1. Roll Call and Determination of presence of a Quorum*  
2. Pledge of Allegiance*  
3. Approval of Agenda (ACTION)  
4. Public Comment* (Three-minute time limit per person)  
5. Approval of the minutes of the October 9, 2009 meeting (ACTION)  
6. Discussion and possible acceptance of a Clean Water Act grant in the amount of $40,000, to offset funding for the ongoing regional integrated wastewater system planning project; and, if accepted, authorize the Chairman to execute a Subgrant Agreement with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection — Chris Wessel, Water Management Planner (ACTION)  
7. Discussion and possible approval of the WRWC fiscal year 2008/09 Financial Statements and audit opinion from Schettler, Macy & Silva, LLC — Ben Hutchins, Washoe County Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) (ACTION)  
8. Presentation, discussion and possible direction to staff on the Desert Research Institute’s (“DRI”) proposed approach to short and longer term funding for its Truckee-Tahoe Basin Cloud Seeding Program — Mark Foree, TMWA, Rosemary Menard, DWR, and Ken Kunkel, DRI (ACTION)  
9. Discussion and possible approval of a request by DRI for funding in the amount of $45,000 from the Regional Water Management Fund to support its Cloud Seeding Program for current season; and, if approved, authorize the Chairman to execute an Interlocal Agreement with DRI — Mark Foree, Rosemary Menard and Ken Kunkel (ACTION)  
10. Status report on development of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, including outline and timeline, and possible direction to staff — Chris Wessel (ACTION)
11. Status Report on “State of the Science” for the Central Truckee Meadows (Groundwater) Remediation District — Chris Benedict, DWR*

12. Status Report on the proposed amendment to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, sponsored by Washoe County, regarding sustainability of water resources — Rosemary Menard*

13. Status report on pending integration/consolidation of TMWA and DWR — Mark Foree and Rosemary Menard*

14. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding agenda items for the December 11, 2009 Commission meeting and future meetings (ACTION)

15. Commission Comments*

16. Staff Comments*

17. Public Comment* (Three minute time limit per person)

18. Adjournment

*Indicates a non-action item

Notes: Because several of the WRWC Trustees are also members of the Board of Directors of TMWA, it is possible that a quorum of the TMWA Board may be present. Such members will not take action at this meeting as members of the TMWA Board, but may take action solely in their capacity as WRWC Trustees. A quorum of the BCC, STMGID and the NNWPC may also be in attendance but will not be taking action.

Public comment will be taken on agenda items upon the submittal of a request via submittal of a Speaker Information Card. There is a three-minute time limit per person.

Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear. The WRWC may take action on any of the action items listed.

Facilities in which this meeting is being held are accessible to the disabled. Persons with disabilities who require special accommodations or assistance (e.g. sign language interpreters or assisted listening devices) at the meeting should notify the Washoe County Department of Water Resources, at 954-4663, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda has been posted at the following locations: Reno City Hall (1 East First Street), Sparks City Hall (431 Prater Way), Sparks Justice Court (630 Greenbrae Dr), Sun Valley GID (5000 Sun Valley Blvd.), TMWA (1355 Capital Blvd.), Washoe County Administration Building (1001 E. 9th Street), Washoe County Clerk’s Office (Court and Virginia Streets), Washoe County Central Library (301 South Center St.), Washoe County Department of Water Resources (4930 Energy Way), Galena Market (19990 Thomas Creek Rd.), Galena High School (3600 Butch Cassidy Way), South Valleys Library (15650A Wedge Parkway) and the WRWC website: http://wrwc.us.
WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DRAFT MINUTES

Friday, October 9, 2009

The regular meeting of the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) Board of Trustees was held on Friday, October 9, 2009, at Sparks Council Chambers, 745 Fourth Street, Sparks, Nevada.

1. Roll Call and Determination of presence of a Quorum – Chairman Carrigan called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. There was a quorum present.

   Commissioners Present:
   Mike Carrigan, Chair
   John Breternitz
   Bob Larkin (left at 1:50 p.m.)
   Geno Martini
   Ron Smith

   Representing:
   Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA)
   Washoe County
   Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA)
   Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (TMWRF)
   City of Sparks

   Commissioners Absent:
   Dave Aiazzi, Vice-Chair
   Bob Cashell
   Steve Cohen
   Patricia Lancaster

   Representing:
   City of Reno
   Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA)
   South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID)
   Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID)

2. Pledge of Allegiance

   Chairman Carrigan asked Commissioner Martini to lead the Western Regional Water Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

   Commissioner Martini made a motion to approve the October 9, 2009 WRWC agenda as posted. Commissioner Larkin seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment

   Chairman Carrigan called for public comments and hearing none, closed the public comment period.

5. Approval of the Minutes of the August 14, 2009 meeting.

   The minutes of the August 14, 2009 Western Regional Water Commission meeting were submitted for approval. Commissioner Breternitz made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
6. Discussion and possible appointment of a new Voting Public At Large Member of the NNWPC, to replace Michael Cameron and represent environmental, biological, conservation or public concerns.

Chairman Carrigan invited Jim Smitherman to present this item. Mr. Smitherman reported that Michael Cameron, Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (NNWPC) Voting Public At Large member recently provided his notice of intent to step down from his position. He reported that staff solicited applications to fill the position, for which seven highly-qualified applicants responded. He stated that interviews were conducted at the September and October NNWPC meetings. He reported that the NNWPC made a recommendation for Mickey Hazelwood to fill the position. He added that Mr. Hazelwood was present at today’s meeting.

Commissioner Martini made a motion to approve the recommendation for Mr. Hazelwood to fill the position. Commissioner Breternitz seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Chairman Carrigan welcomed Mr. Hazelwood and asked if he would like to address the commission. Mr. Hazelwood thanked commissioners for the opportunity to serve on the NNWPC. He stated that he values the water resources of the region and looks forward to working with the NNWPC and WRWC.

Chairman Carrigan stated that item 8 (action item) would be heard next in case a quorum is lost.

7. Presentation on the background, process, and status of the Truckee River total maximum daily load for nutrients (“TMDL”), and possible direction to staff.

Chairman Carrigan welcomed Terri Svetich, Acting Engineering Manager for City of Reno Public Works, and John Buzzzone, Washoe County Department of Water Resources. Ms. Svetich stated that this presentation is a good example of the cooperative spirit under which the City and County have been working for the Third Party Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process. She reported that staffs from City of Reno, City of Sparks, Washoe County and TMWA are working together in the process.

Ms. Svetich referred to a Power Point presentation, which included a brief history and background of the Clean Water Act, which requires states to establish water quality standards based on beneficial uses. She stated that today she and Mr. Buzzzone would be focusing on the Truckee River and aquatic life. If a water body is impaired, the state is required to establish a TMDL. She stated that the concern in the Truckee River is the dissolved oxygen, which is impacted by sunlight, flows, algae, aeration, organic matter and temperature, which can not be controlled. However, other contributors such as nitrogen and phosphorus are contributors that can be controlled.

Ms. Svetich explained that a “TMDL” is a loading to the river, which includes waste load allocation (WLA) assigned to point sources, and a load allocation (LA), which is assigned to non-point source. She referred to a map of the Truckee River and stated that Lockwood has been determined the most appropriate location for monitoring.

Ms. Svetich stated that Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (TMWRF) has been assigned a WLA of 500 pounds per day (ppd) for total nitrogen and 134 ppd for total phosphorus. Commissioner Smith asked if monitoring is performed after (downstream of) the treatment plant. Ms. Svetich stated that is correct; however, monitoring is also performed upstream of the plant. Commissioner Smith asked if the same problems existed prior to TMWRF being in place. Ms. Svetich stated there were problems, which were associated with discharges from manufacturing, industrial and wastewater treatment.
Commissioner Smith asked for a definition of “500 ppd of nitrogen”. Ms. Svetich suggested that she continue with her presentation, which might answer that question. She reported that the federal government established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Commissioner Breternitz asked if the “ppd” is an average measurement, which Ms. Svetich stated it is.

Ms. Svetich reported that the federal government began issuing NPDES permits to industrial dischargers and water reclamation facilities for point source. She explained that the TMDL WLA forms the basis of the NPDES discharge amounts. She added that the community also has a NPDES permit for stormwater.

Ms. Svetich mentioned that Randy Pahl from Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) was present and could answer questions. She turned the presentation over to Mr. Buzzone. Mr. Buzzone stated that TMWRF is the largest regional wastewater facility on the river. He stated that TMWRF is very technologically advanced compared to other national treatment facilities and does a great job of removing nitrogen and phosphorus from the effluent.

Mr. Buzzone stated that currently the system is working fine; however, we need to plan for the future when growth occurs. He stated that currently approximately 20 million gallons per day (MGD) of effluent is being discharged. Chairman Carrigan asked about the plant capacity. Mr. Buzzone stated that currently the plant has a peak treatment capacity of 40 MGD, which could be met in 2039 and would require a WLA of approximately 700 ppd.

Mr. Buzzone summarized that the challenge will be how to deal with planning for the future. He stated if an advanced treatment technology is implemented, reverse osmosis (RO) would be most effective; however, it is extremely expensive (from a construction and operational standpoint). He gave an example that RO treatment of 2.5 MGD would cost approximately $28 million, with approximately $2.2 million per year for operations.

