

CARSON TRUCKEE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

Regular Meeting

March 11, 2025

DIRECTORS:

Todd Westergard
Karen Baggett (Zoom)
Ernie Schank
John Capurro
Ed James
Eddy Quaglieri
Mike Nevin
Ty Minor

ABSENT:

Pete Olsen
Tyler Henderson

Staff

Mary Pat Eymann

OTHER:

Kayla Dowty, Engineer
Lucas Foletta, Attorney
Chad Blanchard, FWM
Dave Silva, Silva Sceirine Accountant (Zoom)

GUESTS:

Austin Lemons, DVCD (Zoom)
Rachel Schmidt, DVCD (Zoom)
Nancy Upham, Churchill Co. (Zoom)
Bryan Byrne, RTC
Dan Moss, City of Reno (Zoom)
Matt Basel, City Forester
Landon Miller, City of Reno

1. CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER –Quorum present

2. PUBLIC COMMENT – limited to no more than three minutes per speaker * None

3. APPROVE AGENDA

- ❖ Director Schank made a motion to approve the agenda; seconded by Director Nevin; motion carried.

4. APPROVE MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 2025, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND CHECKS WRITTEN AS SUBMITTED –

- ❖ Director Capurro made a motion to approve the minutes and financial statements as presented; seconded by Director Minor; motion carried.

5. DISCUSSION, DIRECTION TO STAFF AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE 2025-2026 BUDGET – Staff/Dave Silva

A copy of the budget projects using the preliminary numbers from the Dept of Taxation was provided to the Board and is available at District offices.

The Board has previously discussed the need to make emergency funding available and for this to show

in the Budget the District sends to the Dept of Taxation.

Dave Silva – there is a minimum fund balance of 4% of the prior year’s actual expenditures. The District currently exceeds this at the current time. If the board elects to restrict funds by board action. Then, you would then want to, for example, have the account entitled, whatever that restriction may be, and if the board, instead of restricting, just wants to segregate funds, you can simply, one way of doing this simply is to set up a second account. You can call it, designated by the board or segregated by the board, is rather important in terms of filtering down through the audit. But a segregation or a designation does not carry the same weight that a restriction does. Restriction would require board action to make that restriction, and then, if the situation warranted it at some point in the future, to de restrict, if you will, those funds. In other words, to remove the restriction would also require board action.

Director Schank - If we put a general designation on it, like flood mitigation funds or something like that, then it doesn't matter whether we use it on the Truckee or the Carson.

Dave Silva - you can I think what I'm sensing is, maybe what you're talking about is from an accounting standpoint, not just from an investing standpoint, but from an accounting standpoint. And having a separate fund for emergencies, okay, like special revenue fund or emergencies, you can certainly do that and in that scenario, yes, Department of Taxation would be appraised of that virtually by the fact of you preparing your budget. So instead of having just one fund in your budget, which I believe you do now your general fund, you would then have another fund, which would probably be a special revenue fund for emergencies. You know, whatever you choose to call it. But yes, you can do that. It is recommended that there be Board action for setting up the separate fund.

Director Schank - I think what we need to do is, is we need to look at what our budget's going to be next year. We need to take the 4% off, make sure that that's set aside. And I mean, I would, I would suggest that we maybe go a little higher than the 4%, maybe five, just because it gives us, you know, a little buffer, and we have the money to do it, and then we have whatever's left, and that's what we need to designate.

Director James – We may be restricting ourselves a little too much, because let's say there's a project coming on the Truckee that's not a flood related one, and this board wants to consider.

Director Schank – What are special projects that we might not budget for that might be coming up? Such as Riverside Dr project.

Engineer Dowty – We have tried to budget as best we can but there could be things that pop up that we aren't anticipating.

Director Schank – And so that would be the Special Projects account that would have to come from.

6. WATER MASTERS REPORT AND DISCUSSION – Chad Blanchard.

A complete copy of the Water Report is available at District Offices or on the internet at troa.net and the SNOTEL report at wcc.sc.egov.usda.gov/reports/SelectUpdateReport.html

7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE GRANT TO BE PROVIDED TO THE CARSON WATER SUBCONSERVANCY DISTRICT (CWSD) PURSUANT TO THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO BY AND BETWEEN THE DISTRICT AND CWSD.

