

CARSON WATER SUBCONSERVANCY DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
March 19, 2014, 6:30 P.M.
Minutes

Directors present:

Karen Abowd
Carl Erquiaga
Don Jardine
Doug Johnson
Greg Lynn, Vice Chairman
John McKenna, Treasurer
Austin Osborne, Storey County
Barry Penzel
Mary Rawson
Ernie Schank, Chairman
Fred Stodieck

Directors not present:

Ray Fierro
Don Frensdorff
Joe Ricci

Staff present:

George Benesch, Legal Counsel
Brenda Hunt, Watershed Coordinator
Edwin James, General Manager
Toni Leffler, Administrative Assistant/Board Secretary
Debbie Neddenriep, Water Resource Specialist

Also present:

Karen Baggett, CTWCD
Mitch Blum, HDR
Robb Fellows, Carson City Public Works
Tom Grundy, Carson City Public Works
Marvin Tebeau, Resource Concepts Inc.
Dave Thompson, R.O. Anderson Engineering

Chairman Schank called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Room #1214 of the Nevada Legislative Building, 401 S. Carson St., Carson City, Nevada. The CWSD/Alpine County Joint Powers Board was convened. Roll call was taken and a quorum was determined to be present. The Pledge of Allegiance was lead by Director Johnson.

Item #5 - Approval of Agenda. Mr. James noted that Item #15 will be postponed until a future Board meeting. *Director Lynn made the motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Director Jardine and unanimously approved by the Board.*

Item #6 - Approval of February 19, 2014, Board Meeting Minutes. *Director Rawson made the motion to approve the February 19, 2014, Board meeting minutes, which was seconded by Abowd and unanimously approved by the Board.*

Item #7 - Public Comment. None.

CONSENT AGENDA

Item #8 - Approval of Treasurer's Report for February 2014.

Item #9 - Payment of Bills for February 2014.

Item #10 - Discussion for possible action regarding the 2014 Water Rate Report for the Carson River Watershed.

Item #11 - Discussion for possible action regarding authorizing the General Manager to sign an agreement with River Wranglers to provide assistance with the NDEP grant for the Carson River Conservation Tours.

Item #12 - Discussion for possible action authorizing the General Manager to sign the agreement with the USGS to extend the agreement period and to provide funding for the East Fork Algae Study.

Item #13 - Discussion for possible action authorizing the General Manager to sign the agreement with the NDEP to extend the contract period and to receive funding for the East Fork Algae Study.

Item #14 - Discussion for possible action authorizing \$40,000 in CWSD funding and the Chairman to sign a Letter of Support for FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant for the Douglas County State Route 88/Cottonwood Slough Mitigation Flood Project.

Director Lynn made the motion to approve the consent agenda items #8-14. The motion was seconded by Director Rawson and unanimously approved by the Board. There was no public comment.

****END OF CONSENT AGENDA****

Item #15 - Discussion for possible action regarding a presentation by Linda Conlin on the River Wranglers' Education Program. This item is postponed until the April Board meeting.

Director Stodieck arrived at 6:38 p.m.

Item #16 - Discussion for possible action regarding a presentation by Resource Concepts Inc. on the State of Nevada's Source Water Protection Program. Marvin Tebeau from Resource Concepts Inc. (RCI) explained that RCI has been working with NDEP on the Integrated Source Water Protection Program (ISWPP) in Lyon County. Douglas County already has an approved program. Lyon County's program is to be approved in the next month, and Carson City's will follow shortly after. This is a voluntary program funded by NDEP with no match requirement, only a request from each county to participate for the purpose of protecting community drinking water sources. Churchill

County's timeline is still to be determined. The purpose of the program is to document public drinking water resources in a county and the measure that the communities intend to implement to protect those sources. The Community Source Water Protection (CSWP) Plan is a tool to facilitate cooperation and education to aid in the management and continued safety of communities' drinking water resources.

It takes less effort and money to protect drinking water than to clean it up. Avoiding water supply contamination lessens health issues, the high costs of water treatment, and new source development. For Lyon County a local planning team of public water systems, planners, local and state government, and RCI as the technical assistance provider have met since 2012. It is important for the public to be part of the team for ownership of the product.

Strategies to protect drinking water include education and outreach, Household Hazardous Waste Program, development standards, inter-agency coordination, monitoring, new infrastructure, and the Source Water Protection Team. From the Management Strategies a series of actions were identified: to consider education tools; a household hazardous waste program; review/communication processes with developers, businesses, and property owners; and actions to improve coordination.