Mr. Buzzone stated that another approach was examined to meet future needs; i.e. perhaps the TMDLs for nitrogen and phosphorus might be changed by the regulators. He explained how the “book” standards were set in 1994 and added that more site specific standards could be developed that would be more reflective of actual conditions of the river. He reported that three models are being used, which include TROM, WARMF and TRHSPF.

Mr. Buzzone stated the next steps will be to continue working with the regulatory agencies, complete the “Work Plan”, and perform modeling related to “what if?” scenarios. He added that all of the stakeholders need to be engaged in the process.

Mr. Buzzone reported that since 2004 the Cities of Reno and Sparks have spent approximately $1.5 million to advance the TMDL review, which was primarily focused on model development. He stated that the Board approved a 5-year cash flow projection. He reported that the Work Plan will be finalized and submitted to NDEP by the end of the year. He stated that the model runs will continue and a report will be developed. He welcomed questions from commissioners.

Commissioner Smith again asked how the measurements are made. Mr. Buzzone explained for example that nitrogen exists in molecules floating in water. A water sample is taken where the molecules precipitate to the bottom where they can be measured and compared to the volume, for instance .075 milligrams per liter (mg/L). For compliance procedures, sample “snapshot” measurements are collected and then averaged to develop a “ppd” average measurement.

Commissioner Smith asked about notices on storm drains that say “discharges to the river” and asked where the discharges come into the river. Ms. Svetich stated that all along the river storm drains are
piped into the river or tributaries. She added that as a “heads up”, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is now recognizing stormwater as a point source discharge because it is “piped” to the river. She explained that a WLA for stormwater will be established.

Commissioner Smith asked for clarification of the estimated cost for RO mentioned earlier. Mr. Buzzone reiterated it would cost approximately $28 million for the facility, with a cost of $2.2 million per year for operations. Chairman Carrigan mentioned it would be cheaper to use effluent water for irrigation. Mr. Buzzone stated that issue is being examined. Ms. Svetich stated that one associated issue would be return flows to the river to make up water rights.

Chairman Carrigan asked about other dischargers to the river between Lake Tahoe and Reno. Ms. Svetich stated that Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency (TTSA) is located in Truckee but discharges underground for polishing (similar to a leach field) prior to reaching the river.

Commissioner Breternitz asked what the timeline is for reaching the limit for discharges to the river. He stated it seems to him that the water quality of the Truckee River is more of a limitation than water quantity when examining future growth of the area. Mr. Buzzone agreed that the quality and quantity are very closely related. He stated that the Clean Water Act only provides a limitation for discharges to the river so there is a regulatory disconnect between ensuring sufficient flows to maintain quality.

Chairman Carrigan thanked Ms. Svetich and Mr. Buzzone for their very educational presentation.

8. Discussion and possible renewal of an Agreement for Legal Services for the Western Regional Water Commission (“WRWC”) and the NNWPC with Rhodes Law Offices, Ltd., and, if approved, authorize the Chairman to execute the Agreement. (Heard out of order)

Mr. Smitherman reported the current agreement with Rhodes Law Offices, Ltd. expires on November 1, 2009 so a new agreement is being requested. He reported that the only changes to the agreement are that it covers a two-year period rather than one and Mr. Rhodes agreed to retroactively decrease his fee by 2.5% (in line with County salary reductions). He added that the agreement could be terminated by either party with 30-day notice.

Mr. Smitherman reported that the NNWPC highly recommended approval of the agreement and commended Mr. Rhodes on his performance, as well as coming in under budget.

Commissioner Breternitz made a motion to approve the contract. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Chairman Carrigan thanked Mr. Rhodes for the fee reduction.

9. Status report on pending integration/consolidation of TMWA and the Washoe County Department of Water Resources (“DWR”)

Chairman Carrigan welcomed Rosemary Menard, DWR Director, to provide an update. Ms. Menard stated that since the September 8, 2009 joint meeting of the Board of County Commissioners and the TMWA Board, staff has been working on the Interlocal Agreement (ILA), which is a framework agreement that includes work on changes to the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) (which will be addressed at a joint meeting on October 27, 2009) and the Operating Agreement. She stated that work is continuing on the ILA and a discussion draft will be provided to the TMWA Board next week.

Ms. Menard reported that TMWA and DWR have been communicating internally and externally and have developed a website for employees. The website provides an opportunity for questions and answers. She
stated that another key aspect for the future will be development of an “operation strategy” with a higher level of detail than in the past. She added that the draft should be available next week. Ms. Menard summarized that the process is a work in progress and she feels the teams are working well together and making good progress.

10. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding future meeting dates and agenda items for the WRWC.

Chairman Carrigan asked about the next meeting of the WRWC. Mr. Smitherman and Ms. Menard stated that upcoming agenda items for the November meeting include:

- Presentation on the “state of the science” for the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District (CTMRD)
- Discussion of the Regional Water Plan Update, including an outline of the update process including timelines
- The BCC will consider a Regional Plan Amendment related to Washoe County (WC)-3 Ballot question
- Discussion of the cloud seeding program being implemented by Desert Research Institute (DRI)

Chairman Carrigan thanked staff for their update.

11. Commission Comments

None

12. Staff Comments

None

13. Public Comment

Chairman Carrigan called for public comments and hearing none, closed the public comment period.

14. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Niki Linn, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on_______________ 2009.

____________________________
Mike Carrigan, Chairman

Note: DRAFT Minutes not approved by Board.
Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: October 27, 2009

TO: Chairman and Members, Western Regional Water Commission

FROM: Chris Wessel, Water Management Planner
       Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible acceptance of a Clean Water Act grant in the amount of $40,000, to offset funding for the ongoing regional integrated wastewater system planning project; and, if accepted, authorize the Chairman to execute a Subgrant Agreement with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

SUMMARY
In April 2009 the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) agreed to accept a Clean Water Act grant from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) in the amount of $40,000, to offset the funding for the $96,000 Integrated Regional Wastewater System Planning project (Project), which was previously funded with the Regional Water Management Fund (RWMF). NDEP is ready to award the grant by way of the attached Subgrant Agreement.

BACKGROUND
In early 2009 NDEP informed staff of the possibility that approximately $40,000 in federal economic stimulus package funding may be made available to the local 208 Agency in the form of a Clean Water Act grant. On June 8, 2009, the Governor designated the WRWC as the Washoe County 208 Agency, clearing the way for the WRWC to apply for and receive the grant. Staff prepared and submitted a grant application specifying the $96,000 Project and the intent to use the grant funding to offset RWMF funding otherwise committed to the Project. NDEP approved the application and prepared a Subgrant Agreement for execution by the WRWC.

The Western Regional Water Commission Act, Section 30.9, authorizes the WRWC to apply for and receive grants from public sources for the exercise of its powers.

PREVIOUS ACTION
On April 10, 2009, the WRWC approved a motion to accept a Clean Water Act grant in the amount of $40,000, when it becomes available, to offset the funding for the Integrated Regional Wastewater System Planning project, or support related projects.

FISCAL IMPACT
The fiscal impact to the Regional Water Management Fund will be a revenue increase of $40,000. Budget authority is located in Fund Group 766, Fund 7066, Account Number 710100, Professional Services, Cost Object WP310200.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the WRWC accept the Clean Water Act grant in the amount of $40,000, to offset funding for the ongoing regional integrated wastewater system planning project; and authorize the Chairman to execute the Subgrant Agreement with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

**POSSIBLE MOTION**
Move to accept the Clean Water Act grant in the amount of $40,000, to offset funding for the ongoing regional integrated wastewater system planning project; and authorize the Chairman to execute the Subgrant Agreement with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

JS:jd

Attachment: Subgrant Agreement
SUBGRANT AGREEMENT

A Subgrant awarded by:

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Protection
901 S. Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701-5249
Phone: (775) 687-4670 Fax: (775) 687-5856

and awarded to Subgrantee:

Western Regional Water Commission
hereinafter the “Subgrantee”
4930 Energy Way,
Reno, NV 89502
Phone #: 775.954.5657

WHEREAS, 40 CFR Part 31.37, NRS 445A.265 and NRS 445A.450 authorize the Division of Environmental Protection to award subgrants of federal financial assistance to local governments for the purposes set forth in authorizing statutes; and
WHEREAS, it is deemed that the project purposes hereinafter set forth are consistent with the federal grant agreement that provides support of the subgrant;
NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the aforesaid premises, the parties mutually agree as follows:

1. REQUIRED APPROVAL. This Subgrant shall not become effective until and unless approved by appropriate official action of the governing body of each party.

2. DEFINITIONS. “State” means the State of Nevada and any state agency identified herein, its officers, employees and immune contractors as defined in NRS 41.0307.

3. SUBGRANT TERM. This Subgrant shall be effective from Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Administrator’s approval to December 31, 2010, unless sooner terminated by either party as set forth in this Subgrant.

