

**CARSON WATER SUBCONSERVANCY DISTRICT
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
January 24, 2018, 3:00 P.M.**

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present:

Karen Abowd, Carson City
Carl Erquiaga, Churchill County
David Griffith, Alpine County
Don Frensdorff, Douglas County
Chuck Roberts, Lyon County

Staff Present:

Ed James, General Manager
Debbie Neddenriep, Water Resources Specialist 2
George Benesch, Counsel

Others Present: Austin Osborne

Committee Member Abowd called the meeting of the Administrative Committee to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Conference Room of Carson Water Subconservancy, 777 East William Street, Suite 110, Carson City, Nevada. A quorum of the Administrative Committee was present.

Item #3 – Discussion Only: Public Comment - None

Item #4 - For Possible Action: Approval of the Administrative Committee minutes from November 30, 2017. *Committee Member Erquiaga made a motion to approve the Administrative Committee minutes from November 30, 2017, which was seconded by Committee Member Frensdorff and unanimously approved by the Administrative Committee with Committee Member Griffith abstaining.*

Item #5 - For Possible Action: Discussion regarding Storey County becoming an official member of the Carson River Watershed Committee including possible contribution from Storey County. Mr. James explained that Storey County would like to officially join Carson River Watershed Committee. Mr. James explained that rather than join through Nevada's legislative process, Storey County would join the CWSD Committee by signing a similar MOU to that between the District and Alpine County.

Committee Member Roberts stated that he has no problems with Storey County joining the Carson River Watershed Committee, but he has concerns with the concept of exacting a fee as part of membership. He expressed concern that this could possibly be construed as having to pay to be part of committee. He explained he felt if Storey County would like to be a part of the committee, its membership should not be tied to paying a set amount of money to CWSD annually. Furthermore, he stated he didn't feel it is appropriate to establish a separate pot of money earmarked for projects within Storey County. If CWSD wants to spend money in Storey County, it should be allowed if it fits the nexus of benefitting the watershed.

Mr. Osborne noted Storey County is not opposed to joining through legislative process but thought the MOU process could provide a method for Storey County to join CWSD before the next legislative session. He also noted that Storey County is not adjacent to the Carson River and the benefit of Storey County's participation in CWSD is to its downstream users in Carson River Watershed.

Committee Member Abowd asked how the Alpine County model would be applied to create a MOU for Storey County. Mr. James explained that through the MOU CWSD and Storey County would agree to work together, set a contribution amount, and pay the representative from Storey County for attending the meeting. These funds from Storey County could be used for projects in Storey County. The alternative would be if Storey County wanted CWSD's help with a project, then CWSD and Storey County would enter into an agreement for that project. Through that agreement process CWSD could include a statement if there is an interest for Storey County to pay an administrative fee to CWSD.

Mr. Osborne asked if anyone could be appointed to the Carson River Watershed Committee. Committee Member Roberts answered yes, but it is at CWSD discretion.

After further discussion, it was recommended that the process would be that CWSD Board formally ask Storey County to become a Carson River Watershed Committee member and that Storey County would appoint a representative. Mr. Osborne asked if there could an alternate. Mr. James mentioned that CWSD does not allow alternates.

Committee Member Roberts asked for clarification about allowing alternate committee members. A discussion followed, and the conclusion was that CWSD committee members from the same county could fill in for one another member, but a non-committee member could not fill in. The conclusion was Storey County would not send alternate.

No public comment. *Committee Member Roberts made the motion that the Administrative Committee recommend CWSD Board invite Storey County to join the Carson River Watershed Committee and appoint a representative. Committee Member Griffith seconded the motion which was unanimously approved by the Administrative Committee.*

Item #6 - For Possible Action: Discussion regarding revising CWSD Interlocal Agreements.

Mr. James explained that Committee Member Griffith pointed out that CWSD needs to update and add some liability language to CWSD Interlocal Contracts. He pointed out proposed changes on the example interlocal contract. Those proposed language changes came from Carson City and were run by CWSD's insurance agent. Committee Member Griffith pointed several areas that need some additional language clean up. Mr. James noted that this was not his area of expertise. He will run

the ideas discussed at the meeting by the insurance agent. This will then be brought back to the CWSD Board.

