19, 2017.

COMMISSIONER DEMARTINI MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE SCHEDULE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

11. Program Manager’s Report – Jim Smitherman.

- A. Report on the status of projects and Work Plan supported by the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”)

B. Financial report on the RWMF

Mr. Smitherman presented an overview of the staff reports for these items.

12. Discussion regarding location and possible agenda items for the February 1, 2017, NNWPC meeting, and other future meetings, and possible direction to staff – Jim Smitherman. (For Possible Action)

Mr. Smitherman stated that the February NNWPC meeting will be held in the Washoe County Commission Chambers.

Possible future agenda items will include:

- Review of changes to the RWMP update and schedule; and any other standing items
- Project budget details for the next fiscal year

Mr. Smitherman confirmed for Commissioner Price that he and John Rhodes have registered as lobbyists.

No action was taken.

13. Commission Comments

Chair Flansberg requested that Mr. Smitherman send an email to the Commissioners with links to each of the draft chapters.

14. Staff Comments

None

15. Public Comment

None

16. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

COMMISSIONER ENLOE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 2:09 P.M., SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PRICE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Approved by:

John Flansberg, Chairman

APPROVED BY COMMISSION IN SESSION ON _____, 2017.

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 26, 2017

TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resource Program Manager

SUBJECT: Review, discussion and possible direction to staff regarding comments received on the draft "Issues and Action Plan" chapter for inclusion in the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan ("RWMP") update.

SUMMARY

At the January 4, 2017 meeting of the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission ("NNWPC"), staff provided redline revisions to the draft Issues and Action Plan chapter for inclusion in the RWMP 2016 update. Commissioners were asked to send comments to staff. The attached redline edits reflect the comments received. This chapter identifies current and future issues which will likely require action during the 5-year planning horizon.

In addition to the attached chapter, which shows recommended edits, the chapter in final draft form (without the redline strikeout edits) is available at the following website: <http://www.wrwc.us/draft.html> . Staff anticipates that the content, general organization and informational flow will not change significantly from their present state. However, final review for spelling, grammar, and consistent use of terminology, acronyms, references, section numbers, figure numbers and other non-substantive matters has not yet been completed.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC accept the final draft Issues and Action Plan chapter for inclusion in the draft RWMP 2016 update, pending final editorial review, and provide direction to staff as appropriate.

JS:df

Attachment: final draft Issues and Action Plan with redline edits

Table of Contents

Chapter 9 – Issues and Action Plan	9-2
9.1 Municipal Water Resources.....	9-3
9.1.1 Central Truckee Meadows.....	9-3
9.1.2 South Truckee Meadows.....	9-5
9.1.3 Stead / Lemmon Valley.....	9-9
9.1.4 Cold Springs.....	9-9
9.1.5 Spanish Springs.....	9-11
9.1.6 Lower Truckee River.....	9-13
9.1.7 Groundwater Resource Development and Impact to Domestic Wells.....	9-14
9.2 Water Conservation.....	9-18
9.3 Wastewater Management.....	9-20
9.3.1 Central Truckee Meadows.....	9-20
9.3.2 South Truckee Meadows.....	9-22
9.3.3 Stead / Lemmon Valley.....	9-24
9.3.4 Cold Springs.....	9-26
9.3.5 Lower Truckee River.....	9-27
9.3.6 Septic Systems and Water Quality.....	9-28
9.4 Truckee Meadows NPDES Storm Water Discharge Permit.....	9-31
9.5 Integrated Use of Water Rights.....	9-32
9.6 Water Resources and Land Use Planning.....	9-34
9.7 Local Government Drainage Programs.....	9-36
9.8 Regional Flood Plain Management and Flood Control.....	9-37
9.9 Groundwater Quality Protection and Remediation.....	9-38
9.9.1 Groundwater Remediation.....	9-38
9.9.2 Groundwater Protection.....	9-39

List of Tables

Table 9-1 WRWC/NNWPC Proposed Action Plan.....	9-36
Table 9-2 Issues and Proposed Action Items.....	9-38

Chapter 9 – Issues and Action Plan

Purpose and Scope

The following sections develop summaries of regional water management issues that are introduced and discussed in preceding chapters. Summaries briefly discuss work that has been performed in response to the issues, identify alternatives if developed, and identify work needed to respond to remaining and newly identified issues. Proposed Action Items shown in Table 9-1 are recommendations for future work intended to guide the focus and activities of the Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”) and the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (“NNWPC”) for the next five years.

Introduction

Planning is an ongoing, iterative and evolutionary process that must adapt to changing conditions in the Planning Area. Uncertainty associated with changes that may occur over the next five years with factors such as the economy, funding sources for major infrastructure, population growth trends, the legal and regulatory environment, and climate projections, affect the recommendations for future work and the priority of those recommendations significantly. In addition, unforeseen developments may require entirely new future-work recommendations.

The following issue summaries are organized by category and as appropriate, geographic area, within a category. Key points are identified and briefly discussed under “Specific Issues and Linkages”. “Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues” summarizes work that has been performed in response to the issues. “Proposed Action Items” identify follow up activities proposed for the WRWC, NNWPC or other appropriate entities. Proposed Action Items under each of the numbered issue categories have unique identification numbers for reference in Table 9-1 and Table 9-2 (pages 9-36 and 9-38, respectively). Table 9-2 compiles Proposed Action Items related to all issues identified in this chapter. It also identifies a lead agency, coordinating agencies and whether the WRWC or NNWPC have a role in addressing the item. The table also indicates whether the item is currently being addressed by ongoing work, or expected to be addressed within the five-year *Regional Water Plan* update timeframe. The identification of lead and coordinating agencies is not intended to create a particular financial obligation on the part of any entity.

Table 9-1 includes only items for which the WRWC or NNWPC have a role and are to be addressed in the next five years. As stated above, this table is intended to provide guidance to the NNWPC and WRWC for work in the coming five years and form the basis for annual work plans. The NNWPC acknowledges that new information may result in the need to add or change the emphasis of Proposed Action Items, or eliminate them altogether, as may be appropriate from time to time.

9.1 Municipal Water Resources

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2016-2035 Water Resource Plan

Specific Issues and Linkages

Truckee Meadows Water Authority (“TMWA”) developed and adopted its *2016-2035 Water Resource Plan* (“*2035 Water Resource Plan*”) in March 2016. In December 2009, *TMWA’s 2030 Water Resource Plan* (“*2030 Water Resource Plan*”) was adopted following plan review, update, and/or modification of its water resource planning and management strategies. Key events that have occurred or been completed since adoption of the *TMWA 2030 Water Resource Plan* include:

- In response to the WRWC legislative directive to evaluate the potential consolidation of water purveyors in the Truckee Meadows, staffs of TMWA and Washoe County Department of Water Resources (“WDWR”) successfully merged the former Washoe County water utilities and the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (“STMGID”) into TMWA on December 31, 2014.
- The five Mandatory Signatory Parties - TMWA, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (“PLPT”), the United States, California and Nevada - completed all conditions precedent to implement TROA in the fall of 2015; TROA was implemented on December 1, 2015. TROA’s framework provides flexibility for river operations to allow parties to store water they previously could not store; significantly enhances TMWA’s drought reserves; allows the exchange of water to optimize the use of Truckee River supplies without injuring the water rights on which the parties rely; and resolves future regulatory uncertainties surrounding the use of the Truckee River.
- TMWA’s population forecast estimates total Washoe County population to increase by 95,000 from 450,000 in 2016 to 545,000 in 2035, or 21 percent; the estimated population served by TMWA will increase by 83,000 people from 392,000 in 2016 to 475,000 by 2035, or 21 percent. The population estimates may change over time as the pace of development within the region or its sub-area varies, and as the region moves towards greater intensification of land use. TMWA’s forecast results are statistically similar to the State Demographer’s near-term projections.
- Water demand-per-service within TMWA’s service areas has been decreasing over time resulting in slower total demand growth in TMWA’s extended forecast. Based on the review of current growth and economic trends in the region, future water demand is anticipated to grow in the central Truckee Meadows but at a slower pace than historically seen. The water production forecast for a typical year indicates that from 2016 to 2035, production will increase from current estimates for 2016 of approximately 83,000 AF to a projected 2035 demand of approximately 101,000 AF, or about 18,000 AF. The 2035 production is well within the maximum 119,000 acre feet per year (“AF/yr”) under TROA operations.

Linkages: Water rights balance with TROA implementation and wastewater effluent reuse.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

The adopted TMWA 2035 *Water Resource Plan* presents Key Findings and Recommended Actions associated with the issues identified above. These Key Findings and Recommendations are not reiterated within this Plan; however, several of the significant recommendations are summarized below. (Note: for further detail on these recommendations, the reader is referred to TMWA's 2035 *Water Resource Plan*, see Appendix B.)

TMWA Planning Area: As a result of the merger and expansion of the area that TMWA now plans for, determine the role and extent of TMWA's water resource planning subject to the constraints of TMWA's Joint Powers Authority.

Sustainability of Source Water Supplies -- Climate Variability: Continue to consider, when available, new findings from climate change research for the greater Truckee Meadows region; continue working with UNR, DRI, and other researchers to test climate change effects on TMWA's sources of supply; and engage UNR, DRI and/or other researchers to develop tree ring chronologies of the Truckee and Carson River watersheds for use in water resource planning and management during droughts and periods of drought recovery beyond historic, instrumental record.

Sustainability of Source Water Supplies Related to Drought: The TMWA Board continues to use for planning purposes the worst drought cycle of hydrologic record for the Truckee River.

Sustainability of Source Water Supplies -- Surface Water Contamination: The Continue to: (1) implement its source water protection strategies in cooperation with local entities; (2) maintain, as a minimum, the ability to meet daily indoor water use with its wells; and (3), for river outages lasting up to 7 days during the summer, maintain the ability to meet average daily water demands using its wells, treated water storage, and enhanced conservation measures.

Sustainability of Source Water Supplies -- Groundwater Contamination: Continue to: (1) provide safe drinking water in all areas affected by PCE and septic effluent; (2) investigate the impact to groundwater from PCE and septic effluent; (3) work closely with local jurisdictions to find resources and strategies to convert residences and businesses on septic to sewer; and (4) utilize aquifer recharge as a potential strategy to keep contaminated water away from production wells.

Sustainability of Source Water Supplies -- Groundwater Management: Continue to: (1) reduce impacts to groundwater by pumping municipal wells strategically; (2) allow water levels to recover through passive groundwater recharge; and (3) force water level recovery through active groundwater recharge. Increasing the breadth and scope of all three of these activities in areas formerly served by WDWR will help groundwater levels recover in areas most affected by groundwater level declines.

Sustainability of Source Water Supplies –Aquifer Storage and Recovery: Continue and expand the injection of treated surface water into groundwater aquifers to: (1) augment groundwater supplies which provide additional drought and peak-demand capacity; (2) reduce or eliminate water quality concerns; and (3) stabilize and increase groundwater levels. Increasing the breadth and scope of all three of these activities throughout the service area will help groundwater levels recover and may help reduce the impact from septic, industrial, and naturally-occurring contaminants.

Water Rights Availability: Continue to accept the dedication of Truckee River water rights in the growth prone Truckee Meadows, Spanish Springs and upper, west Pleasant Valley, which water rights are sufficient to support both TROA implementation and increased future development needs within TRA; recognize NVIP is available to meet future demands in the North Valleys, and unless other resources are available in the non-TRA systems, these systems are limited to the resources dedicated for the development within the system’s service area..

Conjunctive Management of Water Resources: Continue to rely on TMWA’s pool of resources to meet current demands and recognize TROA can provide drought-year operational benefits in excess of current drought-year reserves thereby supporting future demands and continue to monitor TMWA’s ability to meet current and future demands through the 1987 to 1994 drought period, the worst drought period of record, and based on factors such as demand growth, conservation improvements, hydrologic cycles, climate changes, etc., update the Board when future conditions evolve that require changes to the planning criteria or supply operation.

Water Demand Management: Accept the Water Conservation Plan outlined in the 2035WRP.

Future Water Resources: Continue to investigate, evaluate, and negotiate, where appropriate, other potential water supply projects consistent with and/or in addition to TROA..

Proposed Action Items

9.1.A Drought Standard – The NNWPC recommends the use of the 8-Year Drought Cycle, from 1987 to 1994 for consistency with TROA and TMWA planning, and review as necessary during the next update of this Plan.

9.1.B Water Supply Development – Continue to investigate sustainable water supply projects that are socially, economically and environmentally feasible and that can be implemented to ensure water supplies are available, as future demands require.

9.1.C Participate in the Desert Research Institute (“DRI”) cloud seeding program for the Lake Tahoe basin and the Truckee River basin, and coordinate with DRI’s efforts to continue the cloud seeding program statewide and support reinstatement of state funding.

9.1.D Adopt TMWA’s 2016-2035 *Water Resource Plan* into the 2016 *Regional Water Plan*.

Relevant Planning Documents

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2016, 2016-2035 *Water Resource Plan*

Truckee River Operating Agreement, 2008, www.usbr.gov/mp/troa/final/troa_final_09-08_full.pdf

9.1.1 Creation of New Water Systems

After consolidation of Washoe County’s water utility into TMWA, Washoe County revised Article 422, which now allows for the creation of new, privately owned water utilities within unincorporated Washoe County. Policy 1.2.h addresses Washoe County’s revised development code, requiring a development/property owner to comply with TMWA or other applicable

regulatory requirements and standards for infrastructure and to ensure adequate water supply. In addition, there are approximately 70 public water systems in Washoe County, many of which are single-well systems typically serving developments such as a small number of commercial buildings or a mobile home park. Most of these systems exist within municipal boundaries and are not subject to Article 422. From time to time, TMWA has discussions with owners of these kinds of systems about possible expansion, acquisition or service from TMWA.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

Prior to acquisition or providing service, TMWA typically requires systems to be improved to its standards, in part to avoid placing the cost of acquisition or service on existing customers. New systems, or those proposing to expand, would likely be regulated by the PUCN, which would allow TMWA to participate in proceedings. When new systems or expansions are proposed, regional consistency throughout TMWA's possible future service area (i.e. hydrographic basins where TMWA has facilities) would ensure standardized facilities in case of eventual requests for service or acquisition.