Next Steps: In Douglas County, the actions are being implemented. In Lyon County, the Plan will be endorsed locally and by the State of Nevada. Lyon County is in the process of requesting funding and technical assistance to implement the action plan. Carson City will complete the Plan with approvals in the Spring of 2014. Grants from the State have no matching requirements

Director Johnson explained that in Douglas County he would like to implement addressing protection of private wells and asked if there was anything to help address that. Mr. Tebeau responded that there is not but Douglas County could implement a program.

Mr. James explained that he brought this item to the Board to help them understand the importance of protecting drinking water sources. The plan is to get a better inventory of water sources available and how to protect them. This will save money in the end.

Director Schank asked if county Public Safety routinely watch wells. Mr. James responded that there are alarm systems around well heads. Attack on the well heads is probably not as big an issue as dumping in the capture zone. It is also important to know what's being stored in buildings.

No action was required on this item; receive and file.

Item #17 - Discussion for possible action regarding a presentation on the proposed new Carson River floodplain maps in the Carson City area. Mr. James explained that Mitch Blum of HDR has been working with CWSD on remapping of floodplains and is just finishing the mapping in the Carson City area. The mapping/modeling program is funded by FEMA, and we have to meet FEMA's requirements. We are making sure it is as accurate up front as possible. There are a few things that have popped up of which the Board should be aware.

Mr. Blum gave an brief overview and background of the FEMA Mapping Activity Statement (MAS) project, the issues in the Hells Bells area of Carson City, and where we are now. The 2008 Floodplain Management Plan had suggested action items with Action #14 being an unsteady state model. We are in year two of the four-year process. The MAS will provide a detailed, up-to-date Carson River Flood Hazard Mapping through Lyon, Carson City, Douglas, and Alpine Counties. This is a tool for assessing watershed scale floodplain impacts. It is important to have consistency

of mapping. The unsteady state flow model is a hydrograph which has time and flow embedded in the analysis. We can look at the timing and volume of water moving through the system. He used the 1997 flood event to calibrate the model using USGS photo documentation and ran the flood information through the model to determine whether the model was reflecting that event. It was a good match with the modeling. He also used the flow rates for the 2006 flood event. It has been determined that the 1997 flood was an 85-year event with the hydrograph showing 25,000 cfs. The hydraulic model that was used is HEC-RAS from the US Army Corps of Engineers which is a one-dimensional model, but he will be using a two-dimensional model in Carson Valley.

Mr. Blum explained that FEMA's definition of shallow flood hazard mapping is areas with a depth of less than 3' and no defined channel. The zones of shallow flooding include: 1) Shaded X which has an average depth less than 1'; 2) AH which is ponded water with average depths of 1-3'; and 3) AO which is sheet flow with average depths of 1-3'.

As a result of the MAS #2 results, the floodplain boundaries in the Hells Bells area of Carson City may need to be changed. Mr. Blum explained that a levy has to meet a federal certification process if you are going to state that water is impounded behind a roadway, etc., but this roadway has not been certified as a levy and could potentially flood in the area. Average depth is 1.2' behind the roadway. The current FEMA floodway is at a 4,606' elevation, but FEMA used coarse topography and their boundary is very generalized. HDR and Carson City did some surveying in that area, and some of the homes are below the 4,606' elevation, so this area could be considered within the 100-yr. floodplain.

Director Abowd asked how many homes are effected. Robb Fellows responded that there are six homes. Mr. James pointed out the homes on a map. Mr. Fellows has been working with FEMA regarding these homes. Mr. Fellows noted that Carson City is seeking more precise information by locating two eyewitnesses who monitored the flood event in 1997 so the model can be calibrated more precisely. If the homeowners are close to or in the 100-year floodplain, they should be informed that the floodwaters could get to their homes. Carson City is incorporating action in their sand bag plan to watch the area for sand bagging and inform the residents. If the homes are in X-shaded zone, the flood insurance policies could be less than \$1,000/yr. per resident. Mr. Blum noted that, depending on how the mapping comes out in this area, there are implications for the insurance.