4. TERMINATION. This Subgrant may be terminated by either party prior to the date set forth in paragraph (3), provided that a termination shall not be effective until 30 days after a party has served written notice upon the other party. This Subgrant may be terminated by mutual consent of both parties or unilaterally by either party without cause. The parties expressly agree that this Subgrant shall be terminated immediately if for any reason State and/or federal funding ability to satisfy this Subgrant is withdrawn, limited, or impaired.

5. NOTICE. All notices or other communications required or permitted to be given under this Subgrant shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been duly given if delivered personally in hand, by telephonic facsimile with simultaneous regular mail, or mailed certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid on the date posted, and addressed to the other party at the address set forth above.

6. INCORPORATED DOCUMENTS. The parties agree that the services to be performed shall be specifically described; this Subgrant incorporates the following attachments in descending order of constructive precedence:
   ATTACHMENT A: SCOPE OF WORK (consisting of 5 pages)
   ATTACHMENT B: ADDITIONAL AGENCY TERMS & CONDITIONS (consisting of 3 pages)

7. CONSIDERATION. Subgrantee agrees to provide the services set forth in paragraph (6) at a cost of $N/A per N/A with the total Subgrant or installments payable: Quarterly not exceeding $40,000.00. In addition, the State does not agree to reimburse Subgrantee for expenses unless otherwise specified in the incorporated documents. Any intervening end to an annual or biennial appropriation period shall be deemed an automatic renewal (not changing the overall Subgrant term) or a termination as the results of legislative appropriation may require.
8. ASSENT. The parties agree that the terms and conditions listed on incorporated attachments of this Subgrant are also specifically a part of this Subgrant and are limited only by their respective order of precedence and any limitations expressly provided.

9. INSPECTION & AUDIT.
   a. Books and Records. Each party agrees to keep and maintain under general accepted accounting principles full, true and complete records, agreements, books, and documents as are necessary to fully disclose to the other party, the State or United States Government, or their authorized representatives, upon audits or reviews, sufficient information to determine compliance with any applicable regulations and statutes.
   b. Inspection & Audit. Each party agrees that the relevant books, records (written, electronic, computer related or otherwise), including but not limited to relevant accounting procedures and practices of the party, financial statements and supporting documentation, and documentation related to the work product shall be subject, at any reasonable time, to inspection, examination, review, audit, and copying at any office or location where such records may be found, with or without notice by the other party, the State Auditor, Employment Security, the Department of Administration, Budget Division, the Nevada State Attorney General's Office or its Fraud Control Units, the State Legislative Auditor, and with regard to any federal funding, the relevant federal agency, the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, the Office of the Inspector General, or any of their authorized representatives.
   c. Period of Retention. All books, records, reports, and statements relevant to this Subgrant must be retained by each party for a minimum of three years from the date of final payment by the State to the Subgrantee, and all other pending matters are closed. Retention time shall be extended when an audit is scheduled or in progress for a period reasonably necessary to complete an audit and/or to complete any administrative and judicial litigation which may ensue.

10. BREACH; REMEDIES. Failure of either party to perform any obligation of this Subgrant shall be deemed a breach. Except as otherwise provided for by law or this Subgrant, the rights and remedies of the parties shall not be exclusive and are in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law or equity, including but not limited to actual damages. If the court awards reasonable attorney’s fees to the prevailing party, reasonable shall be deemed $125 per hour.

11. LIMITED LIABILITY. The parties will not waive and intend to assert available NRS chapter 41 liability limitations in all cases. Subgrant liability of both parties shall not be subject to punitive damages. To the extent applicable, actual Subgrant damages for any breach shall be limited by NRS 353.260 and NRS 354.626.

12. FORCE MAJEURE. Neither party shall be deemed to be in violation of this Subgrant if it is prevented from performing any of its obligations hereunder due to strikes, failure of public transportation, civil or military authority, act of public enemy, accidents, fires, explosions, or acts of God, including, without limitation, earthquakes, floods, winds, or storms. In such an event the intervening cause must not be through the fault of the party asserting such an excuse, and the excused party is obligated to promptly perform in accordance with the terms of the Subgrant after the intervening cause ceases.

13. INDEMNIFICATION. Neither party waives any right or defense to indemnification that may exist in law or equity.

14. INDEPENDENT PUBLIC AGENCIES. The parties are associated with each other only for the purposes and to the extent set forth in this Subgrant, and in respect to performance of services pursuant to this Subgrant, each party is and shall be a Subgrantee separate and distinct from the other party and, subject only to the terms of this Subgrant, shall have the sole right to supervise, manage, operate, control, and direct performance of the details incident to its duties under this Subgrant. Nothing contained in this Subgrant shall be deemed or construed to create a partnership or joint venture, to create relationships of an employer-employee or principal-agent, or to otherwise create any liability for one agency whatsoever with respect to the indebtedness, liabilities, and obligations of the other agency or any other party.

15. WAIVER OF BREACH. Failure to declare a breach or the actual waiver of any particular breach of the Subgrant or its material or nonmaterial terms by either party shall not operate as a waiver by such party of any of its rights or remedies as to any other breach.
16. SEVERABILITY. If any provision contained in this Subgrant is held to be unenforceable by a court of law or equity, this Subgrant shall be construed as if such provision did not exist and the nonenforceability of such provision shall not be held to render any other provision or provisions of this Subgrant unenforceable.

17. ASSIGNMENT. Neither party shall assign, transfer or delegate any rights, obligations or duties under this Subgrant without the prior written consent of the other party.

18. OWNERSHIP OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION. Unless otherwise provided by law or this Subgrant, any reports, histories, studies, tests, manuals, instructions, photographs, negatives, blue prints, plans, maps, data, system designs, computer code (which is intended to be consideration under this Subgrant), or any other documents or drawings, prepared or in the course of preparation by either party in performance of its obligations under this Subgrant shall be the joint property of both parties.

19. PUBLIC RECORDS. Pursuant to NRS 239.010, information or documents may be open to public inspection and copying. The parties will have the duty to disclose unless a particular record is made confidential by law or a common law balancing of interests.

20. CONFIDENTIALITY. Each party shall keep confidential all information, in whatever form, produced, prepared, observed or received by that party to the extent that such information is confidential by law or otherwise required by this Subgrant.

21. PROPER AUTHORITY. The parties hereto represent and warrant that the person executing this Subgrant on behalf of each party has full power and authority to enter into this Subgrant and that the parties are authorized by law to perform the services set forth in paragraph (6).

22. GOVERNING LAW; JURISDICTION. This Subgrant and the rights and obligations of the parties hereto shall be governed by, and construed according to, the laws of the State of Nevada. The parties consent to the jurisdiction of the Nevada district courts for enforcement of this Subgrant.

23. ENTIRE AGREEMENT AND MODIFICATION. This Subgrant and its integrated attachment(s) constitute the entire agreement of the parties and such are intended as a complete and exclusive statement of the promises, representations, negotiations, discussions, and other agreements that may have been made in connection with the subject matter hereof. Unless an integrated attachment to this Subgrant specifically displays a mutual intent to amend a particular part of this Subgrant, general conflicts in language between any such attachment and this Subgrant shall be construed consistent with the terms of this Subgrant. Unless otherwise expressly authorized by the terms of this Subgrant, no modification or amendment to this Subgrant shall be binding upon the parties unless the same is in writing and signed by the respective parties hereto.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Subgrant to be signed and intend to be legally bound thereby.

SUBGRANTEE
By: ________________________________
   Signature
Name: ________________________________
Title: ___________________________ Date: __________

DIVISION
By: ________________________________
   Signature
Name: ________________________________
Title: ___________________________ Date: __________

BUREAU
By: ________________________________
   Signature
Name: ________________________________
Title: ___________________________ Date: __________
ORGANIZATION: Western Regional Water Commission

CONTACT PERSON: Jim Smitherman

MAILING ADDRESS: 4930 Energy Way
                 Reno, NV 89502

PHONE NUMBER: (775) 954-4657

E-MAIL: JSmitherman@washoeCounty.us

CONTRACT TOTAL: $40,000.00

NDEP: Randy Pahl

MAILING ADDRESS: Nevada Department of Environmental Protection
                 Bureau of Water Quality Planning
                 901 South Stewart Street, Suite 4001
                 Carson City, Nevada 89701

PHONE: (775) 687-9453

E-MAIL: RPahl@ndep.nv.gov
Scope of Work for Regional Integrated Wastewater System Planning

The proposed scope of work relies on existing water and wastewater projections from the recently completed Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) Facility Plans, and information to be provided by the wastewater service providers. A regional level summary of existing and planned wastewater facility capacities, effluent disposal capacities, constraints and plans to remedy constraints (including estimated costs, if known) will be provided, which will include a graphical representation of existing and future conditions for water supply, wastewater treatment, reclaimed water and wastewater disposal requirements.

The proposed scope of services also includes a planning-level assessment of the volume of high-quality treated effluent that might be stored and/or disposed of in the alluvial deposits of select hydrographic areas of Washoe County. Also included is an assessment of potential water-quality changes related to aquifer storage and reuse of effluent in Lemmon Valley. The study will rely heavily on data, information and results of previous hydrogeologic investigations of the study areas available through the Washoe County Department of Water Resources. WRWC will contract with a consulting firm to perform this study.

The proposed scope of work will be completed based on the following tasks.