Proposed Action Items

9.1.1.A. Coordinate with TMWA on the development of possible policy recommendations to local governments regarding standards for the creation of new water systems and expansion or acquisition of existing water systems within municipal boundaries.

Relevant Planning Documents

Washoe County Development Code, Article 422

9.1.2 South Truckee Meadows

Specific Issues and Linkages

In 2002, Washoe County through the Regional Water Planning Commission ("RWPC"), WCDWR and South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District ("STMGID"), completed an update to the water facility plans for the South Truckee Meadows. The *South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan* (ECO:LOGIC, 2002) provides a comprehensive water supply plan for build-out of the planning area, which encompasses an area stretching from just north of Double Diamond Ranch south to Pleasant Valley, east to the Virginia Foothills and west to Galena Forest.

The major goals of the Facility Plan were to:

- Utilize the creek resources to their highest and best beneficial uses, and balance beneficial municipal and industrial ("M&I") uses with in-stream flow requirements for recharge, wildlife, riparian habitat, aesthetics and quality of life

- Ensure that recommended plans for water supplies and facilities conform to regional wastewater disposal / water quality requirements at the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (“STMWRF”) and Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (“TMWRF”)
- Allow development to proceed in a phased approach, keeping upfront capital costs low and total water service costs competitive, and provide reliable and economical utility service to the South Truckee Meadows
- Promote system integration, conjunctive use and expand reclaimed water service to maximize the efficient use of water resources and facilities

A number of changes in the basic planning data, such as modifications to planned land uses and planning area, unit demands, growth rate and changes in the location of available water resources, prompted a plan update. The *South Truckee Meadows Water Facility Plan Update* (ECO:LOGIC, 2009):

- Revised projected water demands based on the current planning area, existing and planned land uses and accepted unit demands.
- Updated the recommended water supply scenario presented in the 2002 *South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan* based on revised demands, new facility and water supply information, phasing plans and updated groundwater pumping projections.
- Incorporated groundwater modeling analyses to evaluate potential impacts to groundwater levels given new pumping scenarios and evaluates potential mitigation measures to groundwater drawdown if required.
- Updated the South Truckee Meadows and Hidden Valley water distribution system hydraulic models with current demand projections and water supply sources.
- Provided planning level opinions of probable cost for recommended facilities with project considerations and cost projections consistent with the requirements of NRS 278B.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

After consolidation, TMWA began planning for conjunctive use management of surface water and groundwater in the upper Mt. Rose and Galena Fan areas due to the complete dependence on groundwater and the continued decline in water levels aggravated by the ongoing drought. With the full resources of the consolidated water utility available, immediate construction of the necessary facilities has begun. This will improve reliability for both TMWA customers and domestic well owners by mitigating the continued decline of groundwater levels in the area.

TMWA is implementing a \$7.8 million conjunctive-use plan for the Mt. Rose/Galena Fan area, consisting of three projects which will provide the ability to deliver treated surface water from the Truckee River to the area:

- Arrowcreek/Mt. Rose Conjunctive-Use Facilities
- Expanded Conjunctive-Use Facilities/ASR Program
- STMGID Conjunctive-Use Facilities

The Arrowcreek/Mt. Rose Conjunctive-Use Facilities, Phase 1 will deliver up to 1,500 gpm of surface water primarily during the winter months allowing TMWA to avoid pumping its production wells in the Arrowcreek and Mt. Rose water systems.

TMWA is also expanding its fall, winter and spring ASR in this area starting with the Arrowcreek 2, Tessa West and Mt Rose 3 wells. Phase 2 of the Arrowcreek/Mt. Rose conjunctive-use facilities, scheduled to be constructed in 2016-2017, consists of system improvements that will allow delivery of surface water into the upper portions of the Mt. Rose/Galena water system for use in recharging additional wells.

The STMGID Conjunctive-Use Facilities will provide surface water mainly during the winter for an area primarily of former STMGID customers located near the Saddlehorn neighborhood. A new pipeline in Arrowcreek Parkway and a new booster pump will be constructed in 2017-2018, benefiting TMWA customers and domestic well owners by providing surface water to protect and restore groundwater resources.

Newly adopted rules and water service facility charges for the Mt. Rose/Galena Fan area affecting new development, along with existing TMWA water rights dedication rules, require developers in this area to dedicate supplemental surface water (creek) supplies when dedicating groundwater for new service in the area. Supplemental surface water resources (Whites, Thomas and/or Galena creeks) are a key component of the conjunctive resource management plan and necessary to ensure a sustainable water supply for existing customers, domestic well owners and new development in these areas.

Surface water from Whites, Thomas and Galena creeks has historically been used for agricultural irrigation. These creeks remain a key part of the regional water resources for the South Truckee Meadows. For instance, the creeks are used to augment the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility reclaimed water supply. The State Engineer also permits the use of these creek rights for water service.

In order to develop supplemental surface water supplies that will provide for the long term sustainability of the local groundwater aquifer, TMWA is implementing a plan to construct a small water treatment plant off of Whites and Thomas Creeks. Plans for this treatment plant were approved as part of the 2002 South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan, which recognized that “The upper treatment plant is an integral component of the recommended water supply plan. Most importantly, it will provide recharge water and/or offset winter groundwater pumping in the upper Mt. Rose fan area.”

Proposed Action Items

9.1.2.A Develop tributary creek water for municipal supply by way of the Mt Rose Water Treatment Plant, continue the tributary creek water exchange program and investigate other options to improve the beneficial uses of the tributary creek resources.

9.1.2.B Support TMWA’s Plan for Groundwater Sustainability on the Mt Rose Fan to mitigate future groundwater level declines and potential impacts to domestic wells.

Relevant Planning Documents

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2016, *2016-2035 Water Resource Plan*

ECO:LOGIC, 2009, *South Truckee Meadows Water Facility Plan Update*, prepared for Washoe County Department of Water Resources.

ECO:LOGIC, 2002, *South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan*, prepared for the Regional Water Planning Commission, Washoe County Department of Water Resources, and South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District.

9.1.3 Stead / Lemmon Valley

Specific Issues and Linkages

The WCDWR *2009-2028 Draft North Valleys Water Facility Plan* (ECO:LOGIC, 2009) identified the water resources necessary to serve the former Washoe County (now TMWA) service areas. These supplies are fully developed (local groundwater, imported Truckee River water, and imported Fish Springs Ranch groundwater) and TMWA has developed the infrastructure necessary to distribute these water supplies. TMWA has also developed plans for water facilities to supply Fish Springs water to Cold Springs Valley to the west. The 2035 Regional Water Balance identifies a water supply imbalance between the two basins that will need to be addressed over the long term (see Cold Springs, below).

Relevant Planning Documents

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2016, *2016-2035 Water Resource Plan*

ECO:LOGIC, 2009, *2009-2028 Draft North Valleys Water Facility Plan*, prepared for WCDWR.

9.1.4 Cold Springs

Specific Issues and Linkages

The demand for potable water supplies in Cold Springs will be met in the future using a combination of local groundwater resources, augmented with imported water supplies, such as the Fish Springs and Intermountain water importation projects. The 2035 Regional Water Balance identifies a water supply imbalance in both Cold Springs and Lemmon Valleys that will need to be addressed over the long term. In particular, the combined demand from domestic wells and permitted municipal groundwater pumping exceeds the perennial yield of the Cold Springs basin. This is an issue that affects both existing and future water users and exists under both current and projected 2035 conditions.

Plans have been developed for proposed TMWA water facilities to integrate with the existing Utilities Inc. water system. Potential infrastructure savings could be realized with a conjunctive use operation of the two water systems.

Wastewater and storm water linkages:

- Nitrate contamination of groundwater has been observed in areas with high densities of septic tanks. The *1995-2015 Regional Water Plan* expressed concern over continued installation of septic tanks in this hydrographic basin.
- Importation of a new water supply into the Cold Springs hydrographic basin would result in the generation of additional effluent and storm water run-off volume in this closed basin.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

- New development in Cold Springs is designed to minimize water consumption in order to extend the available water resources as far as possible
- TMWA has developed plans for water facilities to supply Fish Springs water to Cold Springs Valley via a wholesale agreement with Utilities Inc.
- A Cold Springs developer has consulted with WCCSD hydrology staff to determine the sustainable yield of the existing and proposed Utilities Inc. production wells
- The potential future water demands associated with development in Cold Springs were included in the *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan* (ECO:LOGIC, 2007), and the 2035 Regional Water Balance presented in Section 6.3.

Water resource management options are available to help mitigate the potential negative impacts due to the long-term imbalance. For instance:

- A portion of the supply from the Fish Springs Water Importation Project could be used to serve new growth.
- Conversion of domestic wells to the municipal water system, (municipal water systems are able to utilize and manage the groundwater resources more efficiently).
- Expanded groundwater recharge utilizing available water resources from basins with surplus water.
- Consider integrating plans for proposed facilities with the existing Utilities Inc. water system. Potential infrastructure savings could be realized with a conjunctive use operation of the two water systems.
- Consider expanded uses of reclaimed water, such as for groundwater recharge, to offset future potable water demands.

Subsequent Activities and Additional Work Needed

9.1.4.A Develop a facility plan for the build-out of approved land uses in the Cold Springs portion of the TMSA, including conjunctive use and system integration options with Utilities Inc.

Relevant Planning Documents

ECO:LOGIC, 2010, *North Valleys Initiative: Advancing Solutions to Regional Water Issues*, prepared for the NNWPC.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*, prepared for the City of Reno, Washoe County and RWPC.

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *Fish Springs Ranch Facility Plan*

ECO:LOGIC, 2002, *North Valleys Water Supply Comparison*, prepared for the RWPC

JBR Environmental Consultants and Montgomery Watson, 1997, *Water Supply Alternatives Evaluation for the North Valleys*, prepared for the Washoe County Department of Comprehensive Planning.

9.1.5 Spanish Springs

Specific Issues and Linkages

Spanish Springs Valley includes water service areas within the jurisdictions of Sparks and Washoe County. Demands are served by TMWA from a combination of Truckee River water, Truckee Meadows groundwater and Spanish Springs groundwater pumped from TMWA wells managed as part of TMWA's overall resource management plan. TMWA began aquifer storage and recovery operations in Spanish Springs in 2008 and increased the volume of water stored each successive year. In 2015, 1,055 acre feet were stored.

- Issues identified in the *1995-2015 Regional Water Plan (RWPC, 1997)*, the *2004-2025 Regional Water Plan (RWPC, 2005)*, the *Spanish Springs Valley Groundwater Budget Analysis (ECO:LOGIC, 2004)*, and the *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan (ECO:LOGIC, 2007)* were related to future water demands as a result of possible growth in the unincorporated area, water quality impacts due to existing growth and diminishing groundwater recharge. Allocation of groundwater resources in Spanish Springs had resulted in a situation where water rights and cumulative groundwater pumping by all entities exceeded the perennial yield of groundwater resources. Land use changes from irrigated agriculture to residential, commercial and industrial uses had resulted in reduction of recharge occurring from surface water irrigation via the Orr Ditch, which had potentially exacerbated groundwater deficits.

Linkages: Nitrate contamination of groundwater because of septic tank density.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

A number of actions have been taken to manage water resources for long-term sustainability in the Spanish Springs Valley. WCDWR began implementation of a strategy developed in a series of reports and plans from 2004 to 2007 to address water rights and groundwater pumping imbalances by decreasing reliance on groundwater and using more water resources imported from the Truckee Meadows basin. Most recently, in December 2014, Washoe County's water utility was consolidated into TMWA. Coordination of stakeholders within the basin is key to the success of a long-term groundwater management strategy. A brief chronology of alternatives and actions appears below.

- In 1996, WCDWR adopted policies requiring the dedication of water rights when new parcels are created via the parcel map process in an effort to better balance water rights and water resources and enable future mitigation of possible water level declines.
- In 1997, the United States Geological Survey ("USGS") developed a groundwater model of the Spanish Springs hydrographic basin detailing the sources and quantity of the groundwater resource.
- In 2002, WCDWR developed a multi-faceted plan for the management of nitrates in the aquifer, including conversion of septic tanks to the sewer system as funding becomes available.

- In 2003, the RWPC developed water policies seeking to ensure that new commitments against the groundwater resource do not exceed the sustainable yield.
- WCDWR prepared the 2004 *Spanish Springs Water Facility Plan*, a comprehensive plan that identifies the water resources and infrastructure required to serve build-out of approved land uses in the unincorporated area.
- The RWPC sponsored preparation of the 2004 *Orr Ditch Recharge Study* that includes long-term water balance and management strategies for the Spanish Springs hydrographic basin.
- In 2006, WCDWR entered into a wholesale agreement for importation of 3,000 afa of TMWA resources to serve future growth in the unincorporated area.
- In 2006, Sparks extended TMWRF reclaimed water infrastructure far into the valley, enabling the use of reclaimed water to offset demands on the municipal water system.
- In 2007, WCDWR completed Phase 1A of the Spanish Springs Phased Sewer Project, which converted 211 residential units and an elementary school from septic systems to community sewer for protection of groundwater quality.
- TMWA and WCDWR completed construction of interties at Canoe Hill, Campello and Lazy Five Parkway and WCDWR has implemented conjunctive use of groundwater and imported water by way of these interties.
- In 2009, WCDWR integrated the Desert Springs, Spring Creek and Spring Creek East water systems into a single system for operational flexibility and reliability.
- In December 2014, WCDWR's water utility was consolidated into TMWA.
- In 2015, based on permits issued by Nevada Division of Environmental Protection ("NDEP") and State Engineer, TMWA recharged 985 af in its Hawkins Court Well and 70 af into its Desert Springs 4 well.
- In 2017, TMWA will initiate pilot water treatment efforts for removal of nitrate and arsenic from groundwater.

Subsequent Activities and Additional Work Needed

9.1.5.A Monitor groundwater pumping and aquifer water levels to avoid long-term over-pumping. Use Truckee River water resources for conjunctive use and mitigation of water quality issues. Support TMWA's pilot water treatment efforts for removal of nitrate and arsenic from groundwater.

