

# CARSON TRUCKEE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

Public Hearing on the Final Budget

May15, 2014

## **DIRECTORS:**

Todd Westergard

Karen Baggett

John Capurro

Greg Dennis

Ed James

Mike Nevin

Ron Penrose

Chuck Roberts

Ernie Schank

## **GUESTS:**

Leo Bergin, Attorney

Lori Williams, Engineer

Dave Wathen, FWM

Steve Lewis, UNR-CoOp Extension

## **ABSENT:**

Gwen Washburn

### **1. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM -**

President Westergard called the Regular Meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

### **2. PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

### **3. DISCUSS SCOPE/GOALS FOR DISTRICT- Steve Lewis**

Steve Lewis from UNR, Co-Operative Extension lead a discussion with the Board on Goals for the District, a copy of the discussion is attached with these minutes.

### **4. ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING**

- **CALL PUBLIC HEARING ON FINAL BUDGET TO ORDER –**

Meeting was called to order at 10:40 a.m.

- **DISCUSS, APPROVE AND ACCEPT THE 2014-2015 BUDGET –**

Ms. Bergin presented the Budget for the 2014-2015 fiscal years. A copy of the budget was distributed to the board members and is available at the district office. Under the projects to be determined \$20,000 is shown to as expended this was grant monies given to Lahontan Valley Conservation District that they have not requested and has not been paid at this time. This work will not be done or spent by the end of June. This money is not in the 2014-2015 budget. This grant was issued April of 2013. The documents that request funds show a one year use date. Basically, this has expired and the monies have reverted back to the general fund.

Director Schank made a motion to approve and accept the 2014-2015 Budget, Director Dennis seconded the motion, motion carried.

- **ADJOURN PUBLIC MEETING**

Public Hearing closed at 10:50 a.m.

## **5. RE-OPEN REGULAR MEETING**

## **6. PUBLIC COMMENT – None**

## **7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND CHECKS WRITTEN –**

Director Schank made a motion to approve the minutes for April and checks written on Bank of America #9204 - #9209 and Nevada State Bank #2493 - #2499, motion seconded by Director Dennis, motion carried.

## **8. FEDERAL WATERMASTER'S REPORT -**

Dave presented the water report, a copy of which is included in Minutes book. There has been a rise in the last few days due to the weather. This year's runoff has been very inefficient due to the temperatures. Boca elevation is 16271 AF of which 13173 AF is rate water. Prosser elevation is 10566 AF. There is 24062 AF Tahoe Prosser exchange water which can be used to make Floriston rates.

Snotel report: Truckee River at 18%, Lake Tahoe 0%, Carson River 16%, Walker River 21%, Upper Humboldt 170% however this is probably a false reading, Lower Humboldt 23%.

Floriston rates will probably run out end of July or early August.

## **9. Update on Virginia Street Bridge 408 Encroachment Permit –**

*See Engineer/Consultant Report*

## **10. Discuss Status of USACE Inspection, related including SWIF application & action plan**

*See Engineer/Consultant Report*

## **11. ENGINEER/CONSULTANT REPORT - Lori Williams**

*A complete copy of the Engineer's Report is available at the District Offices or on the CTWCD website. Below is a summary of the report.*

Upon following up with the USACE regarding the Virginia Street Bridge encroachment permit authorization, Tri Sage was informed that the USACE had to determine if the walls in downtown Reno were indeed floodwalls or if they were channel walls prior to processing the application. A floodwall determination would require this permit to go to headquarters for authorization, while a channel wall determination would allow for review at the regional level. USACE wanted runs from the updated model to make this determination based on the water surface elevation compared to the horizontal surface. The engineer completed updates to the model for both the existing condition and also the condition with the insert of the new Virginia Street Bridge and profiles were sent to the USACE. The USACE then requested the updated model used to generate the data and subsequently has requested information regarding the model validation and genesis of the Observed High Water data in the model. Tri Sage has worked with TRFMA and their consultant HDR to provide the requested information from the work that HDR has completed for TRFMA. At this writing we are awaiting USACE Modeling review of this information to see if they will regionally authorize the issuance of the Virginia Street Bridge Encroachment Permit which has previously been approved by the CTWCD.

The information provided to the USACE is also a key factor to USACE's general determination of the status of the walls in downtown Reno and how that will ultimately impact the CTWCD inspection issues and the SWIF application. Upon initial review and per our call with USACE, the only section of walls that will likely be considered "floodwalls" under the definition will be the walls upstream and downstream of the City of Reno West Street Plaza area; this determination is due to the fact that at 14,000cfs, the water surface elevation in this area is above the horizontal surface elevation (although it is not above the openings in the parapet railings). USACE has indicated an interest in amending the Martis Creek Agreement to more clearly identify the floodwalls as distinguished from channel walls.

Based on this wall assessment, CTWCD will not be eligible for a SWIF as only projects with Floodwalls are eligible; however a SWIF may not be necessary in light of the interim order referenced below. Furthermore, if the walls are categorized as channel walls and not floodwalls, then there is no vegetation free zone requirement for these walls so this inspection issue is eliminated.