No public comment. *Committee Member Roberts made the motion that the Administrative Committee recommend CWSD Board accept changes to the standard interlocal agreement template, with suggested changes implemented. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Griffith and unanimously approved by the Administrative Committee.*

Item #7 – For Possible Action: Re-evaluate CWSD Staff’s current salary ranges. Mr. James explained that he compared salaries of CWSD staff to other agencies in the area. It was a challenge because there is not a straight comparison for any of the positions at CWSD. Therefore, he tried to compare each job to a variety of jobs at different jurisdictions that require similar knowledge, skills and/or abilities. In 2015, the Watershed Program Manager, Watershed Program Specialist, and Water Resources Specialist 2 positions were modified. The General Manager position was not modified because it was hard to find comparisons, and the Administrative Assistant position was in line with other similar positions in the watershed. The last time these two positions were reviewed and modified was in 2009. Mr. James noticed that CWSD’s current salary ranges are less than most of the other counties’ ranges. He mentioned that one way to correct this would be to expand CWSD salary ranges from 10-steps to 12-steps.

Committee Member Abowd asked if the comparison of the CWSD’s General Manager position to Carson City’s Public Works Director is a true comparison. She noted Carson City’s Public Works Director oversees multiple departments and many staff members. Mr. James replied that the Public Works Director is responsible for many more employees and a much larger budget, but the CWSD General Manager position has more responsibilities. He tried to include several examples for each employee that covered a wide range of responsibilities.

Committee Member Griffith asked if benefits are similar to the counties. Mr. James explained that CWSD employees’ health benefits and PERS are the same as Carson City.

Mr. Osborne asked if CWSD policies are the same as Carson City. Mr. James replied no, CWSD has its own policies; however, CWSD does follow Carson City’s policies closely. Mr. Osborne mentioned he does many salary comparison studies which reflect the highs and lows for a given position in small to large entities in this region.

Committee Member Erquiaga asked how Mr. James compared and what the percentage difference was between steps. Mr. James responded that he tried to compare different jobs with similar task, but that is difficult. The differences between the Steps is a fixed 3.5%. Committee Member Roberts asked how employees qualify to receive merit increase. Mr. James replied a satisfactory

evaluation results in a merit increase. Committee Member Roberts noted that the merit increase amounts to an automatic pay raise.

Committee Member Abowd commented that starting the pay scale at a lower level may make it difficult to find qualified applicants. Committee Member Abowd mentioned that Carson City does performance-based budgeting. Mr. Osborne noted that it was quite difficult for a small public entity to administer performance-based evaluations and made a case that at times it is appropriate for a merit pay increase to be based upon a satisfactory review. Therefore, he is not against “fossil pay” methodology.

Committee Member Abowd asked if employees should get a performance bonus. Committee Member Roberts suggested keeping the current pay scale at 10 steps. Mr. Osborne asked if CWSD was included in county comparison studies; Mr. James replied CWSD was not. Committee Member Roberts asked if any employees are topped out. Mr. James mentioned that both he and Toni Leffler have been topped out for the past four years. Committee Member Roberts proposed modifying the General Manager and Administrative Assistant salary ranging as proposed and keeping the other positions at the current salary ranges. These salary ranges could be evaluated in the future.

Mr. James also mentioned he is proposing that the Administrative Assistant position be reduced to 35 hours per week effective January 1, 2019.

Committee Member Roberts made the motion that the Administrative Committee recommend CWSD Board modify the General Manager and Administrative Assistant salary ranges as submitted to the committee and the Administrative Assistant hours goes 35 hours per week effective January 1, 2019. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Erquiaga and unanimously approved by the Administrative Committee.

Item #8 – For Possible Action: Discuss proposed COLA adjustment for fiscal year 2018-19.

Mr. James explained that CWSD has been using Carson City’s COLA rate which is proposed to be 1.75%. He was wondering if CWSD wanted to consider a different COLA formula in the future. Committee Member Griffith asked what formula would CWSD use. Mr. James replied that this would be a topic for a future meeting.

No public comment. *Committee Member Griffith made the motion that the Administrative Committee recommend CWSD Board approval of a COLA adjust of 1.75% for fiscal year 2018-19. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Roberts seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by the Administrative Committee.*

Item #9 – Discussion Only: Public Comment. None.

Item #8 – Adjournment. *There being no further business to come before the Administrative Committee, Committee Member Griffith made the motion to adjourn which was seconded by Committee Member Roberts and the meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Neddenriep
Water Resources Specialist 2