9.1.5.B Continue implementing phased conversion of areas with high densities of septic tanks to community sewer system as funding is made available.

Relevant Planning Documents

AMEC, 2000, *Sparks Effluent Pipeline Extension*, prepared for City of Sparks.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*, prepared for the City of Reno, Washoe County and RWPC.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *Spanish Springs Water Facility Plan Update*, prepared for WCDWR.

ECO:LOGIC, 2004, *Orr Ditch Recharge Study*, prepared for RWPC.

ECO:LOGIC, 2004, *Spanish Springs Water Facility Plan*, prepared for WCDWR.

RWPC, 2005, 2004-2025 Washoe County Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan.

RWPC, 1997, 1995-2015 Washoe County Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan.

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2010, *Report on Aquifer Storage and Recovery, Spanish Springs Valley Hydrographic Basin, Jan 1 through June 30, 2010*.

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2003, *2005–2025 Water Resource Plan*.

US Geological Survey, 1997, *Hydrogeology and Simulated Effects of Urban Development on Water Resources of Spanish Springs Valley, Washoe County, West-Central Nevada*, Water Resources Investigations Report 96-4297.

Washoe County Department of Water Resources, 2002, *Spanish Springs Valley Nitrate Occurrence Facility Plan*, prepared for the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection.

9.1.6 Tracy Segment (Lower Truckee River)

Specific Issues and Linkages

Industrially zoned lands are concentrated in the Mustang, Patrick / Tracy and USA Parkway areas. Existing wells are low volume producers, although there are well locations that show promise. Planning evaluations concluded that the use of existing wells has a lower overall cost than importation of water from Sparks, even with expected treatment requirements to meet drinking water standards. Industrial users have proposed the use of 4,000 afa of TMWRF reclaimed water via a new pipeline. The reclaimed water would be used for cooling and other industrial purposes. Initial water service for Reno Technology Park (“RTP”) is provided by wells using 1,125 af of permitted groundwater rights and induction wells using x af of Truckee River rights. [John Enloe to edit](#)

Linkages: Joint water supply planning and facility sharing with Storey County may reduce overall costs and infrastructure requirements.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

Facility planning identified proposed industrial development along the lower Truckee River, which will require the construction of water supply and distribution facilities. Key issues include:

- Cost and phasing of facilities and water rights.
- Mustang Area Water: Provide water supply improvements (existing wells) and distribution facilities to serve 20 parcels with 261 developable acres.
- Tracy Area Water: Provide water supply improvements and distribution facilities serving three pressure zones, serving 10 parcels covering 891 developable acres.

Proposed Action Items

9.1.6.B Coordination with Storey County regarding existing commitments and future potential demands for the entire Tracy Segment hydrographic basin.

Relevant Planning Documents

AGRA Infrastructure, 2000, *Water and Wastewater Facility Plans on Industrial Zoned Lands Along the Lower Truckee River within Washoe County*, prepared for RWPC.

Stantec Consultants, 2008, *City of Sparks TMSA/FSA Conceptual Facility Master Plan*

9.1.7 Truckee Canyon (Verdi)

Specific Issues and Linkages

The Boomtown water system is proposing an expansion to service new residential and commercial development. The additional demand would increase Boomtown's groundwater pumping to approximately 400 af/yr. Taking into consideration the planned development in the Verdi area, the long-term sustainable yield of the Verdi area groundwater resource is uncertain, and it is not known whether the long-term yield is sufficient without creating "unreasonable adverse effects" to neighboring domestic wells.

Presently, the Verdi area relies solely on groundwater. The Truckee River dominates the water resources of the Verdi basin, with two perennial streams, Dog Creek (Verdi Range) and Roberts Creek (Carson Range) tributary to the river as are minor ephemeral streams. Canal diversions from the Truckee River, used for power generation, result in no net loss to the river. Historically, leakage occurred from the Verdi Power Canal. However, this leakage has been substantially reduced, and what leakage does occur generally returns to the river. The Steamboat Ditch diverts Truckee River water for irrigation to the Truckee Meadows and loses some water to infiltration and riparian vegetation. Wastewater disposal is provided by individual septic systems, a small private wastewater treatment system serving Gold Ranch and municipal sewer service to TMWRF provided to the Boomtown commercial area and Verdi Meadows residents by the City of Reno.

Historically, Washoe County conducted water well measurements on 156 wells, mostly domestic, during the period of 2002 – 2007. From these measurements and study of lithologic logs, two aquifer systems are indicated (HYDRO-GEO Consulting Services, Ltd, 2016): an alluvial aquifer coincident with the Truckee River corridor and a fractured volcanic aquifer that is coupled to the alluvial aquifer. Data throughout the basin consistently indicates that the piezometric level in the volcanic aquifer is lower than the river, but varies considerably and at times rises above land surface under artesian pressure. Annual fluctuations of 60-80 feet have been measured in this aquifer. Water levels in the alluvial aquifer are generally very stable in elevation throughout the year and are at or above the river elevation by a few tens of feet, indicating a groundwater gradient towards the river.

The Verdi basin also has drinking water quality problems for arsenic, iron, manganese and hydrogen sulfide. The arsenic, iron and manganese constituents are derived from volcanic rocks and the hydrogen sulfide from poor grade lignite deposits within the lower sections of the Tertiary sediments.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

The Boomtown water system is an independent water system not associated with TMWA. TMWA expects the initial phases of the residential and commercial development to be served by the existing Boomtown water system without interconnection to TMWA. However, as demands increase over time, the capacity of the Boomtown water system will be reached, and a new surface water supply will be needed. TMWA has developed a long-range water facility plan for providing service to the Verdi area. The facility plan contemplates assimilation of several small private water systems and potentially the Boomtown water system into the TMWA system, with the addition of a series of pump stations, pipelines, and tanks as presented in Table 9-X. Conceptually, water supply to the Verdi area would follow TMWA's conjunctive use

operating strategy, with baseload demands supplied from TMWA’s existing surface water treatment plants, and summertime peaking capacity provided by the Boomtown wells.

Table 9-X
 Verdi Backbone Water Facility Requirements

	Dia.	Length	Total
	<u>(in.)</u>	<u>(ft.)</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Previous Expenditures			\$2,140,600
US 40 Pump Station Expansion			\$450,000
24" Mayberry River Xing	24	1700	\$912,000
16" Mogul Parallel Mains	16	6060	\$1,954,200
	20	480	\$202,000
Verdi #1 Pump Station			\$1,500,000
Verdi #1 PS Discharge Mains	18	7640	\$2,750,400
	18	4800	\$1,728,000
Lower Verdi Tank & Feeder Main	18	5400	\$3,055,200
	12	3500	<u>\$672,000</u>
			\$15,364,400

Facility cost estimates do not include interest carrying charges that have yet to be determined.

In the short term, TMWA proposes to construct an 18-inch transmission main from the terminus of the planned West Meadows development under the Truckee River to the vicinity of Riverbelle, including improvements to the Mogul pump station. These improvements will provide up to 200 gallons per minute of maximum day demand available to the Verdi area and/or the Boomtown water system. Additional groundwater modeling and water level monitoring will be needed to address the uncertainty associated with the long-term sustainable yield of the Verdi area groundwater resource as the area develops.

Proposed Action Items

9.1.7.A. Coordinate with public and private water purveyors and developers regarding water resources, existing commitments and future potential demands for the Truckee Canyon hydrographic basin.

Relevant Planning Documents

HYDRO-GEO Consulting Services, Ltd, 2016: Assessment of Groundwater Resources in the Verdi Area, emphasizing the Boomtown Water System. Consultant report prepared for Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Reno NV.

TMWA 2030 Facility Plan

9.1.8 Groundwater Resource Development and Impact to Domestic Wells

Specific Issues and Linkages

- A number of domestic wells have failed in two locations within the planning area because of declining water table elevations: Heppner Subdivision in north Lemmon Valley and the Mt. Rose Fan / Callahan Ranch area of the southwest Truckee Meadows. In a third location, Golden Valley, domestic wells have experienced water level declines in addition to septic system related water quality deterioration.
- Several factors can affect domestic wells including drought conditions and the natural variability of annual aquifer recharge, domestic well density, hydrogeologic conditions such as fractured rock aquifers having poor yields, inadequate aquifer penetration at initial construction, age and condition of the domestic well, and municipal groundwater pumping.
- Converting properties with domestic wells to municipal water supply is costly.
- Uncertainty and disagreement commonly exist regarding responsibility for resolving water supply issues in areas where municipal production wells co-exist with domestic wells.
- State water law recognizes the importance of domestic wells as appurtenances to private homes and creates a “protectible interest” to protect their water supply from unreasonable adverse effects caused by municipal, quasi-municipal or industrial uses which cannot be reasonably mitigated (NRS 533.024.2(b)).
- State water law allows the State Engineer to prohibit the drilling of domestic wells in areas where water can be furnished by an entity such as a water district or a municipality presently engaged in furnishing water to the inhabitants thereof (NRS 434.120.3(d)).

Linkages: Conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater resources in South Truckee Meadows

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

- A WCDWR program to model groundwater basins supports decision making for groundwater system operations and helps evaluate possible impacts of alternate long-term operating scenarios.
- The Golden Valley Recharge Project enhances water resources available to domestic wells.

- South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater resources includes a limitation on overall groundwater pumping from municipal wells that considers impacts to domestic wells.
- WCDWR and STMGID are providing opportunities for domestic well owners to connect to existing municipal water systems in the South Truckee Meadows.
- WCDWR is using federal grant funds to offer significantly reduced connection fees to Heppner Subdivision domestic well owners wishing to connect to the existing municipal water system.
- The Washoe County Groundwater Task Force was formed in November 2001 and a Final Report was completed in June 2003.
- The Washoe County Well Mitigation Hearing Board (“WMHB”), active from 2004 through 2008, reviewed 40 domestic well mitigation applications.
- Washoe County developed a new programmatic approach to treat all affected properties equitably, eliminate the burden on property owners of developing and presenting a claim to the WMHB, and reduce the wait-time and internal costs of providing mitigation.
- Washoe County also developed a legislatively-authorized financing program to assist property owners needing to connect to County water systems, primarily in Heppner and Callahan Ranch, but who are unable to afford up-front costs.
- Following the consolidation of public purveyors, TMWA developed plans to expand its system to provide Truckee River resources to areas formerly served by groundwater, e.g. the Mt. Rose Fan and Verdi areas. Additionally, TMWA is pursuing conjunctive use program that includes the proposed Mt. Rose Water Treatment Plant, discussed briefly in Section 9.1.2.

Proposed Action Items

9.1.8.A. Support expansion of TMWA’s Truckee River system to reach areas such as the Mt. Rose Fan and Verdi, to allow for conjunctive use. TMWA’s aquifer storage and recovery program provides secondary benefits to domestic wells locally, such as in Lemmon Valley. Indirect potable recharge may provide future benefits.

9.1.8.B Support TMWA’s Plan for Groundwater Sustainability on the Mt. Rose Fan to mitigate future groundwater level declines and potential impacts to domestic wells.

Relevant Planning Documents

ECO:LOGIC, 2002, *South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan*, prepared for the RWPC, Washoe County Department of Water Resources, and South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District.

RWPC Groundwater Task Force, 2003, *Final Report to the RWPC by the Groundwater Task Force*.

TMWA 2035 Water Resource Plan

TMWA 2030 Facility Plan

9.2 *Water Conservation*

Specific Issues and Linkages

Chapter 7 describes the benefits of water conservation and characterizes the development of water conservation efforts over time since the 1997 adoption of the initial Regional Water Management Plan. Important events affecting water conservation that have taken place since that time include:

Full metering
Revisions to NRS 540.141
Consolidation
TROA implementation
Governors Drought Forum

In December 2014 WC water utility and STMGID were consolidated into TMWA, expanding TMWA's customer base to about 90% of the Washoe County population. The *TMWA 2035 Water Resource Plan* includes a comprehensive water conservation plan that addresses each of the events listed above.

A summary of conservation issues in Chapter 7 includes the following:

- Under existing regulatory and legal constraints, water that is not diverted from the Truckee River as a result of conservation is left in the river, stored upstream in reservoirs for use during droughts or for fish and wildlife purposes, or used to recharge groundwater. This conserved water is not available to supply additional growth.
- The *1995-2015 Regional Water Plan* developed a "Base Case" conservation plan that included a suite of seven conservation measures to be implemented in the five-year timeframe following plan adoption. Conservation measures proposed included new building practices, showerhead retrofit, toilet retrofit, landscape efficiency conservation, good earth-keeping, increasing block water rates, and water meter retrofit. Although potable water demand projections used as the basis for the Base Case conservation have been revised using recent data, amendments to the *Regional Water Plan* in 2005 and 2009 state that the pursuit of Base Case conservation is desirable and beneficial to the planning area. In addition to monitoring water conservation progress, the *Regional Water Plan* will continue to evaluate whether existing conservation programs are effective and practicable, and whether programs should be added or deleted.
- In 2004, TMWA's Technical Advisory Committee ("TAC") formed a Landscape Subcommittee to address increasing customer complaints about landscape standards approved by the local governments and the lack of consistent enforcement of the water conservation elements of the ordinances. The subcommittee, comprised of three voting members representing Reno, Sparks and Washoe County, developed findings and recommendations regarding landscape ordinances (see Appendix H). RWPC staff participated in the development of the recommendations. TMWA and RWPC staff presented the final report to the Reno City Council, Sparks City Council and Washoe County Board of Commissioners at a joint meeting in 2005. At that meeting, the governing boards directed their respective staffs to prepare code amendments to address the findings and recommendations. The RWPC considered enforcement of the entities' landscaping ordinances to be a major objective and included this in the 2009

amendment to the *Regional Water Plan*. The RWPC also recommended working with the local entities and water purveyors on updating their landscaping ordinances, encouraging them to incorporate water efficiency design features for commercial and residential landscapes.