On the call with USACE on April 25, 2014, USACE informed CTWCD (Lori and Ron) of the “Interim Policy for Determining Eligibility Status of Flood Risk Management Projects for the Rehabilitation Program Pursuant to Public Law (P.L.) 84-99” which sets rehabilitation eligibility based on inspection ratings. Under this interim policy, only specified criteria must have either an “Acceptable” or “Minimally Acceptable” ratings in order to maintain eligibility; while less critical criteria may be rated “Unacceptable” and still maintain eligibility. Vegetation along Floodwalls and in Channels is one factor that no longer impacts eligibility under this interim order and all “channel” related criteria no longer impact eligibility under this order. USACE has indicated that the April 24, 2013 inspection report, which has yet to be issued by USACE, may now be issued under this interim order and that the currently “Unacceptable” rated items in that inspection are NOT criteria under the interim order for loss of rehabilitation eligibility. Thus, issuance of this report will not impact the CTWCD’s rehabilitation eligibility.

The Status of USACE inspection issues is noted below:

- 1) Shoaling- the shoaling deposits identified by USACE have been included in the recent modeling and at the current stage are NOT impacting the 14,000cfs flow. USACE has requested we perform analyses to determine how large these deposits can grow before the flow is forced out of the banks; this is being analyzed. There is a new area of possible shoaling identified downstream of Keystone Avenue Bridge that may be the cause of 14,000cfs flows leaving the banks along Riverside Drive; this area will be surveyed and deposits evaluated to get data for further evaluation in the model.
- 2) Flap-gates- Now that we have model water surface elevations in the downtown areas, the City of Reno will evaluate each penetration relative to the water surface elevation at 14,000cfs. Once we have the model updated and run at the reaches upstream and downstream of the downtown areas to produce water surface elevation data, the City of Reno will continue their evaluation on the storm-drain penetrations into the channel.
- 3) Vegetation- vegetation along the walls and growing from the walls was removed by the City of Reno as part of the 2013 Debris Removal Project; determination of the walls as channel walls, not floodwalls means that there is no “vegetation free zone” requirement and other than the short section that the USACE might determine to be floodwalls, vegetation will become a moot point.
- 4) Idlewild Box Culvert/Bank Erosion- the model needs to be evaluated and updated in this section; additional survey data is required as the model contains minimal cross-sections in this reach. Once the model is updated with additional survey data, it will be run to determine the impact of the box and the need for removal. It is anticipated that this box will need to be removed to reduce the erosion of the Idlewild Drive bank. USACE is awaiting evaluation results and proposed solutions for this reach.
- 5) Flood Response- It appears from the current modeling that the 14,000cfs water surface elevation is below the horizontal surface in all areas downtown except for the West Street Plaza area. There was no approved encroachment by the USACE or the CTWCD for this project including the removal of the walls and railings along this section of river. The USACE has requested that the CTWCD work with the City of Reno to propose Interim Risk Reduction Measures that can be reviewed and approved by the USACE and incorporated into the City’s Flood Response Plan. It is not clear at this writing what the requirements will be relative to the placement of plywood along the railings and walls as called for in the Martis Creek Agreement now that it is apparent from the modeling that the 14,000cfs flow is below the top of wall and below the horizontal surface in all sections except the West Street Plaza.

Next steps include the evaluation and running of the model in reaches above and below the Keystone to Lake Street areas for the determination of water surface elevations. Additional survey data will be collected at the sections below the Keystone Avenue Bridge where the water leaves the channel at 14,000cfs and at the Idlewild box culvert as well as other sections where the modeling efforts may require additional sections. The modelers will analyze the box culvert and also perform sensitivity on the shoaling areas to determine if and when these areas will become problematic to the flow. The City of Reno will work to address the flap-gate needs as well as the Interim Risk Reduction Measures for the West Street Plaza. At this time it is anticipated that work will need to be done to remove deposits in the river near Keystone Avenue and to remove the box culvert at Idlewild Drive. The exact requirements of these potential projects are still under evaluation.

The semi-annual inspection has begun to identify issues and debris that should be removed during 2014 prior to the winter flows. It is anticipated that this requirement will be substantially less than the project completed in late 2013. The inspection will be completed in the next few weeks once the peak run-off for the spring has passed and the report will be prepared for USACE in compliance with the Martis Creek Agreement.

**12. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT – Leo Bergin**

Nothing to report

**13. Secretary/Treasurers Report – Gwyn Bergin**

Nothing to report

**14. Continued Discuss of Scope/Goals –**

See report attached to these minutes

**15. PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

**16. BOARD COMMENTS and/or REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEMS –**

- Director Shank – Requested any further information and/or letters besides the Martis Creek Agreement, he thought that might be helpful.
- Director Roberts – Expressed his appreciation to the job that Lori Williams and Ron Penrose have done.
- Director Westergard – He is going to contact the Department of Taxation regarding the presentation they are supposed to make to this board.

**14. ADJOURNMENT -**

There being no further business, President Westergard asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:10p.m. Director Schank moved to adjourn, Director Capurro, seconded said motion, motion carried.

The next regular meeting will be held Tuesday June 10, 2014 at 10:00 a.m.\*\*

---

Todd Westergard,  
President

---

Gwyn S. Bergin,  
Secretary/Treasurer

\*\* Actual meeting Agenda items were taken out of order as to facilitate the Discussion for the Scope/Goals for the District\*\*