**Task 1. Project Management** – This task includes time for project management and coordination, reviewing existing information, time for four coordination meetings with the Project Manager, and a presentation of the report results to the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (NNWPC).

**Task 2. Develop Regional Water Demand and Wastewater Flow Forecasts** - Using the recent TMSA projections and other available work products, develop existing and future regional water demand, wastewater flow, wastewater disposal and reclaimed water demand forecasts. Disaggregate the forecasts by four major planning regions, as follows:

1. Stead, Lemmon Valley and Cold Springs (Reno & Washoe County)
2. Sparks and Spanish Springs Valley (Sparks & Washoe County)
3. South Truckee Meadows (Reno & Washoe County)
4. Balance of Truckee Meadows (Reno)

**Task 3. Summarize Existing Treatment Capacity and Disposal Constraints, Including Both Structural and Permit Limitations** - Existing and future capacity and facility constraints for each treatment plant will be documented, together with a description of the best available information on the current plans to independently remedy such constraints (including estimated costs, if known). A summary table, together with supporting information, will be prepared for South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF), Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (TMWRF), Reno-Stead Water Reclamation Facility (RSWRF) and Cold...
Springs Water Reclamation Facility (CSWRF). The tables will document the following constraints and limitations applicable to each of the four regional wastewater treatment plants:

1. Hydraulic capacity
2. Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) load
3. Nitrogen load
4. Phosphorus load
5. Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) load
6. Solids handing
7. Disposal methods / capacity
8. Effluent storage capacity
9. Reclaimed water use sites
10. Other permit limitations
11. Special operating agreements
12. Water rights considerations
13. Capital cost considerations
14. Operation and Maintenance (O&M) funding considerations
15. Estimate of Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) for residential, commercial and multi-family units, including flow and quarterly billings
16. Others

Four individual meetings will be conducted with key staff from each respective wastewater service provider to collect and compile the available information. In addition, a fifth meeting/workshop will be conducted following completion of the Existing Treatment Capacity and Disposal Constraints Reviews, to identify and document water, wastewater and reclaimed water linkages between the four primary planning areas, including water rights considerations.

Task 4. Develop a Regional Water Balance Flow Diagram - Based on the information summarized from Tasks 2 and 3, develop an existing and future conditions graphical representation of the water supply, wastewater treatment, reclaimed water and wastewater disposal requirements for each of the four major planning areas. The regional water balance flow diagram will be useful to understand the following questions:

- How much potable water is used today, and in what locations?
- Where does the potable water come from, and once used, where does it go for treatment?
- Following treatment, how much of the water is reused, and where is the balance disposed of?
- Are there future imbalances in water supply, wastewater disposal and reclaimed water, and in what locations?

Task 5. Develop Estimates of the Volume of Effluent that can be Stored/Disposed in Select Alluvial Aquifers of Washoe County - Select hydrographic basins in Washoe County will be reviewed to identify those with a potential to store/dispose treated effluent under current
conditions in these areas. These include Lemmon Valley, Cold Springs Valley, Bedell Flat, Warm Springs Valley, Spanish Springs Valley, and the South Truckee Meadows. An estimate of the range of the volume of effluent that can be disposed of or stored in the alluvial deposits of the basins of interest will be made using existing groundwater flow models, where such models have been developed. For basins for which no models exist, estimates will be made using GIS techniques.

**Task 6. Prepare Water/TDS Mass Balance to Examine Long Term Changes in Water Quality in the Alluvial Aquifer of Lemmon Valley arising from Effluent Storage/Disposal/Reuse** - A spreadsheet-based water/TDS annual mass balance will be developed for the Stead, Lemmon Valley and Cold Springs hydrobasins. Water and TDS sources and sinks will include: TMWA, Washoe County, Utilities Inc. and Vidler municipal water supplies; estimates of potable water consumption, irrigation and wastewater return flows to RSWRF, CSWRF and Lemmon Valley Water Treatment Plant (LVWWTP); permitted disposal to Swan Lake, RIBs and current reuse sites; and consideration of future disposal options including a projection of future reuse sites, White Lake, effluent reservoir storage, and aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) by well injection and pumping. No more than three (3) mass balance scenarios will be prepared. Projections of future growth and associated water uses will be based on an agreed upon straight-line growth projection.

Projections of effluent ASR from the water/TDS mass balance will be incorporated into Washoe County’s existing groundwater model of Lemmon Valley. The buildup of TDS in the aquifer arising from effluent storage and recovery will be examined by using MT3DMS (a modular three-dimensional model for simulating advection, dispersion, and chemical reactions of dissolved constituents in groundwater) in conjunction with the County’s current groundwater flow model of Lemmon Valley. No more than three (3) modeling simulations will be performed.

The intent is *not* to develop a fully calibrated solute transport model. Rather, the objective of the study is to develop an awareness of the volume of effluent that might be disposed of and recycled; to determine if there is a need for blending water or eventual TDS removal from the system to prevent an unacceptable increase in TDS; and to obtain a sense of the time it may take for any unacceptable water quality conditions to occur.

**Task 7. Prepare Letter Report** - A brief report that summarizes the information developed in Tasks 2 through 6 will be prepared. The report will include:

- Existing and future regional water demand, wastewater flow, wastewater disposal and reclaimed water demand forecasts, disaggregated by the four planning regions
- A summary table with supporting information, which documents the constraints and limitations applicable to each of the four regional wastewater treatment plants
- A summary of identified water, wastewater and reclaimed water linkages, including water rights considerations
- A graphical representation of existing and future conditions for water supply, wastewater treatment, reclaimed water and wastewater disposal requirements
• A summary of the geologic framework for the hydrographic basins selected for analysis
• Estimates of the range of volume of effluent that can be disposed/stored in the selected basins
• Estimates of the volume of recharge and time it may take for TDS of water in the aquifer in Lemmon Valley to reach a maximum target concentration.

This scope of work and summary report is intended to supplement an ongoing staff working group technical evaluation process, and will provide a common understanding and foundation for more detailed wastewater and reclaimed water facility planning. Ten copies of the report, together with applicable electronic files, will be provided to the NNWPC.

Budget:

The total cost for this project is set at $96,000. Of this total, NDEP will pass through $40,000 from its 604(b) Water Quality Planning fund to partially cover the consultant fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDEP 604(b) Funds</th>
<th>$40,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection shall pay no more compensation that the federal Executive Service Level 4 (U.S. Code) daily rate (exclusive of fringe benefits) for individual consultants retained by the Subgrantee or by the Subgrantee’s contractors or subcontractors. This limitation applies to consultation services of designated individuals with specialized skills who are paid at a daily or hourly rate. The current Level 4 rate is $73.40 per hour.

2. **NDEP shall only reimburse the Subgrantee for actual cash disbursed.** Original invoices (facsimiles are not acceptable) must be received by NDEP no later than forty (40) calendar days after the end of a month or quarter except at the end of the fiscal year of the State of Nevada (June 30th), at the expiration date of the grant, or the effective date of the revocation of the Subgrant, at which times original invoices must be received by NDEP no later than thirty-five (35) calendar days after this date. Failure of the Subgrantee to submit billings according to the prescribed timeframes authorizes NDEP, in its sole discretion, to collect or withhold a penalty of ten percent (10%) of the amount being requested for each week or portion of a week that the billing is late. The Subgrantee shall provide with each invoice a detailed fiscal summary that includes the approved Subgrant budget, expenditures for the current period, cumulative expenditures to date, and balance remaining for each budget category. If match is required pursuant to paragraph 3 below, a similar fiscal summary of match expenditures must accompany each invoice. The Subgrantee shall obtain prior approval to transfer funds between budget categories if the funds to be transferred are greater than ten percent (10%) cumulative of the total Subgrant amount.

3. The Subgrantee shall, as part of its approved scope of work and budget under this Subgrant, provide third party match funds of not less than: $N/A. If match funds are required, the Subgrantee shall comply with additional record-keeping requirements as specified in 40 CFR 31.24 and Attachment N/A (Third Party Match Record-Keeping Requirements) which is attached hereto and by this reference is incorporated herein and made part of this Subgrant.

4. Unless otherwise provided in Attachment A (Scope of Work), the Subgrantee shall submit quarterly reports or other deliverables within ten (10) calendar days after the end of each quarter.

5. All payments under this Subgrant are contingent upon the receipt by NDEP of sufficient funds, necessary to carry out the purposes of this Subgrant, from either the Nevada Legislature or an agency of the United States. NDEP shall determine if it has received the specific funding necessary for this Subgrant. If funds are not received from either source for the specific purposes of this Subgrant, NDEP is under no obligation to supply funding for this Subgrant. The receipt of sufficient funds as determined by NDEP is a condition precedent to NDEP's obligation to make payments under this Subgrant. Nothing in this Subgrant shall be construed to provide the Subgrantee with a right of payment over any other entity. If any payments that are otherwise due to the Subgrantee under this Subgrant are deferred because of the unavailability of sufficient funds, such payments will promptly be made to the Subgrantee if sufficient funds later become available.

6. Notwithstanding the terms of paragraph 5, at the sole discretion of NDEP, payments will not be made by NDEP unless all required reports or deliverables have been submitted to and approved by NDEP within the schedule stated in Attachment A.