Action Taken / Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

Conservation measures that have been implemented include:

- Conservation ordinances have been adopted by all three local governments.
- Evapotranspiration (“ET”) weather station and irrigation controller studies have been completed.
- TMWA and WCDWR have implemented inverted block rate structures.
- TMWA connections are over 96 percent metered.
- The toilet retrofit program has been completed.
- TMWA has implemented a multi-faceted public awareness and education program, including water use review, landscape efficiency and 3-day per week assigned day watering.
- TMWA has been granted authority to enforce water-wasting regulations.
- Local governments have adopted new building codes.
- Various public education and professional development programs have been implemented, such as the Certified Landscape Technician Exam and Washoe Evapotranspiration Website.
- Expansion of the reclaimed water system to offset demands on potable water supplies.

Although Base Case conservation measures have been effectively implemented, Chapter 7 includes an extensive listing of additional conservation measures that could also be implemented for additional water savings.

The 2009 amendment to the *Regional Water Plan* recommends continuing to work with the local governmental entities and water purveyors on updating their landscape codes, and encouraging them to incorporate water efficiency design features for commercial and residential landscapes.

Subsequent Activities and Additional Work Needed

9.2.A Revise Chapter 7 and “Base Case” conservation for consistency with the TMWA 2035 Water Resource Plan, Chapter 5, which is tied to drought, Floriston Rates and TROA.

9.2.B Support and participate in the Water For The Seasons program, led by UNR, which investigates climate variability and potential water supply risks.

9.2.C. Continue long-term regional precipitation gauge monitoring and data analysis.

Relevant Planning Documents

Carlos, W. J., Miller, W., Devitt, D. A., Fernandez, G., 2004, *Evapotranspiration Satellite Irrigation Controller Study*

RWPC, 1997, 1995 – 2015 *Washoe County Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan*

TMWA, 2009, *2030 Water Resources Plan*

Volt VIEWtech, 2003, *Ultra Low Flush Toilet Rebate Program Final Report*. Prepared for the RWPC

9.3 Wastewater Management

9.3.1 Central Truckee Meadows

Specific Issues and Linkages

TMWRF provides centralized wastewater treatment for most of the community, including development in the central Truckee Meadows and portions of adjoining basins. To meet National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) permit requirements for discharge to the Truckee River, TMWRF must achieve balance between treatment process improvements, reclaimed water needs and water rights requirements, Truckee River water quality, and various other inter-related, regional water management objectives.

TMWRF has a permitted capacity of 44 MGD, a design capacity of 40 MGD, and currently operates at about 26 MGD. The actual maximum-month-flow design capacity of 40 MGD is due to increased biological oxygen demand (“BOD”) wastewater strength resulting from indoor water conservation (low flow fixtures and water meters) and inflow and infiltration (“I&I”) reduction. Despite the decrease from 44 to 40 MGD, the revised flow capacity accommodates 110 percent of the Phase III expansion design population (approximately 433,000 vs. 398,000) because the actual flow per residential unit is less than historical flow rates.

During the irrigation season, typically April through October, up to approximately 4,500 af of TMWRF reclaimed water is pumped to reuse sites in Reno and Sparks. TMWRF also serves as a regional biosolids facility, treating waste activated sludge from the Reno-Stead Water Reclamation Facility (“RSWRF”). TMWRF has an estimated replacement value of at least \$500 million.

Following is a concise listing of the key issues concerning TMWRF. Chapters 4 and 6 include more extensive discussions of these issues. Chapter 4 also includes further information on watershed management programs aimed at protecting water quality.

- Constraints on discharge to the Truckee River due to NPDES discharge permit requirements related to nutrient and TDS water quality standards and TMDLs for the Truckee River.
- Truckee River water rights dedications to meet return flow requirements may be needed for the possible future expansion of reclaimed water use, such as irrigation, year round industrial use of reclaimed water **possibly outside the TMSA**, groundwater recharge and/or indirect potable reuse. Water rights dedications are also necessary to maintain Truckee River in-stream flows and improve water quality, and for many other purposes. Section 9.5 addresses the integrated use of water rights.
- Based on: a) 2030 flow projections identified in the Regional Water Balance presented in Chapter 6, b) approximately 33,600 af is discharged annually to the river and, c) 4,000 af of reclaimed water is used for irrigation, roughly 7,700 af of additional disposal capacity will be required. **Need updated water balance from Stantec**

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

Enhanced Nitrogen Removal Planning Study

In 2013, following an upset at TMWRF resulting in a nitrogen discharge violation, the WRWC funded the Enhanced Nitrogen Removal Planning Study conducted by Carollo Engineers. The final Technical Memorandum prepared for the City of Reno identified three treatment technologies, one of which may be selected to supplement existing nitrogen treatment at TMWRF: enhanced coagulation; advanced oxidation; and reverse osmosis (“RO”). Additional evaluations of enhanced nitrogen removal technologies are ongoing.

Near-Term Effluent Management Strategy Development

The near-term effluent management issues focus on reducing the nitrogen load to the Truckee River by maximizing the use of Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (“TMWRF”) reclaimed water at locations away from the river in allowable quantities and during appropriate times of the year, while maintaining a balance with Truckee River flows consistent with State water law and TROA. A variety of alternatives and scenarios are being evaluated using population and employment growth projections to estimate wastewater flow increases over time. Alternatives include an intertie pipeline to Huffaker Reservoir, effluent reuse outside the TMWA, aquifer recharge and indirect potable reuse using effluent treated to exception quality standards.

Exceptional Quality Reclaimed Water Feasibility Study

The Team is jointly developing a feasibility study to evaluate whether the State of Nevada’s proposed “exceptional quality” standard for reclaimed water offers regional long-range water supply resiliency benefits. Criteria for exceptional quality reclaimed water, achieved through a series of advanced water treatment and natural processes, are included in proposed draft State regulations to permit the use of reclaimed water for groundwater augmentation. The Team envisions a 5-year feasibility study that consists of multiple elements including social, environmental and financial analyses, regulatory compliance, public engagement, advanced treatment pilot testing, geotechnical investigations, and field scale treatment demonstration projects.

Downstream river restoration work will help restore the river ecosystem, flood plain, increase the nutrient assimilative capacity of the river and improve water quality.

High-level regional plans for wastewater infrastructure improvements to provide for the future needs of the Planning Area’s service providers were completed in late 2007 and early 2008: the *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan* (ECO:LOGIC, 2007) and the *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan* (Stantec, 2008). These facility plans remain valuable regional planning-level compilations.

Proposed Action Items

9.3.1.A Continue development of near-term regional strategies to manage effluent and reduce nitrogen loading to the Truckee River, which may include additional treatment, expanded distribution of effluent within or outside the TMSA, and expanded uses which may include aquifer recharge and indirect potable reuse.

9.3.1.B Pursue connection of additional reclaimed water users to the existing systems in Sparks and Reno, consistent with regional water quality and water rights considerations, and continue investigating the feasibility of expanded uses of reclaimed water.

9.3.1.C Continue evaluating the merits of regional integrated solutions between TMWRF and STMWRF for wastewater treatment and effluent reuse and disposal.

Relevant Planning Documents

Buzzzone and Svetich, October 9, 2009, Truckee River Total Maximum Daily Load, presentation to the WRWC.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*, prepared for the City of Reno, Washoe County and RWPC.

Kennedy/Jenks Consultants and Stantec Consulting Engineers, 2005, *Spanish Springs Valley Water Reclamation Facility Plan*

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, 2001, *Water Quality Control Plan*

Stantec, 2008, *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan*, prepared for the City of Sparks and RWPC.

Stantec, 2015, *TMWRF/Huffaker Reservoir Effluent Interconnection Pipeline Evaluation*, prepared for the City of Reno.

9.3.2 South Truckee Meadows

Specific Issues and Linkages

WCCSD operates STMWRF, which provides service primarily for the Double Diamond and Damonte Ranch areas of Reno, and unincorporated Washoe County including the Virginia Foothills and Mt. Rose fan. STMWRF is one of the few water reclamation facilities in the United States relying exclusively on effluent reuse for disposal of the treated wastewater. Presently, sludge is handled onsite and transported by truck for landfill disposal.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

~~Plans for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the future needs of the Planning Area's service providers resulted in the *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan* (ECO:LOGIC, 2007) and the *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan* (Stantec, 2008). These plans are the most current regional planning-level compilations available.~~

STMWRF is permitted to treat a maximum month average day flow of 4.1 MGD, expandable to a capacity of 6.0 MGD. An updated 20-year facility plan was completed in 2016 with assistance from Carollo Engineers and a capital improvement plan identifying sanitary sewer interceptor and wastewater treatment improvements was produced. The plan identifies improvements needed for repair and replacement, upgrades to meet permit requirements, and additional capacity for anticipated growth. Infrastructure improvements will be phased over the next 20-year planning period. CH2M Engineers assisted Washoe County to prepare a complimentary 20-year facility plan looking specifically at South Meadows reclaimed water system improvements, which include reclaimed water transmission piping, water storage and treatment facilities.

Huffaker Reservoir was constructed in 1988 and has a capacity of approximately 4,000 af. Reservoir lining to stem seepage losses was completed in 2015.

Based on the 2030 flow projections from the Regional Water Balance presented in Chapter 6, roughly 5,700 af of additional treatment and disposal capacity will be required when STMWRF is expanded to 6 MGD. However, expansion to 6 MGD is not anticipated to be needed within the next 5 to 10 years. Fix and finish improvements are proposed to maintain existing capacity and increase reliability, and consist primarily of control system, effluent pumping, electrical improvements, and upgrades to the headworks and effluent filtration equipment. **Need updated water balance from Stantec**

The use of creek water to supplement reclaimed water supplies will likely diminish to zero in the next 20 years as flows to the plant increase. Additional reuse sites or new reuse practices will need to be identified to use all of the reclaimed water that will be produced within the 20-year planning horizon.

Prior plans for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the future needs of the Planning Area's service providers include the City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan (ECO:LOGIC, 2007) and the City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan (Stantec, 2008). These plans are the most current regional-scale, planning-level compilations available.

Proposed Action Items

9.3.2.A Actively pursue a new reclaimed water strategy to continually balance the increasing supply with available storage capacity and demand. Alternative reuse methods should be explored in detail, in coordination with NDEP, such as reclaimed water aquifer recharge and cooling water for energy generation facilities.

9.3.2.B In regard to the potential regional implications of reclaimed aquifer recharge and indirect potable reuse, it is recommended that the Reno Stead ozone-biological activated carbon ("BAC") pilot plant feasibility evaluation be continued at STMWRF to more fully optimize the technology.

9.3.2.C As discussed in Section 9.3.1, continue evaluating the merits of regional integrated solutions between TMWRF and STMWRF for wastewater treatment and effluent reuse and disposal, including funding considerations.

Relevant Planning Documents

CH2MHill / Stantec, 2008, *Draft Facility Plan Update, South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility 6-MGD Expansion Project*.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*.

Stantec Consultants, 2008, *City of Sparks TMSA/FSA Conceptual Facility Master Plan*.

Carollo, 2016, *STMWRF Facility Plan*

9.3.3 Stead / Lemmon Valley

Specific Issues and Linkages

The RSWRF is located in Stead and is owned and operated by the City of Reno. RSWRF is permitted to treat a maximum month average day flow of 2.35 MGD. The plant effluent either discharges by gravity to Swan Creek, which drains to the Swan Lake wetlands, or it is reclaimed and pumped to several sites within the community for turf irrigation. Washoe County owns and operates the Lemmon Valley Water Reclamation Facility (“LVWRF”). It is a secondary treatment plant that has a permitted capacity of 0.3 MGD, with disposal by evaporation ponds.

Future water supplies will be provided by imported water, primarily from the Fish Springs Water Supply Project. As presented in the *North Valleys Effluent Disposal Options* report, (ECO:LOGIC, 2005) and the *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan* (ECO:LOGIC, 2007), indicate that other means of reuse or disposal of reclaimed water will be needed based on the long-term development potential of the area. As presented in Chapter 4, the North Valleys Initiative (“NVI”) evaluated the feasibility and merits of expanding reclaimed water uses in Stead and Lemmon Valley. The Cold Springs Water Reclamation Facility (“CSWRF”) was also included in the NVI evaluation, since it too is located within a closed basin and its disposal capacity will not be sufficient for the projected future flows.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

The City of Reno completed the RSWRF Phase 2 expansion improvements, which increased treatment and disposal capacity to 2.35 MGD, with specific improvements sized to accommodate higher flows. Similar to STMWRF, sludge disposal is handled by pumping to TMWRF for treatment and disposal. Eventually, RSWRF sludge will be processed on site for beneficial use or disposal.

Consistent with the recommendations from the *2004 – 2025 Regional Water Management Plan*, Reno and the RWPC investigated numerous “treatment and disposal alternatives for RSWRF that support an integrated plan for the region’s limited water resources, particularly water supply, effluent management and flood plain management strategies for this closed basin”. These alternative investigations included:

- A feasibility assessment of an effluent storage reservoir,
- An assessment of rapid infiltration basin (“RIB”) and vadose zone infiltration wells,
- A small scale pilot test of direct injection on three Washoe County test wells,
- Evaluation of disposal alternatives including White Lake, Long Valley Creek, and a pipeline connection to Spanish Springs,
- Expansion of the existing reclaimed water system to supply additional commercial irrigation needs.

The NVI team also investigated other options that would make better use of the reclaimed water resource, including an evaluation of the merits of a dual water system to provide irrigation water to residential customers, and an assessment of the feasibility of effluent ASR using a

groundwater flow model to estimate the recharge storage capacity and identify potential impacts to nearby municipal wells.

To evaluate water quality issues associated with effluent ASR without using expensive reverse osmosis treatment, Reno developed an alternative treatment demonstration project using either sand filtration or membrane filtration, ozonation, and biologically activated carbon.

Based on the 2030 flow projections identified in the Regional Water Balance presented in Chapter 6, expansion of the current treatment capacity to 4.0 MGD is projected to be sufficient for up to 20 years, but new reuse or disposal options need to be developed.

Based on the evaluation of disposal alternatives, the potential for RIBs or vadose wells to dispose of significant quantities of effluent within the Stead / Lemmon Valley area is limited. A feasible 3,000 af effluent storage reservoir site was identified; however, its capacity is not sufficient to meet long term needs, and other non-irrigation season disposal options will be required.

