

# CARSON TRUCKEE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

Regular Meeting

August 8, 2025

---

## **DIRECTORS:**

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

## **ABSENT:**

Tyler Henderson  
Eddy Quaglieri

## **Staff**

Mary Pat Eymann

## **OTHER:**

Kayla Dowty, Engineer  
Lucas Foletta, Attorney  
Dave Wathen, FWM Office

## **GUESTS:**

Bryan Byrne, RTC  
Ally Kay, Granite Construction  
JD McKay, Churchill Co. Mosquito

---

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 JULY 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 Baggett; motion carried.
5. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUEST FROM CHURCHILL CO. MOSQUITO FOR EARLY RELEASE OF FUNDS FOR 25/26 GRANT OR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR UNEXPECTED EXPENSES INCURRED. – JD McKay**

Mr. McKay advised that he had originally requested funding for a potential shortfall in their budget but as of this morning stated that he has looked further into the money they have and they do NOT need any additional funds and will proceed with using the 25/26 grant funds and submitting the proper reimbursement paperwork at that time.

**6. WATER MASTERS REPORT AND DISCUSSION – Dave Wathen.**

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

**7. DISCUSSION, UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING MARTIS CREEK AGREEMENT OPTIONS – Lucas Foletta**

Last month there was an open question about exactly under whose jurisdiction it is, and I did exchange emails with Chad, and he confirmed that is the Corp. They actually have a section on their webpage devoted to kind of public information on Martis Creek and the dam and its status. It's all the things that we just heard that it's still under study. There's no imminent plans to do anything. It was on this list of highest hazard dams in the US at one point, but it doesn't say whether or not that's still the case, but Chad did say that based on some recent evaluations, it looks like some of the concerns about the leakage are reducing, not that it's not happening, but that it's possible that it's not in, as bad shape as they may have thought. At one point in time way, but there's no plans to use it or employ it in any way at this point. It's still under official kind of study things.

Director Schank – When it receives water due to snowpack runoff, or flash flood is it the Corp that tells the WM office to release or you just do it as part of your normal routine?

Dave Wathen – They make their own releases; they have their own dam tender. It used to be that Washoe County Water Conservation District, the dam tender at Boca, there was, they had, there was a contract in place that the district with that Damtender was also the Damtender at Martis. Actually, back when I was at Boca as the damn tender. I was the Damtender at Martis as well, but that contract expired, and they've had their own employee, that is the Damtender. So, you know, their standard operating procedure right now is just a passing flow. They don't actively store water unless they're involved in some kind of study. And if they do that, they call us and let us know that they want to do this. And you know, it's got to be basically scheduled, because that is Floristan rate water coming in there that needs to be passed through so it can't affect adversely affect our demands to meet the rates.

Director Schank - When you say it's, it's basically open, is it open to just an infinite amount of water out? Or is it 20 feet or 60 feet or 100 feet? Because it seems to me like in the case of flash flooding and other events that might put a lot of water in the short time, it would impede and affect your operation of the other sources of inflow to the Truckee River, if you don't have some control as to what is being put in there.

Dave Wathen - Well, it does store water and really high inflow events. There's only so much release the gates. There's two gates. From what I recall there was there like a four foot open setting, which is not fully open. So, they do, you know, inflow can exceed that release capacity, and that's how it stores water, and then it will just drain out. But there is a lot of storage before it gets to that point.

Engineer Dowty – Inquired from the Board if they would like her to ask the USACE at her next regular meeting about Martis? She will try to get the manual of operation and inquire if any recent studies have been done or any considerations as to the dam.

**8. ENGINEERING/SUPERINTENDENT REPORT – Kayla Dowty**

*See engineering report.*

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

I have the two in our local agreements, (agreements available at District offices) for you're the Chairman's signature after the meeting, they have been approved by both the TRFMA and the City of Reno Council. Everyone has executed, and once we execute, I will circulate the final agreements. But that's exciting to have that project funded and underway like we talked about last time. We did get a scope of work to take the engineering through final it was a lot higher than I expected. I think it was \$247,000 and so I went

back to JUB and said, this is just a lot more than we expected and a lot higher than we budgeted. And kind of asked for a little bit more information on why. And the short answer is that the City of Reno's will ultimately own and maintain this stretch of the river, like they do today. And so they have a lot of particular requests when, when they're kind of ultimately going to own the project. And I don't want to say that the scope is creeping, because it's not that it's scope creep, but when you are basically tearing out the park to increase the height of the berm, there's a lot of like domino effect - the sidewalk gets impacted. Some of the trees get impacted. One of the handy camp handicapped ramps is getting impacted. So my proposal right now, and I sent off an email to the City of Reno last week, I'd like them to take on some of the engineering costs, because I don't think that when we originally conceptualize the design for this this section that we are expecting it to have all of these, these dominoes, right? So I'm going to call the head of engineering over there and just have that conversation and hope that they'll split it with us to get it back down for the district, back down to kind of the 150 range that we originally budgeted for, the 25/26 budget. The City will definitely contract it, and they will just pay JUB the remaining, you know, if that's \$100,000 they would just, I would ask them to maybe, you know, they can't. We'll go through the 90% design, which would get us to probably about 150 and then they can take the rest is my suggestion. The Board agreed.