7. Any funds obligated by NDEP under this Subgrant that are not expended by the Subgrantee shall automatically revert back to NDEP upon the completion, termination or cancellation of this Subgrant. NDEP shall not have any obligation to re-award or to provide, in any manner, such unexpended funds to the Subgrantee. The Subgrantee shall have no claim of any sort to such unexpended funds.

8. The Subgrantee shall ensure, to the fullest extent possible, that at least the “fair share” percentages as stated below for prime contracts for construction, services, supplies or equipment are made available to organizations owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) or Small Business Enterprise (SBE)), women (Women Business Enterprise (WBE)) and historically black colleges and universities.
The Subgrantee agrees and is required to utilize the following seven affirmative steps:

a. Include in its bid documents applicable “fair share” percentages as stated above and require all of its prime contractors to include in their bid documents for subcontracts the “fair share” percentages;

b. Include qualified Small Business Enterprises (SBEs) Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs), and Women Business Enterprises (WBEs) on solicitation lists;

c. Assure that SBEs, MBEs, and WBEs are solicited whenever they are potential sources;

d. Divide total requirements, when economically feasible, into small tasks or quantities to permit maximum participation of SBEs, MBEs, and WBEs;

e. Establish delivery schedules, where the requirements of the work permit, which will encourage participation by SBEs, MBEs, and WBEs;

f. Use the services and assistance of the Small Business Administration and the Minority Business Development Agency, U.S. Department of commerce as appropriate; and

g. If a subcontractor awards contracts/procurements, require the subcontractor to take the affirmative steps in subparagraphs a. through e. of this condition.

9. The Subgrantee shall complete and submit to NDEP a Minority Business Enterprise/Woman Business Enterprise (MBE/WBE) Utilization Report (Standard Form 334) within fifteen (15) calendar days after the end of each federal fiscal year (September 30th) for each year this Subgrant is in effect and within fifteen (15) calendar days after the termination date of this Subgrant.

10. The books, records, documents and accounting procedures and practices of the Subgrantee or any subcontractor relevant to this Subgrant shall be subject to inspection, examination and audit by the State of Nevada, the Division of Environmental Protection, the Attorney General of Nevada, the Nevada State Legislative Auditor, the federal or other funding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States or any authorized representative of those entities.

11. All books, reports, studies, photographs, negatives, annual reports or other documents, data, materials or drawings prepared by or supplied to the Subgrantee in the performance of its obligations under this Subgrant shall be the joint property of both parties. Such items must be retained by the Subgrantee for a minimum of three years from the date of final payment by NDEP to the Subgrantee, and all other pending matters are closed. If requested by NDEP at any time within the retention period, any such materials shall be remitted and delivered by the Subgrantee, at the Subgrantee’s expense, to NDEP. NDEP does not warrant or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, report or product of any kind that the Subgrantee may disclose or use for purposes other than the performance of the Subgrantee’s obligations under this Subgrant. For any work outside the obligations of this Subgrant, the Subgrantee must include a disclaimer that the information, report or products are the views and opinions of the Subgrantee and do not necessarily state or reflect those of NDEP nor bind NDEP.

12. Unless otherwise provided in Attachment A, when issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with funds provided under this Subgrant, the Subgrantee shall clearly state that funding for the project or program was provided by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection and, if applicable, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Subgrantee will insure that NDEP is given credit in all official publications relative to this specific project and that the content of such publications will be coordinated with NDEP prior to being published.

13. Unless otherwise provided in Attachment A, all property purchased with funds provided pursuant to this Subgrant is the property of NDEP and shall, if NDEP elects within four (4) years after the completion, termination or cancellation of this Subgrant or after the conclusion of the use of the property for the purposes of this Subgrant during its term, be returned to NDEP at the Subgrantee’s expense.
Such property includes but is not limited to vehicles, computers, software, modems, calculators, radios, and analytical and safety equipment. The Subgrantee shall use all purchased property in accordance with local, state and federal law, and shall use the property only for Subgrant purposes unless otherwise agreed to in writing by NDEP.

For any unauthorized use of such property by the Subgrantee, NDEP may elect to terminate the Subgrant and to have the property immediately returned to NDEP by the Subgrantee at the Subgrantee’s expense. To the extent authorized by law, the Subgrantee shall indemnify and save and hold the State of Nevada and NDEP harmless from any and all claims, causes of action or liability arising from any use or custody of the property by the Subgrantee or the Subgrantee’s agents or employees or any subcontractor or their agents or employees.

14. The Subgrantee shall use recycled paper for all reports that are prepared as part of this Subgrant and delivered to NDEP. This requirement does not apply to standard forms.

15. The Subgrantee, to the extent provided by Nevada law, shall indemnify and save and hold the State of Nevada, its agents and employees harmless from any and all claims, causes of action or liability arising from the performance of this Subgrant by the Subgrantee or the Subgrantee’s agents or employees or any subcontractor or their agents or employees. NDEP, to the extent provided by Nevada law, shall indemnify and save and hold the Subgrantee, its agents and employees harmless from any and all claims, causes of action or liability arising from the performance of this Subgrant by NDEP or NDEP’s agents or employees.

16. The Subgrantee and its subcontractors shall obtain any necessary permission needed, before entering private or public property, to conduct activities related to the work plan (Attachment A). The property owner will be informed of the program, the type of data to be gathered, and the reason for the requested access to the property.

17. This Subgrant shall be construed and interpreted according to the laws of the State of Nevada and conditions established in OMB Circular A-102. Nothing in this Subgrant shall be construed as a waiver of sovereign immunity by the State of Nevada. Any action brought to enforce this Subgrant shall be brought in the First Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada. The Subgrantee and any of its subcontractors shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal laws in carrying out the obligations of this Subgrant, including all federal and state accounting procedures and requirements established in OMB Circular A-87 and A-133. The Subgrantee and any of its subcontractors shall also comply with the following:
   a. 40 CFR Part 7 - Nondiscrimination In Programs Receiving Federal Assistance From EPA
   b. 40 CFR Part 29 - Intergovernmental Review Of EPA Programs And Activities.
   c. 40 CFR Part 31 - Uniform Administrative Requirements For Grants And Cooperative Agreements To State and Local Governments;
   d. 40 CFR Part 32 - Governmentwide Debarment And Suspension (Nonprocurement) And Governmentwide Requirements For Drug-Free Workplace (Grants);
   e. 40 CFR Part 34 - Lobbying Activities;
   f. 40 CFR Part 35, Subpart O - Cooperative Agreements And Superfund State Contracts For Superfund Response Actions (Superfund Only); and
   g. The Hotel And Motel Fire Safety Act of 1990.

18. The Subgrantee shall neither assign, transfer nor delegate any rights, obligations or duties under this Subgrant without the prior written consent of NDEP.
Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: November 5, 2009

TO: Chairman and Members, Western Regional Water Commission

FROM: Ben Hutchins, Finance & Customer Services Manager, DWR

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible approval of the WRWC fiscal year 2008/09 Financial Statements and audit opinion from Schettler, Macy & Silva, LLC

SUMMARY
The attached report presents the Western Regional Water Commission’s (WRWC) Financial Statements for the year ended June 30, 2009, and the auditor’s opinion thereof. It is their expressed opinion that the Financial Statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the WRWC as of June 30, 2009, and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The report is being presented for consideration, discussion and approval.

PREVIOUS ACTION
On March 13, 2009, the WRWC selected Schettler, Macy & Silva, LLC as the external auditor of record for fiscal year ending June 30, 2009.

BACKGROUND
Pursuant to NRS 354.624, each local government shall provide for an annual audit of its financial statements. In keeping with this statute, the WRWC engaged Schettler, Macy & Silva, LLC to provide the audit services of its Financial Statements for the year ending June 30, 2009. The audit results and findings of the auditor must be presented at a meeting of the governing body and immediately thereafter must be filed as a public record and submitted to the Department of Taxation.

FISCAL IMPACT
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Washoe County’s Department of Water Resources Finance and Customer Services Manager recommends that the WRWC approves the Financial Statements and audit opinion from Schettler, Macy & Silva, LLC for fiscal year 2008/09.

POSSIBLE MOTION
Should the Commission agree with the above noted recommendation, a suggested motion is: “Move to approve the Financial Statements and audit opinion from Schettler, Macy & Silva, LLC for fiscal year 2008/09.”

Attachments
WESTERN REGIONAL
WATER COMMISSION
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JUNE 30, 2009
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Board of Trustees of the
Western Regional Water Commission
Reno, Nevada

We have audited the accompanying basic financial statements of the Western Regional Water Commission (Commission) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2009, as listed in the table of contents. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Commission's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinions.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Western Regional Water Commission as of June 30, 2009, and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated September 25, 2009, on our consideration of the Commission's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.
Management's Discussion and Analysis and the budgetary comparison information identified in the table of contents are not a required part of the basic financial statements but are supplementary information required by accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted principally of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of the required supplementary information. However, we did not audit the information and express no opinion on it.