Results from the effluent ASR groundwater modeling work indicate that recharged water is unlikely to negatively influence the nearest municipal well at injection rates up to 2 MGD. A recharge program would improve groundwater levels within the west and east Lemmon Valley basins, and would benefit both municipal and domestic well users by reducing drawdown and pumping costs. Current calculations indicate that total dissolved solids (“TDS”) from the recharged water would not likely reach the municipal supply wells for at least 60 years and the TDS would be substantially diluted as a result of advection and dispersion within the aquifer.

Compared to high energy reverse osmosis (“RO”) systems, Reno’s alternative treatment process was effective in providing multi-barrier treatment for all major categories of contaminants of concern. The process benefits include lower capital costs, lower operation and maintenance costs and lower energy use compared to RO. Additionally, it eliminates treatment and disposal of process reject water, produced by RO.

Each of the treatment and disposal options is expensive; therefore, the region should make the investment that maximizes the benefits provided by the available water resources.

Proposed Action Items

9.3.3.A Continue to evaluate the merits of regional integrated solutions between RSWRF and CSWRF for wastewater treatment and effluent reuse and disposal, including funding considerations.

9.3.3.B Continue to work with NDEP on reclaimed water groundwater augmentation feasibility/demonstration efforts, including additional groundwater modeling assessments of aquifer storage and recovery.

Relevant Planning Documents

ECO:LOGIC, August 2010, *Removing Refractory Organics from Wastewater Using MF-03-BAC Treatment (Draft)*.

ECO:LOGIC, July 2010, *North Valleys Initiative*, Prepared for Washoe County.

ECO:LOGIC, February 2010, *Treated Effluent Recharge Estimates, Lemmon, Cold Springs, Spanish Springs, Warm Springs and South Truckee Meadows Valleys.*

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*, ECO:LOGIC, Prepared for City of Reno and Washoe County.

ECO:LOGIC, 2006, *North Valleys Reservoir Site, Results of Geological and Geotechnical Evaluations*, prepared for City of Reno.

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *City Of Reno, North Valleys Effluent Disposal, Stead Vadose Zone Injection Wells Construction and Testing*, prepared for City of Reno.

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *North Valleys Effluent Disposal Options*, prepared for the City of Reno and the Regional Water Planning Commission

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *Washoe County Site, Injection Test Results Summary*, prepared for Washoe County.

Stantec, 2007, *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan*, Stantec, Prepared for City of Sparks.

WCDWR, December 2009, *Groundwater Flow and TDS Transport Modeling, Lemmon Valley, NV.*

9.3.4 Cold Springs

Specific Issues and Linkages

The CSWRF is owned by Washoe County operated by WCCSD, and is permitted to treat a peak month average day flow of 0.7 MGD. The CSWRF was included in the NVI evaluation, since it too is located within a closed basin and its disposal capacity will not be sufficient for the projected future flows. ECO:LOGIC (2007) determined that other means of disposal or reuse of reclaimed water will be needed based on the long-term development potential of the area.

Several integrated water and wastewater issues are only partially understood, including: long term water supply availability within the basin, taking into consideration demands from both municipal and domestic wells; capability to assess water quality considerations, including TDS, nitrate, fate of the effluent disposed by the RIBs, and the potential for reclaimed water ASR; aquifer storage capacity; and coordination with the White Lake 100-year flood level.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

The CSWRF has recently been upgraded to a new 0.7 MGD facility. Secondary treated wastewater is denitrified and disposed of at 12 rapid infiltration basins with a capacity of up to 1.2 MGD.

Nancy Gomes Elementary school was connected to the municipal sewer system, together with about ten existing residences. About one or two existing homes currently on septic systems convert to the municipal sewer system each year.

Based on the 2030 flow projections identified in the Regional Water Balance, treatment will need to be expanded to 1.2 MGD. Disposal capacity is projected to be sufficient for up to 20 years; however, plans for future disposal options will need to be developed **Need updated water balance from Stantec.** Reno and the RWPC investigated numerous treatment and disposal

alternatives for RSWRF and CSWRF. In the Cold Springs area, these alternative investigations included:

- A feasibility assessment of an effluent storage reservoir.
- Evaluation of disposal to White Lake, which is feasible; but limited due to the reduction in flood storage capacity, and the potential mobilization of high TDS shallow groundwater. Increasing shallow groundwater levels adjacent to the playa could affect domestic wells and septic systems.
- Evaluation of disposal to Long Valley Creek, which flows into California. This is a “permissible” and technically feasible option, but it does not make efficient use of available water resources.

As discussed in the prior section, the NVI team also investigated options that would make better use of the reclaimed water resource, including:

- Evaluation of a dual water system to provide irrigation water to residential customers
- A feasibility assessment of reclaimed water aquifer storage and recovery

Proposed Action Items

9.3.4.A Continue to evaluate the merits of regional integrated solutions between CSWRF and RSWRF for the treatment and disposal of wastewater, including funding considerations.

9.3.4.B Update and refine the existing Washoe County groundwater model for Cold Springs to address interrelated groundwater, surface water and wastewater issues.

Relevant Planning Documents

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*, Prepared for City of Reno and Washoe County.

ECO:LOGIC, 2006, *White Lake Playa and Vicinity, Results of Geological and Hydrogeological Evaluations*, Prepared for Washoe County.

Stantec, 2007, *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan*, Prepared for City of Sparks.

9.3.5 Tracy Segment (Lower Truckee River)

Specific Issues and Linkages

Significant undeveloped, industrial zoned lands are located in the Mustang and Patrick / Tracy areas, including the 2,205 acres adjacent to Interstate 80 E being studied for the development of a technology park. The land owner and developer contemplate the use of 4,000 af annually of TMWRF reclaimed water to be utilized for water cooling an energy generation and data center complex. There is also significant development potential on the Storey County side of the river. This area includes existing industrial development such as Kal Kan and Kaiser Aluminum, and continued commercial and industrial development within the Tahoe Reno Industrial Center.

[Update with John Enloe's help](#)

The long-term wastewater management approach for the Wadsworth area and Stampmill Estates subdivision may also require a separate planning effort. Currently, the PLPT facility provides secondary treatment and disposal through sedimentation and facultative lagoons for

the town of Wadsworth. This facility is mentioned for regional information and coordination purposes only; it does not fall under the jurisdiction of the *Regional Water Plan*.

Septic systems will continue to be used in this area, and there is evidence of nitrate contamination to the groundwater, indicating the future need for municipal sewer service. Joint wastewater treatment and facility planning could be economically advantageous to both Washoe and Storey counties and should be considered in future work.

To comply with regional TMDLs and help protect water quality within the Truckee River, wastewater treatment facilities should be implemented that include biological nitrogen removal, with subsurface disposal and/or landscape irrigation.

Further planning and implementation of wastewater infrastructure in this area will be driven by parties interested in developing the land. Close coordination and cooperation between Sparks, Washoe County and Storey County is needed to ensure long-term water quality objectives for the river are maintained.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

A large residential development has been proposed adjacent to Stampmill Estates, which would require a municipal water and sewer system. If this project develops in the future, Stampmill Estates should be included in plans for municipal sewer service.

Proposed Action Items

9.3.5.A As this area of Washoe County and Storey County continues to grow, it will be important to monitor water quality for non-point source pollutants entering groundwater the Truckee River.

9.3.5.B Remain open to discussions among Washoe County, PLPT, and the City of Fernley to seek an area-wide water and wastewater strategy for lower Truckee River users.

Relevant Planning Documents

AGRA Infrastructure, 2000, *Water and Wastewater Facility Plans on Industrial Zoned Lands Along the Lower Truckee River within Washoe County*. Prepared for the RWPC.

Stantec, 2007, *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan*, Stantec, Prepared for City of Sparks.

9.3.6 Septic Systems and Water Quality

Specific Issues and Linkages

~~The WCCSDWR~~ has identified areas of water quality degradation as a result of septic system effluent, occurring predominantly in areas with high-density development. In addition to high densities, contributing factors to water quality degradation include shallow depths to ground water, permeable soil conditions, and proximity to sensitive receptors, such as water supply wells, creeks, rivers, and lakes. These conditions are present in Spanish Springs Valley, Golden Valley, Washoe Valley and Lemmon Valley. In Spanish Springs Valley, fifteen years of groundwater quality monitoring have shown increasing levels of nitrate contamination in municipal wells.

The management options for mitigation of nitrate contamination due to high densities of septic systems have been studied regionally. The results of these analyses have coalesced around four possible mitigation strategies:

- Conversion of septic systems to a municipal sewer system
- Conversion of septic systems to nitrate reducing septic systems
- Dilution of groundwater via artificial recharge with treated drinking water resources
- Pumping of high nitrate groundwater for non-potable uses to remove nitrates from the groundwater aquifer

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

The Washoe County Health District (“WCHD”) has undertaken several measures to reduce future potential impacts from septic systems. Effective 2001, the minimum lot or parcel size for new subdivisions and second or subsequent parcel maps proposing to use septic disposal was established at five acres. Smaller lots may be considered if it can be shown that adequate measures have been taken to ensure that the smaller lot area will not have a greater impact to the groundwater quality than the five-acre lot size.

In some areas of Washoe County, the number of septic systems allowed has been limited based on an analysis of the potential impacts to water quality. One such area is Verdi, where the *Washoe County Comprehensive Plan* allows a maximum of 1,300 septic systems (Washoe County, 2002).

Adequate measures for mitigation of nitrate contamination due to high densities of septic systems might include the installation of nitrate reducing septic systems, however an ~~The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (2005) conducted a multi-year project to study the performance of 11 individual nitrate reducing systems installed at residences near La Pine, Oregon. The study~~ found that, although several systems showed high levels of nitrogen reduction in test centers, they did not perform as well in the field. ~~Nitrogen reduction below 10 milligrams per liter (“mg/L”) appears to be difficult to achieve consistently without a secondary carbon source.~~

The *Spanish Springs Valley Water Reclamation Facility Plan*, completed in November 2004, recommended phased sewerage of the existing lots with septic systems in the area to TMWRF. Phased sewerage commenced in early 2005; Phase IA of the program is complete and serves approximately 211 homes. Washoe County recently received grant funding from the Army Corps of Engineers (“ACOE”) for the construction of Phase 1B, which will serve approximately 168 homes. ~~Is this still true?~~

~~Using lessons learned in these areas, and especially~~ In light of the septic system densities in Spanish Springs Valley, the WCDWR conducted the *Septic Nitrate Baseline Data and Risk Assessment Study* (2007) throughout the densely populated portions of Washoe County ~~served by septic systems~~. The goals of the study were to investigate the potential for nitrate contamination in the metropolitan and suburban areas of the Reno-Sparks metropolitan area, and to provide recommendations for prioritizing additional study of areas potentially contaminated by septic systems. Sixteen Project Areas were identified for investigation. Data

from these specific areas were analyzed to determine the potential for areas with high-density septic systems to contribute to water quality degradation.

Results of the *Septic Nitrate Baseline Data and Risk Assessment Study* and previous studies point to the importance of ~~density of~~ septic system ~~density~~, distance to sensitive receptors, and parcel size. The following recommendations ~~awere~~ made:

- Collect additional water quality and water level data from domestic well owners in all Project Areas.
- Collect water quality samples from surface water bodies adjacent to and downstream of high density septic systems.
- Perform additional analysis of currently available data, including basic mass balance and vadose-zone modeling of areas requiring further investigation.
- Perform a geographic information system (“GIS”)-based analysis of land-use, septic system age, and water quality trends around water supply wells.
- Consider the potential for other sources of nitrate contamination.

Water and Sanitary Sewer Financial Assistance Program: The 2009 Legislature Approved AB 54 authorizing Washoe County to establish a program to provide financial assistance to persons to connect to a public water or sewer system, and to owners of public or private property to make such property resistant to flood damage. The program is a direct response to property owner needs that are the result of changing economic conditions. When a property owner’s domestic well or on-site septic system fails and a community water or sewer system is available, existing state and Health District regulations require that the property be connected to the municipal system.

Hooking up to a municipal water or sewer system can cost between \$15,000 and \$30,000 per property. 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, and required abandonment of septic systems and domestic wells.

The initial focus of the financing program will be in assisting property owners in these areas:

- Spanish Springs (septic to sewer conversion)
- Mayberry Ranch Estates (septic to sewer conversion)
- Heppner Subdivision (domestic well to community water system conversion)
- Callahan Ranch (domestic well to community water system conversion)

Proposed Action Items

9.3.6.A Continue to provide guidance to ~~owners of septic systems and~~ domestic well-~~owners~~ on how to manage/mitigate domestic well water with elevated levels of nitrate.

Relevant Planning Documents

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*, ECO:LOGIC, Prepared for City of Reno and Washoe County.

Kennedy/Jenks Consultants / Stantec, 2004, *Spanish Springs Valley Water Reclamation Facility Plan*.

Stantec, 2007, *City of Sparks Conceptual Facility Master Plan*, Stantec, Prepared for City of Sparks.

WCDWR, 2007, *Septic Nitrate Baseline Data and Risk Assessment Study for Washoe County, PHASE I: Prioritization of Study Areas & Assessment of Data Needs*.

WCDWR, 2017, Septic Nitrate Baseline Data and Risk Assessment Study for Washoe County, PHASE II:

9.4 Truckee Meadows NPDES Storm Water Discharge Permit

Specific Issues and Linkages

The most recent Municipal Storm Water Discharge Permit was issued to Reno, Sparks and Washoe County (the “co-permittees”) on May 26, 2010. The co-permittees are required to update the Storm Water Management Program (“SWMP”) for the five-year permit term within 18 months of the issue date, ~~most recently-or-by~~ November of 2011. ~~This u~~Updates warrants an evaluation of the program element needs, activities and schedule from the ~~issue date~~present to permit reissuance. ~~The existing permit term has been extended pending the issuance of a new permit.~~

The Storm Water Permit Coordinating Committee (“SWPCC”) anticipates that, based on talks with NDEP and review of national regulatory trends, a Waste Load Allocation (“WLA”) will be assigned to storm water in the future. It is not yet known how or when a storm water WLA will be implemented, or what constituents will be covered.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

~~In 2004, the SWPCC Interlocal Agreement was amended to provide for the SWPCC to advise Reno and Sparks City Councils and the Washoe County Board of Commissioners concerning the storm water permit and watershed management relative to water quality impacts to the watershed.~~

The SWPCC continues to request annual funding from the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”) for ~~the storm water~~ program administration, ~~specific projects and~~ to complete the required program updates ~~and for specific projects~~.