Director McKenna asked if Empire Ranch Golf Course would impact flooding since it wasn't there in the 1997 flood. He noted that several residents' families have been in their locations for generations without ever experiencing flooding. Mr. James stressed the importance of the modeling being able to reflect the impact of growth, as in Carson Valley. Mr. Blum agreed that even a small amount of development in the Carson Valley floodplain can impact flow in the Carson City floodplain. Director McKenna pointed out that this study could cause more expense to those residents by putting them in the floodplain. Mr. Fellows noted that this modeling is designed to determine the risk of flooding and that residents would want to know if they could be involved. Mr. James reminded the Board that this is why we are taking the lead in mapping the floodplain to be able to work to help residents within FEMA guidelines.

Director Johnson commented that if the 1997 flood was determined to be a 100-year flood instead of an 85-yr. flood, these residents would not be in the floodplain. Mr. Blum noted that FEMA did studies in 1980 which preceded the 1997 and 2006 flood events and came up with 36,000 cfs as the

100-yr. flood flow. We have since extended the timeline of analysis to include the later events and flow was reduced to 33,000 cfs.

Mr. Blum summarized that HDR is resolving issues of mapping for Phase 2 through Carson City and Phase 3 is started in Douglas County. He showed the Board the modeling program in action, noting how the flood waters would swell and recede over a period of time.

No action was required on this item; receive and file.

Item #18 - Discussion for possible action authorizing staff to enter into a contact with a web designer/developer for CWSD website redesign. Brenda Hunt explained that staff is proposing to redesign the current 10-year-old CWSD website because it is an integral part of providing information to the public. Currently the website is not very user friendly, has broken links, and sections were added on without a comprehensive plan for how information is found on the website. The technology is old and staff cannot manipulate the website; we have to pay to have someone do that. We have legal requirements to put agendas and minutes on the website, but we can make that easier to do with an updated website. The online library could be more user friendly. Courtney Walker has done a lot of work putting buttons on the front page and shoring up the current website.

Staff has sent out a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to five local web designers and is hoping to receive submissions by Friday, March 21. Then staff will sit down with applicants to go over our requirements and estimate the cost. Funding for this will come from the Outside Professional Services account. The current website hosting contract ends at the end of April; therefore, we need to migrate the information to the new website before then.

Director Abowd asked about an interactive website and using an online template to cut costs. Ms. Hunt pointed out that we want this to be as cutting edge as possible since it may be another 10 years before the website is redesigned again. We want to do a Stewardship Pledge which may be interactive and also a blog. Director Rawson mentioned that she has a website and it can be frustrating when she has to go to the webmaster to integrate information. Debbie Neddenriep noted that there are software problems that won't communicate between areas of our website. We need the right technology. The website was never mapped out to provide for growth; it has just been added to randomly.

Director Osborne noted that Storey County also has a similar problem. Their IT department is now migrating their website. He offered for Storey County to help CWSD where possible. Director Johnson suggested putting a not to exceed amount into the motion. Director Johnson suggested that a pre-approve amount might make it possible for staff to be able to move forward sooner.

Director Penzel suggested adding the ability to take payments on the website. This could be an opportunity to increase revenue by accepting payments through Square or Paypal.

Director Schank asked about the analytics for the website. Ms. Hunt explained that the analytics can tell the general location of who viewed the website, how long they viewed, which pages were viewed the most, etc., so that staff can change the website to be most effective. Providing the analytical data is one of the grant criteria required by NDEP to assure that we are meeting our grant requirements. Director Schank asked about whether teachers can find lesson plans on the website. Ms. Hunt responded that lesson plans are in the Explore Your Watershed portion but accessing them can be made easier with new programming. Lesson plans can be submitted to the website as well.

Director Penzel suggested coordinating the CWSD website with applications for Smart Phone users, etc., to modernize for educating younger users. Ms. Hunt noted that involving those applications are currently out of our financial reach.

Director Johnson made the motion to authorize the General Manager to enter into a contract with the chosen web designer/developer for the CWSD website redesign not to exceed the amount of \$7,500 and any other options outside of that will be brought back to the Board for approval. The motion was seconded by Director Stodieck and unanimously approved by the Board.

Item #19 - Discussion for possible action authorizing the Chairman to sign a letter of support for the grant proposal for Habitat Restoration Planning at Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge. Mr. James explained that he was approached by the River Partners organization for a letter of support for Habitat Restoration Planning at Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge. Initially he was under the impression that this project had received approval by the local community, but he has since learned that there may be complications. Director Schank has been investigating the matter. Mr. James suggested approving the draft letter with the caveat that Churchill County supports the project. Director Schank pointed out that Churchill County could support the project and TCID not support it. He has set up a field trip tomorrow to see if TCID has any concerns with the project. Terri Pereira will be going on behalf of the county.