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

*See Engineering Report.*

**C. Encroachment permits and requests.**

*See Engineering Report*

**1. Permit 23-02 Arlington Bridges – Variance Extension Request.**

Bryan Byrne, RTC project manager for the Arlington Bridges project - We've been here before, earlier on the year, at the March board meeting to get the variance to start into the project in the river early which we went ahead and did, started the project in June, got the river diverted into the south channel down there at Wingfield Park. So, we're constructing the north bridge right now. As you guys know, we did get that little bit of a storm that kind of infiltrated our project site and kind of flooded it up. So we we've kind of been working on cleaning that up, assessing the damage we're looking at. We didn't really have much damage, just more of a delayed schedule. And so we're kind of working on getting back up to speed, working on Sundays, and just trying to get back on that schedule. And for clarity, that storm was a bit of an odd one, because it didn't really send a ton of flow down the river, but it came down from Peavinie and through a storm drain. It overtopped our little dam that we had, kind of, we're in our mitigation efforts for that storm drain. And that thing came full capacity and kind of just breached and kind of back flowed, up into the project site. So it was kind of more of that pond effect. It wasn't coming down through the river. Our Aqua dam did not get breached. It was, it was secure. It held, maintained that river flow.

Engineer Dowty – RTC sent a variance extension request (available at District offices). We get a lot for work within the river they're asking so typically, we would say that work in the channel, right within the 14,000 CFS channel, has to be complete by November 1 to accommodate flood season, they're requesting an extension to November 30. I'm recommending approval of that extension. Obviously, that will include all of our typical language that full demo happens when a river event is anticipated to exceed, I think we put like 1800 CFS or something, and then the North Channel 8000 Okay, so we kind of call and let you know. Obviously, it always includes disclaimers that they're fully responsible for all of their equipment as well as the infrastructure that they're policing, and that Carson Truckee and the Water Master's office will do our best to communicate expected flow events, but that we aren't responsible for communicating

- ❖ Director Capurro made a motion to grant the variance extension request to RTC; seconded by Director Schank; motion carried.

**D. Miscellaneous items:**

JUB is starting to take a very close look at the downtown section of our HEC RAZ model, because there's a lot of work going on down there with all the bridge replacements and some other work. The City of Reno's doing some bank armoring. They're talking about replacing some sections of path. So JUB is taking a very close look at that whole section of downtown model and are kind of finding that there's quite a few holes in the 1D model. That is not really a surprise, because it was all done with LIDAR survey and under bridges, which downtown there's a million of them, we don't get any survey points right. So there's so the original model was intended to and extrapolate points underneath the bridges. But the service, because the bridges take up so much space there, there's definitely some holes in the model, and they think that it may be kind of misrepresenting the 14,000 inundation. So you know, if a year ago or so, we had totally shut down the thought of merging our model with TRFMAs, 2D model, because it, it just didn't really make sense. JUB is now thinking that it might really improve the Carson Truckee model. I have asked for a memo and a recommendation, because I have to be honest, I'm still really on the fence about it. I don't know. I think it might make more sense to just incorporate the project models for the bridges as we get them into the 1D model.

Because, like Arlington, they had to do survey all underneath the bridge in order to accurately model their project and submit it for a 408, we're going to have Sierra by the end of the year. We're going to have Keystone in another one or two years. We're going to have Lake two years after that. You know, I mean, we're going to start really piecing together this, this model. If I don't know that it makes a lot of sense to do it right now. I don't think that it's negatively impacting our work, if that makes sense. I've asked for a memo and a recommendation so that we can take a look at it and see if they can better explain it to where it might make a justification to improve the model. But right now, I'm not super, not 100% sold on.

Director Schank - When we do this work with the Riverside flood wall looks like I hope we're not letting up on what impact that might have further downstream. Are TRFMA and City of Reno looking at that with that in mind, that unless some improvements are made down there by actually exacerbating problem going from one to the other?

Engineer Dowty – They are absolutely looking at it. The good news is when Arlington design was done we knew that Riverside was coming there was already kind of a conceptual of getting that section done. So we required that they basically take a snippet of the Arlington model and put 14,000 down it not look at what and not consider the portion that comes out of the river at Riverside, like don't even basically just take this little, tiny, microscopic look of, if 14,000 is held up there, what happens down here. And that's how Arlington was designed. We saw downstream, kind of what it did. It, does it inundate the West Street Plaza a little more? Yep, it does. And yes, the City needs to do something about it. The City needs to do something about West Street Plaza, regardless of whether we do Riverside or not. But yes, all of these bridge projects are looking at the full 14,000 assuming that it's held upstream at Riverside.

**9. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT –Lucas Foletta**

Nothing to report.

**10. SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT – Mary Pat Eymann**

Nothing to report.

**11. PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

**12. BOARD COMMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**New Future Agenda Item Requests – None**

**Board Comments – None**

**13. ADJOURNMENT -**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

**Next meeting  
September 9, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.**

---

Todd Westergard,  
President

---

Mary Pat Eymann,  
Secretary/Treasurer

Minutes transcribed via otter.ai