A copy of a worksheet regarding the determination of how the ILA would be figured out was provided to the Board and is available at District offices.

Changes per Board discussion were that engineering expenses be added to the administrative costs and USGA Stream Gauging be deleted as the gauges are on the Carson River.

The worksheet will be updated with the new figures and the changes discussed and brought back to

the Board.

8. REVIEW/DISCUSS INCREASE BY WCWCD FOR CONTRACT SERVICES – Staff

WCWCD discussed at their March meeting raising the rate it charges CTWCD for contract services. There was no quorum present but it was felt that an increase of \$200 per month would be adequate for a total of \$44,000 per year. This will be voted on formally at the next WCWCD meeting.

- ❖ Director James made a motion to approve the raise in fees for Contract Services to \$44,000 per year; seconded by Director Minor; motion carried.

9. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR GRANTS AWARDED BY THE DISTRICT – Kayla Dowty

Complete applications are available at District offices and were provided to the Board.

3 applications have been received. Currently there is \$95,000 in the “Projects to be Determined” account. This total amount (\$95,000) includes what would be given to CWSCD per the ILA.

Applicants:

1. City of Reno – request of \$10,821 for Truckee River Pathways & Riverbanks Tree Removal Equipment.
2. City of Reno – request of \$70,000 for John Champion Park Cement Repurposing.
3. Churchill County Mosquito Vector – request of \$20,000, Noxious weed program

Discussion:

City of Reno requests:

Engineer Dowty - The biggest question between your two requests is, is one higher priority than the other? Maybe question one and then question two, with the \$70,000 request at John champion, if you don't get the whole \$70,000 from the district, do you have other mechanisms in place?

Matt Basel – We could do some of the work in house, with in house staff and equipment to supplement the funding. Without the funding, we wouldn't be able to do that, to take on the project. The priority would be John Champion project.

Director Westergard – Given one of our main purposes has to do with the conveyance of a certain amount of water through the Truckee River channel, what's the connection between your project and the CWSD?

Engineer Dowty - I think the biggest connection is that park is heavily eroded. The banks are completely have either been carved out for encampments or they have just been eroded because of natural river conditions. So that's the biggest connection into what our district does. Yes, we're responsible for the 14,000 conveyance, but we're also responsible for bank stabilization, and that's what this project would intend to do.

Churchill County request:

Nancy Upham- Last fall, we did a little bit of perennial pepper weed, noxious weed control at Derby dam, but realized the water was still real high. It's not easy to get to some of the areas where you do have the perennial pepper weed. And from that point downstream, it was very difficult to find access onto properties to do an inventory of noxious weeds. So we kind of regrouped, and maybe it's best to put together a database and reach out to the landowners. And so in the last couple of weeks, we've been doing that, and I put together a flyer with the most likely noxious weeds that we would see along the Truckee River and along the Truckee canal. And I worked with TCID, and they gave me a database with names and addresses to reach out to the people. So that's one big thing that we're trying to do right now, with all of the work that's been done along the Truckee canal, especially, they brought a lot of dirt in. So they're bringing a lot of weed seed in to that area. And if we can jump on it in the next month, month and a half, we can reduce that seed production

tremendously. But what our goal is, is to reach out and get an inventory and get access to areas that we can treat, and then treat the plants before they go to seed. So, the best time to be doing these treatments is from bud to bloom, and if we can jump on that this spring to treat those areas. So that's kind of the gist of this spring. Hopefully with the reaching out to the property owners, that will help us, like I said, educate the property owners, get access to areas where there are weed infestations, and then also access for treatment. And so that's why we want to be realistic. Unfortunately, weed season hits at the very same time mosquito season hits. So that's why I just wanted to put in a realistic amount. If we could use it all, great. If we don't, we or we won't, you know, we won't use what we don't what we can't get to, but I'm working with our new manager, and we'll continue to work with our new manager on this, because we'd really like to see it happen, and he's well aware of it.