Director Lynn indicated that he is not comfortable with CWSD or TCID holding the bag. He noted that we need to know much water this will take. Director Schank explained that the owner purchased the old Camp Ranch, and the Old Stillwater Slough runs through it. They claim that they are losing native vegetation and want to remove the bank of the slough so that it will flood their property but are not considering the irrigation area on the other side of the slough. When you spread water out in one place you impact people downstream who depend on the Old Stillwater Slough.

Director McKenna asked if CWSD can stay out of this. Director Johnson noted that we can stay out of it by putting the burden on the Churchill County to get more information and approve the project. Director Shank noted that TCID has invited Churchill County to come on field trip to share the information.

Mr. James commented that the safe thing to do is say is that we support Churchill County's position. Director Rawson noted that she would rather TCID make a decision about the project too.

Director Lynn made the motion that we support Churchill County in whatever position they take in this matter. Director McKenna seconded the motion.

George Benesch asked if we want to include TCID's position in the motion. Director Erquiaga commented that Churchill County will probably support the project depending on whether TCID can support it. Director McKenna noted that it is hard to give a letter of support for the project that is not defined, but given the timeframe and trust of the people in Churchill County and TCID to determine the project's appropriateness, Churchill County and TCID can tell CWSD what they want and we can sign on to that. We don't know if it is even our business. Director Schank pointed out using it just takes common sense to determine if what they are proposing is going to cause problems, but that the dilemma is that no one from the county or TCID has had time to look at the project. Without a consultant we have a hard time knowing whether it will cause environmental problems. Mr. James said he has not done any research on his own about this. A letter of support should mean something, but if we are not comfortable with giving our support, we should not move

forward for our own integrity. CWSD should not do anything but let the local community move forward.

Director Lynn withdrew his motion, which was approved by Director McKenna as the second.

Director Schank advised staff to write a letter explaining why CWSD cannot provide a letter of support at this time and that we need more time to gain information. If more time is granted, we would consider writing a letter but need time to analyze the project first.

Director Lynn made the motion that, pending further information, the General Manager is to send a letter saying that we don't have the information we need to act on supporting this project. The motion was seconded by Director Abowd and unanimously approved by the Board.

Item #20 - Discussion for possible action regarding approval of the FY 2014-15 tentative budgets.

Mr. James thanked the Finance Committee for spending six hours hearing information and considering the budgets. He then went through the tentative budget briefly. On pages 127-128 of the Board package, the tentative budget income from Ad Valorem taxes is based on last year's data. Changes to the budget since the Finance Committee meeting include additional funding for the Algae Study on a pass through basis. We did get the Literacy and Trails grants. He congratulated Courtney Walker for submitting the grant which received the highest score of all grants submitted in the state of Nevada.

Administrative costs are more this year to provide for a single audit if federal grant funds exceed \$500,000. Salaries and benefits are as approved previously by the Board. Legal expenses are slightly higher to reinstated mileage reimbursement to Mr. Benesch. On page 129, preliminary planning is an emergency account which has gone up and down over the years. Staff is trying to keep about \$500,000 in it, though we have had to use some over the past few years. On page 130, the Floodplain Management Fund has changed. Instead of \$400,000, the Floodplain Planning account would be \$360,000, with \$40,000 going for the SR 88 Flood Project in Minden. The Acquisition/Construction Fund includes the request from Carson City for the intertie with Douglas County at Costco as a regional project.

The regional water system list of projects identified four years ago cannot be funded in its entirety since we need an additional \$600,000 to fund them all. Mr. James wanted the Board to be aware in the future planning process that we will have to start putting more funds from the General Fund to the Acquisition Fund for regional projects.

Mr. James noted that the Tax Department wants to see an ending balance around 4-5% of budget expenses.

Director Penzel referred to page 128 and asked, with the Douglas County Regional Pipeline now complete, why another \$125,000 is budgeted. Mr. James responded that Douglas County and Carson City both bonded the pipeline, and CWSD agreed to help fund the bond payments for a 20-year period.

Mr. James pointed out that on p. 129 under New Projects, the Water Quality and Water Level Study in Churchill County assumes that Churchill County will participate in the match requirement. If Churchill County doesn't provide 25% of the match, CWSD will not provide 25%.