Proposed Action Items

9.4.A Continued SWPCC communication with NDEP is necessary to address changes/updates to the NPDES Storm Water Discharge Permit.

9.4.B Support the update of the Watershed Management Plan such that it can be used to support applications for 319h grants to help fund future watershed projects.

9.5 *Integrated Use of Water Rights*

Specific Issues and Linkages

There are many competing demands for water rights that must be considered from a broad planning perspective so that the limited availability will go the farthest in satisfying the water resource needs of the region. Some of the primary uses for Truckee River and tributary water rights in the planning area are listed below:

- Dedication of water rights for maintenance of in-stream flows in the lower Truckee River as required by the *Negotiated Settlement* (PL 101-618, 1990) and *TROA*.
- Dedication of water rights for water quality enhancement in the lower Truckee River as required by the *Water Quality Settlement Agreement* (“WQSA”), 1996.
- Dedication of Truckee River water rights to TMWA for M&I supplies.
- Dedication of water rights for reclaimed water return flow requirements to maintain in-stream flows and satisfy downstream water rights.
- Dedication of certain tributary creek water rights in the South Truckee Meadows for new surface water M&I supplies.
- Allocation of water rights to facilitate groundwater recharge using surface water and/or, possibly in the future, highly treated reclaimed water.

To independently satisfy these primary uses for water rights, plus others, could eventually require more water rights than the river and its tributaries can provide **water**. The many competing demands for water rights and resources from the Truckee River and other sources need to be coordinated to the maximum extent possible by developing cooperative management strategies that satisfy two or more competing demands with the same water.

As presented in Section 6.3, the region has **potentially** available water resources to meet the projected demand increases; however, there are water **supply**-imbalances in some of the planning areas that will need to be addressed over the long term. These imbalances are not water resource availability issues, as water resource management options are available to help mitigate the potential negative effects. Rather, the issues **are** how to efficiently manage the use of the resources and minimize the resulting impacts, and **how to identify** who shares in the cost of mitigation.

Effluent reuse is a water management practice that provides multiple benefits to the region, including nutrient and TDS discharge compliance for TMWRF, and drought and water quality benefits to the Truckee River. As noted above, water rights dedications are sometimes necessary for reclaimed water return flow requirements.

Policy 2.1.a, Effluent Reuse - Efficient Use of Water Resources and Water Rights, is intended to provide guidance to purveyors when developing long range plans for effluent management.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

- *TROA* **expands** operation of Truckee River reservoirs ~~will be expanded~~ creating greater flexibility, thereby increasing dry year reserves.

- Management options **exist** for tributary water rights dedicated for municipal water supply during non-drought conditions.
- In 1998, Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and PLPT began purchasing water rights as a result of the WQSA.
- Reno, Sparks and Washoe County, have, as agreed in *TROA* Section 1.E.4, provided 6,700 af of additional Truckee River water rights for water quality purposes.
- **The Regional Effluent Management Team is working toward regionally-based solutions to several near-term effluent management issues, incorporating efficient use of water rights into alternatives being evaluated.**

Proposed Action Items

The NNWPC, TMWA, Washoe County, Reno and Sparks have undertaken efforts to respond to numerous recommendations for the integrated use of water rights. Cooperative management strategies should be developed among local governments, effluent providers and water purveyors that maximize the benefits derived from the available water resources. Additional work that needs to be completed includes:

9.5.A Continue the implementation of *TROA* and related agreements. Compare the water demand and water right recovery estimates to future conditions imposed by *TROA* and related agreements.

9.5.B Continue the water rights recovery program to convert inactive Truckee River water rights to beneficial use and update the water right status and demand projections regularly.

9.5.C Continue the analysis and development of non-structural measures to improve Truckee River water quality, enable increased TMWRF discharges to the Truckee River, and ensure the future sustainability of the river.

9.5.D Quantify groundwater and surface water resources and determine the feasibility of conjunctive use or other programs, including but not limited to expanded recharge projects, use of Fish Springs Ranch water supplies, and conversion of tributary water rights to M&I water supply and other beneficial uses.

9.5.E Develop cooperative management strategies among local governments, reclaimed water providers and water purveyors that maximize the benefits of available reclaimed water resources to the Truckee Meadows community.

9.5.F Monitor existing and future water demand and planning area growth projections, and develop plans to resolve any major discrepancies in consideration of available water resources and geographic constraints.

Relevant Planning Documents

Negotiated Settlement (PL 101-618, 1990)

Truckee River Operating Agreement, Section 1.E.4

Water Quality Settlement Agreement (“WQSA”), 1996

9.6 *Water Resources and Land Use Planning*

Specific Issues and Linkages

The importance of integrating water resource management with land use planning has come to light in several forums in recent years. Rapid growth between 2003 and 2006, and relatively steady growth in recent years in the TMSA and outlying valleys has led to questions about the sustainability of the region's water resources. Specific regional-scale issues include:

- The availability and cost of water resources to supply the demands of existing and future development.
- The capacity to reuse or dispose of treated wastewater effluent generated by future development.
- The importance of flood plain management in reducing the risk of future flooding within the community.
- The importance of maintaining natural recharge to sustain groundwater resources.
- The potential of the region to use “green infrastructure” and Low Impact Development techniques to enhance regional aesthetics and quality of life while preserving or enhancing natural resources.
- **The long-term costs of infrastructure operations and maintenance relative to projected development patterns**

In addition to these regional scale issues, some land use plans for outlying rural areas have identified imbalances between groundwater resources, appropriations and potential domestic well demands, such as the *Warm Springs Valley Area Plan* (Washoe County, 2010).

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

Following are some events pertinent to water resource management and regional land use planning that have occurred in the last five years:

- *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan completed* (November 2007)
- *City of Sparks TMSA/FSA Conceptual Facility Master Plan completed* (January 2008)
- *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2008-2030* adopted by Regional Planning Commission (“RPC”), including 2030 forecasted population of 620,323 (June 2008)
- TROA signing (September 2008)
- Washoe County Ballot Question #3: “Shall the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County?” passed by a majority of voters (November 2008)
- Reno, Washoe County and Sparks TMSA/FSA facility plans included an amendment to the *Regional Water Plan* (January 2009).
- Regional Plan amended to require the Regional Planning Commission to adopt a Consensus Population Forecast that is consistent with the estimated population that can

be supported by the sustainable water resources identified in the *Regional Water Plan*; and Regional Planning Governing Board *Regulations on Procedure* amended to require that a comparison with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources, as identified in the *Regional Water Plan*, be included as part of the process for updating and maintaining the adopted Consensus Forecast (January 2010)

- Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (“TMRPA”), NNWPC and purveyors agreed on a methodology to calibrate consensus population forecast to annual certified population estimates and disaggregate population into subareas for water demand projections (April 2010).
- WRWC found that the forecasted population can be supported by the sustainable water resources as set forth in the *Regional Water Plan* (May 2010).
- *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2010-2030* adopted by RPC, including 2030 forecasted population of 590,490. (July 2010).
- *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2012-2032* adopted by RPC, including 2032 forecasted population of 560,772. (May 2012).
- *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2014-2034* adopted by RPC, including 2034 forecasted population of 563,779. (September 2014).
- *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2016-2036* adopted by RPC, including 2036 forecasted population of 548,159. (September 2016).
- -TROA implementation (December 2015)
- *Truckee Meadows Housing Study* completed by TMRPA (2016).
-

Proposed Action Items

9.6.A Continue working with TMRPA staff to strengthen appropriate linkages between the *Regional Plan* and the *Regional Water Plan*

9.6.B Review areas within the TMSA boundary for gaps in facility planning and develop a plan to respond to changes in land use and the TMSA that affect current facility plans

9.6.C Continue to coordinate with TMRPA and other entities on the development of a GIS parcel based tool that can be used to estimate potential water demands and wastewater flows based on approved land uses

9.6.D Coordinate with local land use planning agencies to address rural groundwater basin imbalances

Relevant Planning Documents

Amendment to the *Regional Water Plan*, 2009.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water, Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*.

Stantec Consultants, 2008, *City of Sparks TMSA/FSA Conceptual Facility Master Plan* .
Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, 2002, as amended.

Truckee River Operating Agreement, 2008, www.usbr.gov/mp/troa/final/troa_final_09-08_full.pdf.

Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2010-2030 adopted by Regional Planning Commission 2010.

Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2008-2030 adopted by Regional Planning Commission June 2008.

Washoe County Master Plan, Warm Springs Valley Area Plan, 2010.

9.7 Local Government Drainage Programs

Specific Issues and Linkages

The recent economic downturn and corresponding decrease in local government general fund revenues has constrained capital expenditures budgets for new storm water facilities and associated operations and maintenance at local governments without dedicated storm water funding mechanisms.

Some local governments are exploring the potential creation of utility districts with the goal of shifting from the general fund to utility district-based funding for storm water related functions.

Local government drainage programs and the Flood Project have some similar and complimentary responsibilities and needs, e.g. flood plain management, adjoining facilities, and the need to form utility districts, or other types of funding districts, to generate revenue for flood management services.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

In 2014, Reno identified alternatives for managing ditches used to convey storm water, including annual maintenance agreements with ditch companies, ditch acquisitions, and construction of storm drain infrastructure to exclude storm water from ditches.

A number of irrigation ditches serve as storm water drainage conveyances. In the early 2000s, Reno and Washoe County entered into agreements with some ditch companies for contributions toward annual maintenance costs. Significant storm events in 1997, 2005 and 2017 generated flows that exceeded ditch capacities in some locations leading to localized flooding.

In February 2009, the Washoe County Board of Commissioners (“BCC”) directed Public Works staff to seek public input and explore facility and financing alternatives for the possible creation of an unincorporated County storm water utility district.

Proposed Action Items

9.7.A Local government public works departments and the Flood Project are expected to discuss and reach consensus concerning funding and other issues involving local drainage programs and the Flood Project.

9.7.B Discuss with local government public works departments the status of the Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Design Manual and possible need for developing and update.

Relevant Planning Documents

Report to NNWPC by Washoe County Department of Public Works, (May 5, 2010)

9.8 Regional Flood Plain Management and Flood Control

Specific Issues and Linkages

Chapter 5, Flood Management and Storm Water Drainage, identifies a number of issues and linkages concerning the Truckee River Flood Project, including:

Flood Plain Storage and Critical Flood Pools: Flood plain storage is a critical component of flood protection. Many properties that were built in compliance with Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) standards for the National Flood Insurance Program (“NFIP”) may be at risk because of loss of flood plain storage. Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and Flood Project staff members involved in flood plain storage volume mitigation seek to ensure that the Flood Project remains feasible and future flood impacts are minimized.

Federal and Local Funding for the Project: The Flood Project may be the largest public works project ever undertaken in northern Nevada. The ACOE is expected to contribute to the project cost, however the community will be required to contribute the remainder. Although the Flood Project is locally funded by a 1/8-cent sales tax, additional funds will be required to meet the local sponsor’s required funding contribution.

Local Programs: Local Drainage programs have some similar and complimentary responsibilities, e.g. flood plain management, adjoining facilities and the need to form utility districts, or other types of funding districts, to generate revenue for local flood control and drainage services.

Upstream Dam Operations: Releases from Lake Tahoe at the Tahoe City Dam and other reservoirs according to *TROA* will have an affect on flood flows in the Truckee Meadows.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

Reno and Washoe County have adopted ordinances amending development codes to address flood plain storage

Studies for funding, financing and rate alternatives are underway by TRFMA.

Proposed Action Items

9.8.A Support TRFMA’s efforts to develop funding for the flood project and incorporate cost, financing and rate information when available into the Regional Water Plan.

Relevant Planning Documents

Regional Water Planning Commission, 2003, *Regional Flood Plain Management Strategy*, prepared by the Flood Plain Management Subcommittee for the Regional Water Planning Commission.

9.9 Groundwater Quality Protection and Remediation

9.9.1 Groundwater Remediation

Specific Issues and Linkages

PCE in Central Truckee Meadows: Groundwater underlying the central Truckee Meadows is contaminated by tetrachloroethylene (also known as perchloroethylene or “PCE”) as described in Section 2.2.4. The Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District (“CTMRD”) program, created in 1995 to address the problem, is administered on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners by the WCCSDWR.

Sparks Solvent/Fuel Site (“SS/FS”): The SS/FS is also described in Section 2.2.4. A new municipal well field comprised of six wells with a sustainable capacity of approximately 8,300 gpm or more to the north of the tank farm is likely to result in significant changes in local hydrodynamics when it is put into operation. Changes may include an increased risk to groundwater utilized for municipal water supply from contaminants at SS/FS. NDEP is overseeing and directing the ongoing remediation of contaminated soils and groundwater at this site.

PCE in Lemmon Valley: Groundwater near the Reno-Stead Airport in the West Lemmon Valley hydrographic basin is also affected by solvent contamination. A PCE plume, identified there in 1994, is associated with military activities at the Stead Air Force Base during the 1940s and 1950s. Corrective actions are successfully controlling contaminant migration and cleaning up the impacted groundwater.

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

PCE in Central Truckee Meadows: CTMRD program funds have paid for the construction and ongoing operation of three air-stripping treatment facilities that remove PCE from five TMWA wells. Program funds have also been used for the preliminary design of two additional treatment systems (using activated carbon) for wells with low levels of PCE. Treatment will be implemented for these wells (Sparks Avenue and Poplar #2) in the event PCE concentrations increase to the action level. A regular and systematic groundwater monitoring program was implemented in late 2003 to identify potential source areas, identify areas of higher risk, support resource management, and to prioritize other program activities. CTMRD program activities also include focused stakeholder efforts to minimize the possibility for ongoing releases of PCE and ongoing source management on the part of WCDWR and NDEP to identify and mitigate (where practical and cost-effective) PCE sources that are contributing to PCE plumes in the Central Truckee Meadows. By minimizing the potential for ongoing releases and by mitigating sources contributing to the plumes, the time (and associated cost) required for well head treatment for PCE in the Truckee Meadows will decrease.