Scheffer, Mary L. Sivon, LLC

Reno, Nevada
September 25, 2009
As management of the Western Regional Water Commission (Commission), we offer readers of the Commission’s financial statements this narrative overview and analysis of the financial activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. We encourage readers to read the information presented here in conjunction with additional information that we have furnished in the Commission’s financial statements, which follow this narrative.

The Western Regional Water Commission (Commission) was created on April 1, 2008 pursuant to Chapter 531 of the Statutes of Nevada to improve water resource planning at the regional level and facilitate coordinated resource management among the four public water purveyors of Washoe County (Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Washoe County Water Resources, Sun Valley General Improvement District and South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District).

A cooperative agreement was entered into upon the creation of the Commission by the following member agencies: the cities of Reno and Sparks, the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District, the Sun Valley General Improvement District, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority, and Washoe County, to form a Joint Powers Authority to operate the Commission. The Commission is directed by a Board of Trustees composed of members from each of the governing agencies.

Financial Highlights

- Government-wide net assets increased by nearly $160,000 to $3.2 million.
- The Commission’s net assets are unrestricted and unreserved; therefore, the net assets are available for spending in fulfillment of the Commission’s mission.

Overview of the Financial Statements

This discussion and analysis is intended to serve as an introduction to the Commission’s basic financial statements.

The (1) Statement of Net Assets and Governmental Fund Balance Sheet and the (2) Statement of Activities and Governmental Fund Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance and the (3) Notes to the financial statements provide information about the activities of the Commission.

Government-wide Financial Statements

The government-wide financial statements are designed to provide the reader with a broad overview of the Commission’s finances, similar in format to a financial statement of a private-sector business.

The Statement of Net Assets and Governmental Fund Balance Sheet presents information on all of the Commission’s assets and liabilities, with the difference between the two reported as net assets. Over time, increases or decreases in net assets may serve as a useful indicator of whether the financial position of the Commission is improving or deteriorating.

The Statement of Activities and Governmental Fund Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance presents information showing how the Commission’s net assets changed during the most recent fiscal year. All changes in net assets are reported as soon as the underlying event giving rise
to the change occurs, regardless of the timing of the related cash flows. Thus, revenues and expenses are reported in the statement for some items that will only result in cash flows in future fiscal periods.

Fund Financial Statements

A fund is a grouping of related accounts that is used to maintain control over resources that have been segregated for specific activities or objectives. The Commission uses fund accounting to ensure and reflect compliance (or non-compliance) with finance-related legal requirements, such as the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and the Commission's regulations.

Unlike the government-wide financial statements, fund financial statements focus on near-term inflows and outflows of spendable resources, as well as on balances of spendable resources available at the end of the fiscal year.

The Commission's General Fund is a governmental fund.

Notes to Financial Statements

The notes to the financial statements provide additional information which is essential for a full understanding of the information provided in the government-wide and fund financial statements.

Required Supplementary Information (RSI)

The RSI presented compares the Commission's budgetary information to actual results. The Commission adopts an annual budget for its General Fund. The RSI demonstrates the Commission's compliance with its budget.

Government-Wide Financial Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION NET ASSETS</th>
<th>JUNE 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and other assets</td>
<td>$ 3,361,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>72,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$ 3,288,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2009

Governmental Activities:

The Commission’s governmental activities for the year ended June 30, 2009 are presented in the following table:

WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION
CHANGES IN NET ASSETS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General revenues:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water surcharge fees</td>
<td>$1,198,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings on investments</td>
<td>156,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,354,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services and supplies</td>
<td>1,194,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>1,194,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>159,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Assets, July 1, 2008          | 3,128,835|
Net Assets, June 30, 2009          | $3,288,782|

ECONOMIC FACTORS / NEXT YEAR’S BUDGET / OTHER SIGNIFICANT MATTERS

In the opinion of management, revenues will continue to be less than historical trends due to a significant economic downturn which has left several thousand homes vacant, causing decreased water consumption; however, these impacts will be partially offset by user rate increases recently approved by member purveyors. Although future revenues are expected to be less than prior accounting periods management does not believe this will have a material financial impact on the Commission’s ability to achieve its desired goals and objectives.

Unrestricted net assets as of June 30, 2009 was $3.29 million, whereas operating expenses in the June 30, 2010 budget are only $573 thousand, or 22.6% of the total budget. All other budgeted expenses relate to projects and can be managed in a way that aligns with remaining resources and expected future revenues.
REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

This report is designed to provide an overview of the Commission’s finances for those with an interest in this area. Questions concerning any of the information found in this report or requests for additional information should be directed to:

Western Regional Water Commission
c/o Washoe County Department of Water Resources
4930 Energy Way
Reno, NV 89502
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION

STATEMENT OF NET ASSETS
AND GOVERNMENTAL FUND BALANCE SHEET
JUNE 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Adjustments (See Note 4)</th>
<th>Government-wide Statement of Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$ 3,083,360</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,083,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>264,110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>264,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable</td>
<td>14,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$ 3,361,646</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,361,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **LIABILITIES**           |              |                          |                                        |
| Accounts payable          | $ 13,728     | $ -                      | $ 13,728                               |
| Due to other governments  | 59,136       | -                        | 59,136                                 |
| Total Liabilities         | 72,864       |                          | 72,864                                 |

| **FUND BALANCE/NET ASSETS**|              |                          |                                        |
| Fund Balance:             |              |                          |                                        |
| Unreserved and undesignated | 3,288,782 | (3,288,782)              | -                                      |
| Total Liabilities and Fund Balance | $ 3,361,646 | | 3,361,646 |

| Net Assets:               |              |                          |                                        |
| Unrestricted              | 3,288,782    | 3,288,782                |                                        |
| Total Liabilities and Net Assets | $ -         | $ 3,361,646 |

See accompanying notes.
WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL FUND REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Adjustments (See Notes)</th>
<th>Government-wide Statement of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES/EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and supplies</td>
<td>$ 1,194,362</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,194,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water surcharge fees</td>
<td>1,198,225</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,198,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings on investments</td>
<td>156,084</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Revenues</td>
<td>1,354,309</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,354,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>159,947</td>
<td>(159,947)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159,947</td>
<td>159,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE/NET ASSETS, July 1</strong></td>
<td>3,128,835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,128,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE/NET ASSETS, June 30</strong></td>
<td>$ 3,288,782</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,288,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes.
NOTE 1 - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Reporting Entity

The Western Regional Water Commission (Commission) was created on April 1, 2008 pursuant to Chapter 531 of the Nevada Revised Statues (NRS) to improve water resource planning at the regional level and facilitate coordinated resource management among the four public water purveyors of Washoe County (Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Washoe County Water Resources, Sun Valley General Improvement District and South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District).

A cooperative agreement was entered into upon the creation of the Commission by the following member agencies: the cities of Reno and Sparks, the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District, the Sun Valley General Improvement District, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority, and Washoe County, to form a Joint Powers Authority to operate the Commission. The Commission is directed by a Board of Trustees composed of members from each of the governing agencies.

Measurement Focus, Basis of Accounting and Financial Statement Presentation

In this report, the government-wide statements and fund statements for the Commission are presented on the same page with the adjustments column showing the differences (if any).

Government-Wide Statements

The statement of net assets and statement of activities columns display information about the primary government (Commission). These statements include the financial activities of the overall Commission.

The government-wide financial statements are reported using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of when the related cash flows take place.

Fund Financial Statements

Governmental fund financial statements are reported using the current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when measurable and available (susceptible to accrual). Interest and surcharges are accrued when their receipt occurs within sixty days after the end of the accounting period so as to be measureable and available.
Expenditures generally are recorded when a liability is incurred, as under accrual accounting. However, certain expenditures are recorded only when payment is due.

The General Fund column displays the Commission’s primary operating fund. It accounts for all financial resources of the general government.

**Accounts Receivable**

Accounts receivable are recorded as earned and no allowance for doubtful accounts is required as all receivables are considered to be fully collectible.

**Revenue**

The Commission receives a surcharge of 1.5% on all customer water bills within the region collected by water purveyors in Washoe County.

**Use of Estimates**

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts and disclosures. Accordingly, actual results could differ from these estimates.

**NOTE 2 – BUDGETS AND BUDGETARY ACCOUNTING**

The Commission adheres to the *Local Government Budget and Finance Act* incorporated within the statutes of the State of Nevada, which includes the following major procedures to establish the budgetary data which is reflected in these financial statements:

1. Prior to April 15, the Commission’s Board of Trustees (the “Board”) files a tentative budget with the Nevada Department of Taxation for the fiscal year beginning the following July 1. The tentative budget includes proposed expenditures and the means of financing them.

2. Prior to June 1, at a public hearing, the Board indicates changes, if any, to be made to the tentative budget and adopts a final budget by the favorable vote of a majority of the Board’s members.
3. The Water Resources Program Manager is authorized to transfer appropriations between accounts within the Water Management Fund, if amounts do not exceed the original budget, subject to subsequent approval by the Board of Trustees. Augmentations in excess of the original budget require approval from the Board of Trustees.

4. Formal budgetary integration is employed as a management control device for the Commission’s General Fund. The budget is legally adopted, and its annual appropriations lapse at year-end.

5. Budgeted appropriations may not be exceeded by actual expenditures of the various programs in the budgeted governmental fund.