Mr. James noted that the Tax Department sends out the Ad Valorem tax revenue with the abatement amount on March 25, but our Tentative Budget needs to be submitted before our next Board

meeting. Mr. James asked that he be able to modify the Ad Valorem numbers to reflect the State's numbers as provided on March 25. Also, Mr. James asked that the Preliminary Planning be changed to keep the ending balance within the 4-5% range as requested by the State. Director Penzel noted that the 5% reserve requirement is "to meet necessary expenses" and asked for the legal reference to 5%. Mr. James responded that it is our Tax Department representative who asked for the 4-5% reserve.

Director Lynn made the motion to approve the FY 2014-15 tentative budgets as presented and give the General Manager the ability to adjust the ending balance to reflect actual ad valorem taxes. The motion was seconded by Director Penzel and unanimously approved by the Board.

Item #21 - Discussion for possible action regarding an update on the 2014 water picture for the Carson River Watershed. Mr. James showed graphs of the Carson River at various gauge locations. He is concerned that the weather temperatures are so warm that there is already a spring melt. He noted that the runoff is like a checking account; if you spend it up front, there will be no reserves. The West Fork at Woodfords is coming off quickly already. The Carson City gauge water is coming down but far below normal. Irrigation started in Lyon County this Monday, and next week irrigation in Douglas County will kick in, so flows will be impacted. At Lahontan we are about 20,000 AF behind last year. We will see water coming in from the Truckee Canal. Right now 160 cfs is coming from the Carson River and 270 cfs from the Canal. About 70% of the water in Lahontan Reservoir is Truckee River water. Marlette Lake is coming up a bit but there is still a question of it filling this year. Predictions for April-August are very low this year. Because of the drought the Federal Water Master is allowing diversions on the Carson River now. The allocation from Lahontan is only 40% this year. Director Schank noted that snow is predicted on Thursday and Friday of next week.

No action was required on this item; receive and file.

Item #22 - Staff Reports

General Manager - Mr. James reported: 1) He participated in an ARKstorm simulation last week based on 1860-61 flood information and referred to a newspaper article which was handed out. The simulation brought to his mind that we will be on our own in the Carson watershed when a major flood hits the West. It might be helpful in the future to do something like this simulation for this community. 2) He received a phone call yesterday that NDEP is withdrawing changes to the permit for working on waterways since CWSD brought up potential complications with the changes they were planning to make. 3) CWSD is now looking at possible funding from FEMA for MAS #5.

Brenda Hunt reported: 1) On p 150 of the Board package is a letter to support AB 2403, a bill in the California Assembly to help fund weed management areas which is essential for Alpine County. 2) CWSD is having a full Carson River Coalition (CRC) forum on April 3. The program is on the CWSD website and includes important and varied information. Lunch will be provided, and everyone is invited. 3) The annual "Get on the Bus" Carson River Watershed tour is scheduled for June 11-12. We will be going to some new spots on the East Fork in Alpine County instead of to Hope Valley. We will also be going to Soda Lakes instead of to Stillwater in Churchill County.

Legal –Mr. Benesch had nothing to report.

Correspondence – As handed out and in the Board package. There was also a policy to go into each Director's CWSD information binder.

Item #23 - Directors' Reports

Director Johnson reported that the Douglas County Commissioner's last meeting went 9.5 hours, particularly because they were reviewing the water and sewer rates, and tomorrow they will hold a similar meeting at Lake Tahoe. 2) Park Cattle Company filed a lawsuit against ARCO for Leviathan Mine contamination.

Director Jardine reported that California is celebrating 150 years since the creation of Alpine County. Everyone is invited to a series of events and tours.

Director Osborne reported that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is converting property for the new Storey County sewer project. 2) Storey County is receiving a grant to rebuild the reservoir in Virginia City.

Director Rawson reported: 1) The watershed workday training was very successful with a record attendance of 27 people. 2) The Alpine County Supervisors had a wonderful luncheon with legislators at their Board of Supervisors meeting to celebrate Alpine County's 150th anniversary.

Director Schank reminded the Board to provide Toni Leffler with ideas for field trips and dates to go to each county.

Directors Stodieck, Erquiaga, Penzel, Abowd, McKenna, Lynn, and Schank had nothing specific to report.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Director Lynn made the motion to adjourn and the meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Toni Leffler
Secretary