Sparks Solvent/Fuel Site (“SS/FS”): The plume is being hydraulically contained with extraction wells and contaminated groundwater is treated. NDEP is overseeing and directing the ongoing remediation of contaminated soils and groundwater and is aware that changes to the monitoring and remediation strategy employed at the site may be necessarily with the development of the new well field.

Corrective actions are successfully controlling contaminant migration and cleaning up the impacted groundwater. Remediation at this site is being implemented by the responsible parties under direction and oversight of NDEP (see Section 2.2.4).

Proposed Action Items

9.9.1.A Support the efforts of the CTMRD and others to remediate solvent and/or fuel sites in the Planning Area ~~9.9.1.B Participate in Source Water Protection Program activities sponsored by the State of Nevada.~~

Relevant Planning Documents

Camp Dresser and McKee, Bouvette Consulting and Washoe County Department of Water Resources, 2002, *Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District, Remediation Management Plan*, prepared for the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District.

9.9.2 Groundwater Protection

Specific Issues and Linkages

In addition to remediation of contaminated groundwater, groundwater quality is protected by a number of activities including regular water quality monitoring, pumping schedules, programs to comply with drinking water standards (such as iron or radionuclides), public education and wellhead protection planning.

Wellhead Protection Programs: Water purveyors that manage wellfields are encouraged to develop Wellhead Protection Plans (“WHPP”) to protect groundwater quality through the delineation of zones of groundwater movement toward municipal supply wells and strategies to protect wellhead protection zones (see Section 2.2.4).

Alternatives Evaluated to Address the Issues

~~NDEP is folding the WHP Program into the Integrated Source Water Protection Program~~

WHPPs have been developed and approved by NDEP for the following Public Purveyor systems:

- Truckee Meadows (TMWA’s entire system)
- South Truckee Meadows (STMGID)
- Arrowcreek (WCDWR)
- Hidden Valley (WCDWR)
- Lemmon Valley (WCDWR)
- Spanish Springs (WCDWR)

Proposed Action Items

9.9.2.A ~~9.9.1.B Participate in Integrated Source Water Protection Program activities sponsored by the State of Nevada~~ Continue development of WHPPs for systems not covered by approved plans.

Relevant Planning Documents

TMWA, 2008, *Wellhead Protection Plan*

WCDWR, 2004, *STMGID and Arrowcreek Wellhead Protection Plan*

WCDWR, 2004, *Hidden Valley Wellhead Protection Plan*

WCDWR, 1994, *Lemmon Valley Wellhead Protection Plan*

WCDWR, 2008, *Spanish Springs Wellhead Protection Plan*

INSERT

Table 9-1 WRWC / NNWPC Proposed Action Plan

Table 9-2 Issues and Proposed Action Items

References Cited

AGRA Infrastructure, 2000, *Water and Wastewater Facility Plans on Industrial Zoned Lands Along the Lower Truckee River within Washoe County*, prepared for RWPC.

AMEC, 2000, *Sparks Effluent Pipeline Extension*, prepared for City of Sparks.

Carlos, W. J., Miller, W., Devitt, D. A., Fernandez, G., 2004, *Evapotranspiration Satellite Irrigation Controller Study*.

Buzzzone and Svetich, October 9, 2009, *Truckee River Total Maximum Daily Load*, presentation to the WRWC.

Camp Dresser and McKee, Bouvette Consulting and Washoe County Department of Water Resources, 2002, *Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District, Remediation Management Plan*, prepared for the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District.

CH2M Hill / Stantec, April 2008, *Draft Facility Plan Update, South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility 6-MGD Expansion Project*.

ECO:LOGIC, August 2010, *Removing Refractory Organics from Wastewater Using MF-03-BAC Treatment (Draft)*.

ECO:LOGIC, July 2010, *North Valleys Initiative*, prepared for Washoe County.

ECO:LOGIC, February 2010, *Treated Effluent Recharge Estimates, Lemmon, Cold Springs, Spanish Springs, Warm Springs and South Truckee Meadows Valleys*.

ECO:LOGIC, 2009, *2009-2028 Draft North Valleys Water Facility Plan*, prepared for WCDWR.

ECO:LOGIC, 2009, *Draft South Truckee Meadows Water Facility Plan Update*, prepared for Washoe County Department of Water Resources.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *City of Reno and Washoe County TMSA/FSA Water Wastewater and Flood Management Facility Plan*.

ECO:LOGIC, 2007, *Spanish Springs Water Facility Plan Update*, prepared for WCDWR.

ECO:LOGIC, 2006, *White Lake Playa and Vicinity, Results of Geological and Hydrogeological Evaluations*, Prepared for Washoe County.

ECO:LOGIC, 2006, *North Valleys Reservoir Site, Results of Geological and Geotechnical Evaluations*, prepared for City of Reno.

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *City Of Reno, North Valleys Effluent Disposal, Stead Vadose Zone Injection Wells Construction and Testing*, prepared for City of Reno.

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *Washoe County Site, Injection Test Results Summary*, prepared for Washoe County.

ECO:LOGIC, 2005, *Fish Springs Ranch Facility Plan*.

ECO:LOGIC, 2004, *Orr Ditch Recharge Study*, prepared for RWPC.

ECO:LOGIC, 2004, *Spanish Springs Water Facility Plan*, prepared for WCDWR.

ECO:LOGIC, 2002, *South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan*, prepared for the Regional Water Planning Commission, Washoe County Department of Water Resources, and South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District.

ECO:LOGIC, 2002, *North Valleys Water Supply Comparison*, prepared for the RWPC.

JBR Environmental Consultants and Montgomery Watson, 1997, *Water Supply Alternatives Evaluation for the North Valleys*, prepared for the Washoe County Department of Comprehensive Planning.

Kennedy/Jenks Consultants and Stantec Consulting Engineers, 2005, *Spanish Springs Valley Water Reclamation Facility Plan*.

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, 2001, *Water Quality Control Plan*.

Regional Water Planning Commission, 2005, *2004 – 2025 Washoe County Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, as amended*.

Regional Water Planning Commission, 2003, *Regional Flood Plain Management Strategy*, prepared by the Flood Plain Management Subcommittee for the Regional Water Planning Commission.

Regional Water Planning Commission, 1997, *1995-2015 Washoe County Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan*.

RWPC Groundwater Task Force, 2003, *Final Report to the RWPC by the Groundwater Task Force*.

Stantec Consulting Engineers, 2008, *City of Sparks TMSA/FSA Conceptual Facility Master Plan*.

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, 2002, *Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, as amended*.

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2010, *Report on Aquifer Storage and Recovery, Spanish Springs Valley Hydrographic Basin, Jan 1 through June 30, 2010*.

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2009, *2010-2030 Water Resource Plan*.

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, 2003, *2005-2025 Water Resource Plan*.

Truckee River Operating Agreement, 2008, http://www.usbr.gov/mp/troa/final/troa_final_09-08_full.pdf.

US Geological Survey, 1997, *Hydrogeology and Simulated Effects of Urban Development on Water Resources of Spanish Springs Valley, Washoe County, West-Central Nevada*, Water Resources Investigations Report 96-4297.

Volt VIEWtech, 2003, *Ultra Low Flush Toilet Rebate Program Final Report*. Prepared for the RWPC.

Washoe County, 2010, *Washoe County Master Plan, Warm Springs Valley Area Plan*.

Washoe County, 2010, *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2010-2030*, adopted by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission July 2010, revised November 2010.

Washoe County, 2008, *Washoe County Consensus Forecast 2008-2030* adopted by Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission June 2008.

Washoe County Department of Water Resources, 2009, *Groundwater Flow and TDS Transport Modeling, Lemmon Valley, NV*.

Washoe County Department of Water Resources, 2007, *Septic Nitrate Baseline Data and Risk Assessment Study for Washoe County, PHASE I: Prioritization of Study Areas & Assessment of Data Needs*.

Washoe County Department of Water Resources, 2002, *Spanish Springs Valley Nitrate Occurrence Facility Plan*, prepared for the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection.

Western Regional Water Commission, 2009, *Amendment to the Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan*.

Water Quality Settlement Agreement (“WQSA”), 1996.

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 26, 2017

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

FROM: Jim Smitherman, NNWPC Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Review, discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the draft Regional Water Balance Model for possible inclusion in the “Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow” chapter of the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan (“RWMP”) update.

SUMMARY

Stantec Consulting Services (“Stantec”) has been contracted to update the regional water balance model for inclusion in the “Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow” chapter of the 2016 RWMP update. Mr. Buzzone of Stantec last reported to the NNWPC on December 7, 2016, that the water balance was partially completed and that certain assumptions needed to be confirmed before the model could be finished. Since that date the necessary decisions have been made and the model has been completed. Mr. Buzzone will present the final product and answer questions.

BACKGROUND

The regional water balance model is a spreadsheet model and a GIS-generated geographical flow diagram of a projected 2035 future conditions scenario for water supply, wastewater treatment, reclaimed water and wastewater disposal requirements. The regional water balance is useful to answer questions such as the following.

- How much potable water will be required and in what locations?
- From what sources will potable water originate?
- Once potable water is used, where will wastewater treatment happen?
- Once treated, how much water will be reused and in what locations?
- Where will the remaining effluent be disposed?
- Are there future imbalances in water supply, wastewater reuse/disposal, and if so, where?
- Are there planning areas with adequate capacity to address imbalances?

Stantec has compiled future water demand and wastewater flow projections for 2035 provided by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (“TMRPA”), which are distributed within the Truckee Meadows Service Area (“TMSA”) into 6 geographic areas that coincide with the service areas of the 4 major water reclamation facilities (“WRF”):

<u>Area</u>	<u>WRF</u>
1. Cold Springs	Cold Springs WRF
2. Lemmon Valley/Stead	Reno-Stead WRF
3. South Truckee Meadows	South Truckee Meadows WRF
4. Sparks/Spanish Springs	Truckee Meadows WRF
5. Sun Valley GID	Truckee Meadows WRF
6. Truckee Meadows	Truckee Meadows WRF

Water demand projections are a function of residential and non-residential unit projections based on the 2014 Consensus Population Forecast, derived using the TMRPA parcel-based population and employment model and Truckee Meadows Water Authority (“TMWA”) water use coefficients. Projections are reviewed by TMWA for consistency with water demand projections in its 2035 Water Resources Plan (“WRP”).

Wastewater flow projections are derived similarly, using TMWA’s indoor water use coefficients. The methodology is calibrated by modeling 2015 average day annual flows and comparing them to 2015 observed flows at each WRF.

Water demand and wastewater flow projections are compared to plans provided by the service providers for future water supply, wastewater treatment capacity, and effluent management to create a high-level, 20-year water balance scenario for each of the 6 areas.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC accept the report and provide direction to staff as appropriate.

JS:js

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 26, 2017

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.

JS:df

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 26, 2017
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 the schedule for final review of the draft 2016 Regional Water Management Plan (“RWMP”) update.

SUMMARY

On January 4, 2017, the NNWPC approved the schedule shown below for final review of the draft 2016 RWMP update and recommended its approval to the Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”). On January 15, 2017, the WRWC approved it as a tentative schedule, recognizing that some flexibility in the timing might be necessary as the review process progresses.

This schedule should allow for the NNWPC to make a recommendation for adoption of the RWMP update to the WRWC at a public hearing on March 1, 2017, the date of the March NNWPC meeting. This can be accomplished provided that all comments are returned to staff in time to prepare the final draft RWMP update for the agenda packet by February 23, 2017.

Staff would appreciate that comments be received by the end of the day, Friday, February 17, 2017, to allow adequate time for compilation of the document.

Tentative Schedule

Feb. 17, 2017	Publish 10-day notice of NNWPC public hearing, as required by statute
Mar. 1, 2017	NNWPC public hearing required by statute, and possible resolution recommending adoption of the Plan to the WRWC
Mar. 19, 2017	Distribute attested copy of the Plan to the WRWC (on or before Mar. 19)
Mar. 19, 2017	Deliver copy of the Plan to the County Clerk for 30-day public inspection period, and publish notice, as required by statute
TBA , 2017	Hold afternoon / evening public workshop (not required by statute), with prior publication
Apr. 7, 2017	Publish 10-day notice of WRWC public hearing, as required by statute
Apr. 19, 2017	WRWC public hearing required by statute, and possible adoption of the Plan

After the Plan is adopted, the statutes require that it be submitted to the Regional Planning Commission for a review for consistency with respect to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

BACKGROUND:

As required by Chapter 531 Statutes of Nevada 2007, the Western Regional Water Commission Act (the “Act”), a proposed amendment to the RWMP, must follow an adoption process as set forth in Sections 45 through 50 of the Act.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC accept the report and provide direction to staff as appropriate.

JS:df

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 26, 2017
TO: Chairman and Members, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission
FROM: Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager
SUBJECT: Review draft Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”) tentative budget; discussion and possible recommendation to the WRWC to approve the tentative budget.

SUMMARY

Staff has developed a draft tentative budget for fiscal year 2017-2018 for review and possible recommendation to the WRWC. This item comes to the NNWPC this year in February because budget figures must be submitted by February 13 to the Washoe County Community Services Department’s Finance & Administration Director [manager of the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”) under an Interlocal Agreement with the WRWC] due to early deadlines imposed by the Washoe County budget office. The attached draft tentative budget includes RWMF revenues, cash on hand and expenses for staff and non-staff professional services. Additional budget worksheets include details for professional services related to priority projects and routine operating expenses.

BACKGROUND

The WRWC is required to submit a budget to the Nevada Department of Taxation after holding a hearing in May of each year. The attached draft tentative budget is provided for review, discussion, possible direction to staff, and possible recommendation to the WRWC for approval as presented or with revisions. Based on input received, staff will prepare a tentative budget for review and adoption by the WRWC.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal year 2017-2018 draft tentative budget projects \$1,406,200 in revenue, \$2,324,926 in expenses, and an ending cash balance of approximately \$438,367. Budget expenses include a maximum of \$1,621,926 for WRWC work plan activities, \$617,000 for three full time staff and legal services, and various routine operating expenses in the amount of \$86,000.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the NNWPC review the draft tentative budget for fiscal year 2017-2018, provide appropriate direction to staff, and make a recommendation to the WRWC for approval of the tentative budget as presented or with revisions.