6. All budgets are adopted on a basis consistent with GAAP. The accompanying financial statements reflect the Original Budget and the Final Budget in one columnar presentation as there were no adjustments made to the Original Budget.

NOTE 3 – CASH IN COUNTY TREASURY

Cash at June 30, 2009 consisted of the following:

| Cash in County Treasury | $ 3,083,360 |

The Commission maintains all of its cash and investments with the Washoe County Treasurer in an investment pool. The Treasurer allocates interest to participants based upon their average balances. Required disclosure information regarding categorization of investments and other deposit and investment risk disclosures can be found in the County’s financial statements. The Washoe County financial statements may be obtained by contacting the Office of the Comptroller at 1001 E. Ninth Street, Room D-120, Reno, NV 89512. The Investment Committee oversees the Washoe County Treasurer’s investments and policies.

Investments held in the County’s investment pool are available on demand and are stated at cost plus accrued interest, which approximates fair value.

*Interest Rate Risk* – Interest rate risk is the risk of possible reduction in the value of a security, especially a bond, resulting from the rise in interest rates. To limit exposure to interest rate risk, the Nevada Revised Statues limits bankers’ acceptances to 180 days maturities, repurchase agreements to 90 days, U.S. Treasuries and Agencies to less than 10 years, and commercial paper to 270 days.
Credit Risk – Credit risk is the risk that an issuer or other counterparty to an investment will not fulfill its obligation and is a function of the credit quality ratings of its investments. In accordance with Nevada Revised Statutes, the Commission limits its investment instruments by their credit risk. The Washoe County Investment Pool is an unrated external investment pool.

NOTE 4 – RECONCILIATION OF FUND AND GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

As of and for the year ended June 30, 2009, there were no differences between:

- The Governmental Fund (General Fund) Balance Sheet and the Government-Wide Statement of Net Assets, and


NOTE 5 – NET ASSETS AND FUND BALANCE

Net Assets

Equity is classified as net assets in the government-wide financial statements. Net assets are categorized as invested in capital assets (net of related debt), restricted and unrestricted.

Net assets are reported as restricted when there are limitations imposed on their use either through legislation or through external restrictions imposed by creditors or laws or regulations of other governments.

As of June 30, 2009, the Commission only has unrestricted funds:

- *Unrestricted Net Assets* – Net assets of the Commission which are not restricted for any project or other purpose.

Fund Balance

Equity is classified as fund balance in the fund financial statements as follows:

*Reserved Fund Balance* – Those portions of fund equity which are legally segregated for specific future use or which do not represent available expendable resources and therefore are not available for appropriations for expenditures.
Unreserved Fund Balance – The portion of fund equity which is available for appropriation in future periods.

- Designated Unreserved Fund Balance – This represents the portion of unreserved fund balance for which management has tentative plans for financial resource utilization in a future period. Such plans or intentions are subject to change and have not been legally authorized and do not represent commitments of the Commission.

NOTE 6 – RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

On November 8, 2008, the Commission entered into an agreement with Washoe County stating that the County would provide to the Commission, on a contractual and reimbursable basis, services of certain County employees from the County’s Department of Water Resources (assigned employees), who have historically been fully dedicated to supporting and performing the duties, functions and responsibilities necessary and proper for the planning and implementation of regional water matters. Assigned employees retain all rights and status of Washoe County employees. The Commission reimburses the County for all actual costs for the services provided by the assigned employees, including wages, hours, compensatory time, sick leave, special sick leave, annual leave, insurance premiums, worker’s compensation insurance, and all other benefits the County currently provides or may provide in the future.

In addition to the services provided by the assigned employees, routine and general administrative activities in support of the Commission’s mission are provided in part by other Washoe County Department of Water Resources personnel. The County does not charge the Commission for these routine and general administrative services.

As discussed in Note 1, the Commission derives its revenue from a surcharge on customer water bills within the region collected by water purveyors in Washoe County. Some members of the governing bodies of the purveyors are also members of the Commission’s Board of Trustees.

NOTE 7 – BEGINNING FUND BALANCE / NET ASSETS

Prior to April 1, 2008, the Commission was organized as an interim commission and its operations were accounted for within the Department of Water Resources (DWR) of Washoe County, Nevada. Upon the enactment of Senate Bill 487 by the 2007 Nevada Legislature, the Western Regional Water Commission Act created the Commission as a separate entity.
Prior to the close of the June 30, 2008 fiscal year, the Commission’s separate accounting records were established with an effective date of April 1, 2008. The Commission’s financial resources as of July 1, 2008 were $3,128,835 and are represented by the July 1, 2008 fund balance / net assets in the accompanying Statement of Activities and Governmental Fund Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance.

NOTE 8 – WATER SURCHARGE FEES

The water surcharge fees reported for the year ended June 30, 2009 are reported net of a $96,068 downward adjustment to reflect the difference in revenue estimated for 2008 versus the amount eventually realized in 2009. It is standard practice for DWR to estimate several revenue accruals at year-end; therefore, the $96,068 downward adjustment is deemed to be a 2009 transaction.
REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
# Western Regional Water Commission

## Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes

in fund balance - budget and actual - general fund

Year ended June 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original And Final Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance To Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water surcharge fees</td>
<td>$ 1,452,275</td>
<td>$ 1,198,225</td>
<td>$ (254,050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings on investments</td>
<td>69,289</td>
<td>156,084</td>
<td>86,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,521,564</td>
<td>1,354,309</td>
<td>(167,255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and supplies</td>
<td>2,098,533</td>
<td>1,194,362</td>
<td>904,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>(576,969)</td>
<td>159,947</td>
<td>736,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE, July 1</strong></td>
<td>2,619,251</td>
<td>3,128,835</td>
<td>509,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE, June 30</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,042,282</td>
<td>$ 3,288,782</td>
<td>$ 1,246,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLIANCE SECTION
To the Board of Trustees of the
Western Regional Water Commission
Reno, Nevada

We have audited the financial statements of the Western Regional Water Commission (the Commission) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2009, and have issued our report thereon dated September 25, 2009. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

**Internal Control over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Commission’s internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission’s internal control over financial reporting.

A *control deficiency* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the Commission’s ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the Commission’s financial statements that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the Commission’s internal control.

A *material weakness* is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statements will not be prevented or detected by the Commission’s internal control.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.
Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Commission's financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Board of Trustees, management, others within the entity, and Federal awarding agencies and pass-through entities, as applicable, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Schettler, Mary F. Schettler, LLC

Reno, Nevada
September 25, 2009
WESTERN REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION

AUDITORS' COMMENTS
JUNE 30, 2009

STATUTE COMPLIANCE

Current Year

The Commission complied with all significant statutory constraints on its financial administration during the year.

Prior Year

An audit was not performed for the period ended June 30, 2008.

AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Current Year

We did not note any financial weaknesses of a magnitude to justify inclusion within our report.

We have prepared a management letter dated September 25, 2009, which addresses internal controls in the accounting process. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

Prior Year

An audit was not performed for the period ended June 30, 2008.
Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: October 27, 2009

TO: Chairman and Members, Western Regional Water Commission

FROM: Rosemary Menard, Director, Washoe County Department of Water Resources

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible approval of a request by the Desert Research Institute (“DRI”) for funding in the amount of $45,000 from the Regional Water Management Fund to support DRI’s Cloud Seeding Operations for the Truckee and Tahoe Basins for the current water year; and, if approved, authorize the Chairman to execute an Interlocal Agreement with DRI

SUMMARY

Desert Research Institute (“DRI”) funding cuts have affected its cloud seeding operations such that outside financing is necessary to continue the program. DRI is therefore seeking funds from the Regional Water Management Fund (“RWMF”) to continue cloud seeding operations for the Truckee and Tahoe Basins. DRI staff will provide a presentation about the program including immediate and long term funding needs.

The cloud seeding budget for the 2010 water year is $210,072. Earlier this year, the Truckee River fund awarded $165,151 leaving a $44,921 shortfall. The City of Reno subsequently pledged $10,000 contingent on DRI securing the balance.

BACKGROUND

Wintertime cloud seeding is focused on enhancing snowfall in mountainous regions to increase the snowpack, resulting in more spring runoff and water supplies in the surrounding areas. The DRI cloud seeding program has been in operation for more than 25 years. DRI claims that, for the Truckee River Basin, cloud-seeding has boosted water in the snowpack by an average of 18,000 acre-feet a year over the last 10 years.

In response to budget cuts that threaten to eliminate the program, DRI applied to the Truckee River Fund (TRF) to support the operation of five cloud-seeding generators in the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. DRI received approval for partial funding for the 2010 water year, however long-term funding for Truckee and Tahoe Basin cloud seeding remains uncertain.

PREVIOUS ACTION

No Previous Action

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact to the RWMF, should this item be approved, will be $45,000. Budget authority is located in Fund Group 766, Fund 7066, Account Number 710100, Professional Services, Cost Object WP310100.
RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the WRWC consider the presentation from DRI and provide direction regarding the 2010 funding request and/or future activity concerning the cloud seeding program.
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Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: October 28, 2009

TO: Chairman and Members, Western Regional Water Commission

FROM: Chris Wessel, Water Management Planner
Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager

SUBJECT: Status report on development of the 2011 Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan, including outline and timeline, and possible direction to staff.