Engineer Dowty - I have a much more administrative question, so for I want to point out that. And I think this is clear in our grant application, but the grant funding that you're applying for now, the funds don't take effect until July 1, because that falls within our fiscal year. So you were awarded a 24/25 fiscal year grant for \$20,000 and it looks like there's about that, about \$8,800 sorry, \$8,700 of that 20,000 has been spent thus far. So you still have for and I hear you saying that you need to apply the herbicide like now during budding season prior to July 1. So are you able to use that, um, that remaining \$12,000 to do that, that application?

Nancy Upham - I believe so. And the reason being is because our applications are going to be now, but also going into next year, the herbicide now, which the costs of herbicides have gone up significantly, but that will carry us into after July 1 as well.

Engineer Dowty – So if you can use that remaining \$12,000 then is there still a need for the \$20,000 starting July 1 of this year?

Nancy Upham - It really depends on the inventory and what, what we've got acreage wise. I would say we would not use, we will not ask for any money that we do not use in treatment.

Director James - Am I wrong? You got the money now for this spring, but you'll need money next spring for treatment, so your application really would be more a spring of 2026, so if we want to allocate funding, at least that money can't be spent until 2026 but do you have funds today for 2025.

Nancy Upham - Yes. But the funding for 2024 2025 can carry us into the next cycle, and then that money can carry us into the next spring.

Director Schank - they could use the money any time after July of this year, right? But they so it'd be 25 to 26 so, okay, so that's where it would probably more realistically fits the calendar to utilize what they have left and then the next year. And I just, you know, I'm, I guess I'm a little partial, but it's something that's needed to be done for a long, long time. And it's, it's a very appropriate project for what we're looking at.

Director James – I am thinking is that if the \$105,000 hasn't fully been allocated, and there are some expenses this year I'm getting back that if we're cutting back the 57,000 that we be remarked for the Dayton area, but if we haven't allocated those funds for this year, then we don't have to reduce it to CWSD, but then that would free up money then for these other entities, because there's going to be money over to CWSD. But I'm trying to figure out how we can help fund the request here for Reno and others too. So I'm thinking that if we haven't allocated all the funds this fiscal year. That may be a way of bringing up some of the money this year that can then help with what's being required.

Engineer Dowty - So it sounds like the city of Reno \$54,000 and we'll end up spending the full \$20,000 to Churchill County, based on today's discussion. So that'll leave about \$40,000 it sounds like for carryover.

Once final budget numbers are in this agenda item will be discussed at next month's meeting for final amounts.

10. DESIGNATE AUDITOR FOR FY 2024-2025, SILVA, SCEIRINE & ASSOCIATES, LLC – Staff

- ❖ Director James made a motion to approve the firm of Silva, Sceirine & Associates, LLC as the auditors for FY2024-2025 for the District; seconded by Director Schank; motion carried.

11. DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE BOARD DIRECTION REGARDING REQUEST FROM DAYTON VALLEY CONSERVATION DISTRICT (DVCD) FOR EXTENSION OF GRANT PREVIOUSLY ENXTENDED IN 2024 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$57,000 – Staff/Kayla Dowty

Austin Lemons - I'm the new manager for Dayton Valley. Just kind of an update on our project here. We got 100% new staff between June and November of last year. We've applied for all of our permits back in November. We're still waiting on almost all of them. State Lands should be here any day now, but our Core engineers and our NDP permits are being processed, and they've been in process since November. We've purchased bio engineering supplies. We have Coon's construction under a contract for the project, but with waiting on permits, we are not going to be able to get in the river this winter slash spring. By the time we get those permits, the water flows will have increased, and we're not going to be able to get into the river. So just kind of wanted to chat with you guys about a way going forward. I know we have about \$57,000 back in our grant that was earmarked only for construction. I don't know if we are able to extend it, or if we can find some happy medium. I kind of wanted to see what you guys thought.