CW:df

Attachments: WRWC Draft Tentative Budget FY17-18

**Western Regional Water Commission
Fiscal Year July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018
Tentative Budget Summary Worksheet**

Budget Category	1.5% WMF	NOTE	Washoe County In-Kind	NOTE	TMWA In-Kind	NOTE	SVGID In-Kind	NOTE
REVENUE	Amount		Amount		Amount		Amount	
Estimated Water Surcharge Revenues	1,394,568							
Grant and/or Other Revenue	40,000							
Estimated Interest Income	25,648							
Total Revenue	1,460,216		0		0		0	
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES/SUPPLIES	Amount		Amount		Amount		Amount	
Estimated Professional Services (Page 2)	1,621,926	1						
Staff Services (Page 3)	617,000	2,3	0				0	
Non-Staff Services (Page 3)	86,000							
Total Professional Services/Supplies	2,324,926		0				0	
OTHER EXPENSES	Amount		Amount		Amount		Amount	
Estimated Misc.			0					
Total Other Expense	0		0		0			
Total Expenses	2,324,926		0		0		0	

Net Decrease in Cash Reserves (\$864,710)

Cash Balance as of 7/1/16	\$1,190,112
Estimated 2016/2017 Revenue (Cash Flow)	1,406,200
Estimated 2016/2017 expenditures (Page 4)	(\$1,293,235)
Estimated cash balance as of 7/1/17	\$1,303,077
Net Decrease in Cash Reserves for FY 2017-18	(\$864,710)
Estimated cash balance as of 6/30/18	\$438,367

NOTES:

- Proposed budget provides legal spending authority for projects yet to be approved by the WRWC upon recommendations provided by the NNWPC. Specific per project scope and cost yet to be developed and approved by the WRWC.
- Proposed budget provides legal spending authority for contract staff services previously approved by the WRWC.
- Includes Washoe County estimate for overhead: human resources, information technology, office space, utilities, computer hardware, software, copier, supplies, routine/administrative and GIS/drafting services.

Tentative Professional Services Budget Detail Fiscal Year 2017/2018

Professional Services Project Name	2017/2018 Budget Total	Expense Description/Example
-b-	-i-	-k-
<i>Climate Variability Data Assessmant</i>	\$0	
<i>Precipitation Monitoring</i>	\$30,000	
<i>Highland Canal Water Quality Project</i>	\$250,000	
<i>TROA 6700 AF Water Rights Requirement</i>	\$100,000	Water rights acquisition for TROA 6700 AF requirement
Regional Water Planning Projects	\$380,000	
<i>Cloud Seeding</i>	\$100,000	ILA with DRI for cloud seeding operations
<i>Washoe ET Project</i>	\$10,000	ILA with DRI; weather station maintenance
<i>Water Usage Review Program</i>	\$100,000	ILA with TMWA
<i>Certified Landscape Technician Program</i>	\$12,500	ILA with NLA
Regional Water Conservation	\$222,500	
<i>Bedell Flat Infiltration</i>	\$100,000	Hydrologic Investigations
<i>Bedell Flat Infiltration Grant</i>	\$0	208 grant (40K; see <i>Grant and/or Other Revenue</i> ; Page 1)
<i>Integrated Wastewater and Reclaimed Water System Planning</i>	\$204,000	Advanced Water Treatment Demonstration; ILA with UNR
Regional Reclaimed Water Planning Projects	\$304,000	
<i>Watershed Management Plan Update</i>	\$70,000	ILA with City of Reno
<i>NPDES Storm Water Permit Update</i>	\$112,926	ILA with City of Reno
<i>NPDES Storm Water Quality Management Program</i>	\$262,500	ILA with City of Reno
Regional Storm Water Planning Projects	\$445,426	
Regional Flood Control Planning Projects	\$0	
<i>N & P Reduction in watershed</i>	50,000	
<i>Water Quality Compliance</i>	150,000	
Regional Wastewater Planning Projects	\$200,000	
<i>Water Management Plan Update</i>	\$50,000	WMP contracts.
<i>TMRPA GIS Population Model</i>	\$20,000	ILA with RPGB
Comprehensive Plan	\$70,000	
Totals	\$1,621,926	

**Western Regional Water Commission
Tentative Routine Operation Budget Fiscal Year 2017/2018**

		2017/2018 Annual Routine Operating Budget Total	Expense Description/Example
WRWC Employees	Staff Services	\$440,000	Cost of <i>Support Staff</i> services as defined by employee services contract entered into between Washoe County and WRWC. Includes finance and administrative staff labor cost
Washoe County Overhead		\$45,000	Based on analysis of fy16-17 actual general fund overhead (excludes labor)
Mileage Expenses		\$2,400	Annual routine daily vehicle mileage expenses.
Legal Services		\$129,600	Cost of <i>Legal Counsel</i> services as defined by contract as entered into between Rhodes Law Office and WRWC
Lobbying Registration		\$0	Cost of registration for staff members as state lobbyists
Staff Services Subtotal		\$617,000	
Minutes	Non-Staff Services	\$15,000	Annual service contract to provide for recording of meetings, transcription of minutes and document editing.
Website		\$33,000	Such as website content and design services; annual website updating, maintenance, and hosting; specialized programming services; digital library development and updating; hosting, development and maintenance of databases; licensing fees, software and software updates, training/programming reference materials.
Video Coverage		\$5,000	Annual expense for video coverage of WRWC and NNWPC meetings.
CAFR & Audit		\$10,000	Annual expense for CAFR development and financial audit.
Regional Training		\$1,000	Cost of training for staff members <i>not covered by in-kind services</i> including registration and other miscellaneous cost such as reference materials, field trips, etc.
Regional Travel		\$1,000	Cost of travel for staff members <i>not covered by in-kind services</i> including transportation services, mileage reimbursement, lodging, meals, and other miscellaneous cost such as parking, etc.
Advertising		\$1,000	Such as advertising and legal notices.
Misc. Operating		\$20,000	Such as printing & reproduction, publications, and public notices, refreshments for volunteer boards/commissions, GIS and other in-house member agency support (not covered by in-kind services), equipment & supplies (i.e. computers, computer related supplies such as CDs, DVDs, etc.), projectors, printers, poster board, reproduction services, software licensing and fees, labels, business cards, periodicals, subscriptions, books, postage & mailing, promotion and public materials, misc. equipment rental, insurances, staff office supplies, and other expenses not included as part of overhead.
Non-Staff Services Subtotal		\$86,000	
Totals		\$703,000	

Estimated Expenditures Fiscal Year 2016/2017

Quarter Ending	Total Estimated Fiscal 2016/2017 Expenditure as of 6/30/17
WRWC Employees	300,000
Mileage Expenses	2,400
WRWC Overhead	95,000
Legal Services	129,600
Lobbying Services	600
Service Contract Subtotal	527,600
Minutes	5,000
Website	33,000
Envision/Sosu	5,000
CAFR & Audit	8,700
Regional Training	800
Regional Travel	1,000
Advertising	1,000
Misc. Operating	5,000
Non-Service Related Routine Operating Subtotal	59,500
Routine Operating Expense Subtotals	587,100
<i>TROA 6700 AF Water Rights Requirement</i>	32,585
<i>Restoration Investments in the Truckee Watershed</i>	29,050
<i>Climate Variability Data Assessment</i>	50,000
<i>Highland Canal Water Quality Project</i>	0
<i>Precipitation Monitoring</i>	30,000
Regional Water Planning	141,635
<i>DRI Cloud Seeding Monitoring</i>	25,000
<i>DRI Cloud Seeding</i>	100,000
<i>Washoe ET Project</i>	10,000
<i>Water Usage Review Program</i>	100,000
<i>Certified Landscape Technician Program</i>	12,500
Conservation, Sustainability, Climate Change	222,500
<i>Bedell Flat Infiltration</i>	0
<i>Bedell Flat Infiltration Grant</i>	0
<i>Integrated Wastewater and Reclaimed Water System Planning</i>	25,000
Regional Reclaimed Water Planning Projects	25,000
<i>Watershed Management Plan Update</i>	
<i>NPDES Storm Water Permit Update</i>	0
<i>NPDES Storm Water Quality Management Program</i>	262,500
Regional Storm Water Planning Projects	262,500
Regional Flood Control Planning Projects	0
<i>N & P Reduction in watershed</i>	0
<i>Water Quality Standards and TMDL Review, and Compliance</i>	0
<i>Septic System Mitigation Planning</i>	4,500
Regional Wastewater Planning Projects	4,500
<i>Plan Update (Cost-Finance and Water Balance Model Contract)</i>	50,000
<i>TMRPA GIS Population Model</i>	0
Water Management Plan	50,000
Project Subtotal	706,135
Totals	1,293,235

Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 24, 2017
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) Report on the status of Projects and Work Plan supported by the RWMF; and
- b) Financial Report on the RWMF.

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

Funds Ctr/ Project #	Project	Vendor	Orig.PO	Changes	Balance	Percent Complete	Start Date	End Date
WP310002	Acquisition of water rights	TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY	132,585.53	-23,420.00	109,166	18%	5/16/2013	6/30/2017
WP310006	Study:headwater restore/conservation	NATURE CONSERVANCY	8,121.63	-7,323.13	798.50	90%	10/1/2014	12/31/2016
WP310008	Precipitation"Can"Gauge Monit FY16-17	BOARD OF REGENTS/DESERT RESEARCH	37,989.00	0.00	37,989.00	0%	9/29/2016	9/30/2017
WP310101	Water Usage Review Program 2016/17 FY	TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY	100,000.00	0.00	100,000.00	0%	7/1/2016	6/30/2017
WP310102	Washoe ET Program FY 2016-17	BOARD OF REGENTS/DESERT RESEARCH	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00	0%	7/1/2013	9/30/2017
WP310103	Cloud Seeding Monitoring	BOARD OF REGENTS/DESERT RESEARCH	25,000.00	0.00	0.00	100%	7/1/2014	6/30/2017
WP310103	Cloud Seeding Project FY2016-17	BOARD OF REGENTS/DESERT RESEARCH	100,000.00	0.00	100,000.00	0%	9/15/2016	6/30/2017
WP310203	Advanced Wtr Treatment Demo. FY16-17	BOARD OF REGENTS, NSHE, obo UNR	155,699.00	-10,422.28	145,276.72	7%	7/1/2016	9/30/2017
WP310205	Regional Effluent Mgmt Strategy FY16/17	STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC	25,483.50	-5,115.00	20,368.50	20%	4/1/2015	9/30/2017
WP310303	Truckee Meadows Strmwater qual	RENO, CITY OF	262,500.00	-66,853.04	195,646.96	25%	7/1/2016	6/30/2017
WP310603	RWMP Update - Editing	STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC	25,000.00	-608.00	24,392.00	2%	11/3/2016	9/30/2017
WP310701	RWMP Update-Water Balance Model F16/17	STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC	20,113.00	0	0.00	100%	6/29/2015	6/30/2017
WP310701	Minutes for FY2016-17	TRUCKEE MEADOWS REG PLAN AGENCY	7,000.00	0	7,000.00	0%	7/1/2016	9/30/2017
WP310704	Envision Video Coverage for WRWC FY16-17	ENVISION VIDEO LLC	2,000.00	-680	1,320.00	34%	7/1/2015	6/30/2017
WP310704	FY17 Video Coverage NNWPC	SOSUTV CORP	3,000.00	-637.5	2,362.50	21%	7/1/2016	9/30/2017
WP310717	TRIG Website Hosting for FY2016-17	RENO, CITY OF	20,176.00	0	20,176.00	0%	7/1/2016	9/30/2017

-- Indicates contracting in progress or project status being updated.

01/24/2017
 Fund 766
 Report 400/ZF15
 Fiscal Year 2017; Period 1 through 7

**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%
State Grants	40,000.00-				40,000.00-	100-		40,000.00-	100-
* INTERGOVERNMENTAL	40,000.00-				40,000.00-	100-		40,000.00-	100-
Interest-Pooled Inv.	27,985.00-	7,795.92-		7,795.92-	20,189.08-	72-		20,189.08-	72-
RGL Pooled Inv.		693.41-		693.41-	693.41			693.41	
URGL Pooled Inv.		19,761.51		19,761.51	19,761.51-			19,761.51-	
Water Surcharge 1.5%	1,416,677.00-	908,965.11-		908,965.11-	507,711.89-	36-		507,711.89-	36-
* MISCELLANEOUS	1,444,662.00-	897,692.93-		897,692.93-	546,969.07-	38-		546,969.07-	38-
** REVENUE	1,484,662.00-	897,692.93-		897,692.93-	586,969.07-	40-		586,969.07-	40-
Professional Services	1,754,976.00	141,106.35	720,639.13	861,745.48	893,230.52	51		893,230.52	51
WRWC Staff & Legal	512,000.00	199,701.42	75,600.00	275,301.42	236,698.58	56.39		236,698.58	
Fin Consult Services	10,000.00	8,700.00		8,700.00	1,300.00	13		1,300.00	13
Invest Pool Alloc Ex		527.79		527.79	527.79-			527.79-	
Lobbying Services		600.00		600.00	600.00-			600.00-	
Pmts to O Agencies	175,000.00	23,420.00	109,165.53	132,585.53	42,414.47	24		42,414.47	24
Seminars and Meetings	1,000.00				1,000.00	100		1,000.00	100
Advertising	1,000.00				1,000.00	100		1,000.00	100
Undesignated Budget	20,000.00				20,000.00	100		20,000.00	100
Insurance Premium		3,286.00		3,286.00	3,286.00-			3,286.00-	
Combined Utilities	400.00	199.98		199.98	200.02	50		200.02	50
Travel	1,000.00				1,000.00	100		1,000.00	100
Overhead	129,600.00	41,309.37		41,309.37	88,290.63	331.78		88,290.63	331.78
** EXPENDITURES	2,604,976.00	418,850.91	905,404.66	1,324,255.57	1,280,720.43	49		1,280,720.43	49
*** Total	1,120,314.00	478,842.02-	905,404.66	426,562.64	693,751.36	62-		693,751.36	62-