Engineer Dowty - So I think we'll point out, and Austin maybe already said this. This original grant was for the 23/24 fiscal year, where we allowed pushing the \$57,000 to the 24/25 fiscal year, and now we're talking about the 25/26 fiscal year. This is the one that I was saying is going to be very interesting in how you think that plays with the interlocal agreement?

Director Schank - The question that I would ask is Dayton Valley appeared before the Carson Water Sub Conservancy board two weeks ago at our budget hearings, did you build this money that you have not used into those grants that you were asking CWSD for?

Austin Lemons – No, as they are separate grants and separate entities.

Director James - There are two possible ways on that. One is to extend this another year, or the other one is to because it's going to be reducing what comes to CWSD, is to not reduce it from CWSD and not extend it. That's pushed both ways.

Attorney Foletta – What the agreement says is it comes with the actual distribution of the funds. But if they end up getting distributed, they should obviously reflect it in the agreement.

Director Schank – The easiest thing to do would be to not renew the extension request and add it into the agreement with CWSD and let them handle it.

- ❖ Director Schank made a motion to deny the requested extension by DVCD and instead make the \$57,000 part of the amount given to CWSD per the ILA and the money be taken from the Contingency Fund and that the ILA reflects this; seconded by Director Capurro; motion carried.

➤ Director James – had to leave the meeting.

**12. ENGINEERING/SUPERINTENDENT REPORT – Kayla Dowty
See engineering report.**

A. Riverside Drive Inundation and possible involvement of the District.

A copy of the report from JUB for the 30% downstream portion was provided and is available at District offices.

TRFMA voted on February 14th to approve an Interlocal Agreement to fund the project. The agreement has been sent to CTWCD and City of Reno attorneys. There are a couple of issues. The first one is that TRFMA feels there should be separate agreements for the downstream berm and the upstream wall, which is in direct conflict with what we want. We want assurance that the funding will be in place for both pieces because one piece without the other is of no use to us. It does not contain 14,000 and will jump out at one spot or another. The second issue was whether it makes sense for CTWCD to be a party to the agreement. The typical agreement between TRFMA and the City of Reno is just the flow of funding. Funding from TRFMA to the City, which would mean that CTWCD really doesn't need to be a party, but the way it has been drafted does it make sense? Attorney Foletta stated that if we want an ongoing influence over the design, and if there's any chance that the design changes while the project is underway, then it should be clear that we have the authority over that issue. We can probably manage the existence of two agreements if we make them effective upon the approval of both. In other words, neither one of them is effective without the other. Attorney Foletta will work with TRFMA and City regarding any comments back and forth.

B. Maintenance debris removal work, emergency debris/deposit removal work and authorization for expenditures for such work.

See engineering report.

A complete report with photos was also provided to the Board and available at District offices.

C. Encroachment permits and requests.

A letter was received from RTC requesting permission to work during flood season (available at District offices).

Director Schank inquired about how RTC would be notified in the event of a possible event, Ms. Dowty advised that it is written if CTWCD provides you notice, you have notice, but it is also the responsibility of the party to track weather patterns and anticipated flows. RTC advised that on April 14th it was requested to basically go into do water sampling for the permit which is the work within the 14,000 cfs that needs to be done. Starting in May, the improvements up and outside of the flood bank or the flood walls.

- ❖ Director Schank made a motion to approve the request by providing a waiver letter granting the extension; seconded by Director Minor; motion carried.

D. Miscellaneous items

13. LEGISLATIVE REPORT AND UPDATE – Attorney Foletta, Director Baggett

Attorney Foletta - AB 104 and 36 were heard last week both have to do with water buyback programs.

Director Baggett – sent out her summary report to the Board and available at District offices.

14. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT –Lucas Foletta

Nothing to report.

15. SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT – Mary Pat Eymann

Nothing to report.

16. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

17. BOARD COMMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

New Future Agenda Item Requests – none

Board Comments – none

18. ADJOURNMENT -

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

**Next meeting
Regular Meeting
April 8, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.**

Todd Westergard,
President

Mary Pat Eymann,
Secretary/Treasurer

Minutes transcribed via otter.ai