SUMMARY
As required by the Western Regional Water Commission ("WRWC") Act (the "Act"), the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission ("NNWPC") must develop a new comprehensive plan by January 1, 2011. Staff began the process of reviewing the existing 2004-2025 Water Management Plan, and amendments, to assess how well elements of the current plan satisfy the statutory requirements outlined in the Act. Following staff’s initial review to ensure compliance with statutory requirements, WRWC member agencies where asked to provide input on elements they felt needed to be addressed.

Following the culmination of the required elements and member agency needs, staff began the process of organizing the plan subjects into an outline. The outline differs slightly from the organization of previous water management plans to streamline the document and improve the logical progression of information. The intent is to: provide the reader with the appropriate background information; follow with analyses of current and possible future conditions; and, conclude with an assessment of needs and requirements for moving forward.

The outline, in its current format, is provided as an attachment for your review. The outline provides the main chapters and subheadings along with an anticipated schedule for completion. Staff anticipates working with various member agency staff members and consultants to compile the information necessary to complete the plan.

It is anticipated that the WRWC will hold a public hearing in December 2010 in order to comply with the January 1, 2011, statutory deadline for development of the plan. A draft plan will be available for the NNWPC to review at its August 2010 meeting. The NNWPC will need to hold a public hearing at its November 2010 meeting to consider recommending the plan to the WRWC.
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Attachment:
### Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 1 - Regional Water Planning Policies and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Plan for the Development of Sustainable Water Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Plan for Regional Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Plan for the Protection of Human Health, Property, Water Quality and the Environment through Regional Flood Plain and Storm Water Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Support the Implementation of the Regional Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 2 - Water Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.1 Sources of Water

#### 2.2 Factors Affecting Water Resource Sustainability

#### 2.3 Watershed Management Programs to Protect the Availability and Quality of Water Resources for Municipal and Industrial Use

### Chapter 3 – Water Purveyors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Public Water Purveyors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Non-Public Water Purveyors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Reclaimed Water Purveyors (Reno, Sparks, WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Water Resources Available for Municipal Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Water Demand and Supply Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Water Rights Dedication Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 4 - Wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary and Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 Service Providers (Reno, Sparks, WC, SVGID)

#### 4.2 Water Reclamation Facilities

#### 4.3 Wastewater Planning for Other Areas

#### 4.4 On-site Disposal Systems

### Chapter 5 – Background on Flood Control / Storm Drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary and Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.1 Flood Damage

#### 5.2 Flood Types

#### 5.3 Flood History and Regional Setting

#### 5.4 Storm Water Drainage Planning

#### 5.5 Flood Plain Management and Regional Flood Control Master Plan

#### 5.6 Legislation and Programs to Address Flood Issues

#### 5.7 Truckee River Flood Control Efforts

#### 5.8 Flood Control Overview by Hydrographic Basin

### References Cited
### Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Purpose and Scope</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>References Cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 – Population Forecast and Projections of Water Demand, Peak Day Requirements and Wastewater Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Water Conservation - Efficient Use of Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Issues Identification and Proposed Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Cost and Financing Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timeline in Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: November 3, 2009
TO: Chairman and Commission Members
FROM: Chris Benedict, CTMRD Program Manager, DWR
SUBJECT: Status Report on “State of the Science” for the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District (CTMRD)

SUMMARY
The CTMRD program was created in 1995 by state and local legislation in response to the recognition of widespread tetrachloroethene (PCE) contaminated groundwater in the central Truckee Meadows that poses a potential human health risk to local residents and water users. The CTMRD program is implemented by the Washoe County Department of Water Resources (DWR) on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners and in coordination with a stakeholder group that includes the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), Reno, Sparks, Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), DWR, and the Washoe County Health District (WCHD).

The principal goals of the CTMRD program are to prevent, protect, and mitigate PCE contamination in accordance with the Remediation Management Plan (RMP), which by state statute (NRS 540A.260) must accommodate “any action which is reasonable and economically feasible in the event of the release or threat of release of any hazardous substance which may affect the water quality in this state.” The RMP defines the activities, processes, and procedures utilized by program stakeholders to address the PCE contamination of in the central Truckee Meadows.

This status presentation will provide a brief background to and current overview of the PCE problem in the central Truckee Meadows basin (the “State of the Science”) along with an update of CTMRD program activities to date. These activities include:
- Protecting and treating the resource needed to meet municipal water demands;
- Ongoing groundwater monitoring and investigations;
- PCE source management and potential source area investigations; and,
- Updating the Remediation Management Plan to reflect what we now know about the PCE problem in the central Truckee Meadows and how stakeholder agencies can best work together to prevent, protect, and mitigate PCE contamination.

PREVIOUS ACTION
No previous action.

FISCAL IMPACT
No fiscal impact.
RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Commission receive the status report on “State of the Science” for the CTMRD, and obtain answers to any questions they may have. This is an informational item and no action is required.

CB
Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: October 27, 2009

TO: Chairman and Members, Western Regional Water Commission

FROM: Rosemary Menard, Director, Washoe County Department of Water Resources

SUBJECT: Status Report on the proposed amendment to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, sponsored by Washoe County, regarding sustainability of water resources

SUMMARY
On October 27, 2009, the Washoe County Board of Commissioners (BCC) unanimously adopted a resolution to sponsor a Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (“Regional Plan”) amendment that implements Washoe County Ballot Question #3 (“WC #3”), approved by voters in November 2008. WC #3 calls for the Regional Plan to be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County. The resolution includes recommendations to the Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) that the Regional Plan and the RPGB’s Regulations on Procedure, Section XII, be amended to clarify that the Consensus Forecast is to be compared with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan.

A copy of the BCC staff report is attached for your information.

BACKGROUND
On August 13, 2009, the RPGB discussed implementation strategies in response to WC #3 and related discussions in the 75th session of the Nevada Legislature. The RPGB decided to refer the possible initiation of a Regional Plan amendment to implement WC #3 to the BCC. Washoe County staff collaborated with Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency staff members to develop recommended amendments to the Regional Plan. The recommendations were discussed with WC #3 proponents prior to the BCC’s action.

On November 4, 2008, Washoe County voters passed WC#3 with 73%, or 121,555 voters, in favor. The question read: “Shall the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County?”
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DATE: September 17, 2009

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Rosemary Menard, Director, Department of Water Resources
       954-4666, rmenard@washoecounty.us
Adrian Freund, Director, Department of Community Development
       328-3606, afreund@washoecounty.us

SUBJECT: Approve and authorize the Chairman to: 1) execute a Resolution to
        sponsor a Regional Plan amendment that implements Washoe County
        Question #3, approved by voters, which calls for the regional plan to
        be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that
        local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with
        identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe
        County; and 2) recommend to the Regional Planning Commission and
        the Regional Planning Governing Board that the Regional Plan and
        the Regulations on Procedure, Section XII, be amended to clarify that
        the Consensus Forecast is to be compared with the estimated
        population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources
        as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan. (All
        Commission Districts)

SUMMARY
On August 13, 2009, the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) discussed
implementation strategies in response to Washoe County Ballot Question WC #3 (WC#3)
and related discussions in the 75th session of the Nevada Legislature. The RPGB decided
to refer the initiation of a possible Truckee Meadows Regional Plan amendment to
implement WC #3 to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners.

Staff has collaborated with Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and Truckee Meadows
Regional Planning Agency planners to develop the attached recommended amendments
to the Regional Plan (Attachment 1). The elements of the recommended amendments are
described briefly below.

- The following statement is added to the introduction to Module #1 - Regional
  Form and Development Patterns: “Ensure that the population forecast prescribed
  in the Regional Plan is consistent with the estimated population that can be
  supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water
  Management Plan”.

AGENDA ITEM #
• Language is added to Policy 1.1.1 requiring the Regional Planning Commission to adopt a Consensus Forecast that is consistent with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan.

• Also in Policy 1.1.1, a reference to RPGB Regulations on Procedure, section XII, is clarified to provide for a comparison of the Consensus Forecast and the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan. A decision tree (Attachment 2) illustrates the procedure by which the comparison might be made, including possible outcomes. The procedure is described more thoroughly below. This change to Policy 1.1.1 would necessitate an amendment to the RPGB Regulations on Procedure, section XII, which are attached for reference (Attachment 3). Amendments to the RPGB Regulations on Procedure are handled separately from Regional Plan amendments; therefore, the appropriate action today would be a recommendation to amend both the Regional Plan and the RPGB Regulations on Procedure.

The decision tree procedure mentioned above is conceptual at the present time, subject to review and approval by the RPGB and the WRWC. The following is a summary description of the process:

Pursuant to the RPGB Regulations on Procedure, Washoe County will prepare a draft Consensus Forecast (CF) and forward the draft to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC). The RPC will receive the draft CF and forward it to the WRWC for comparison with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources (PSWR) identified in the adopted Regional Water Management Plan (RWMP). The PSWR and the methodology to calculate it will be set forth in the RWMP due in January 2011.

The WRWC will make a finding based on the comparison: either the CF is less than or equal to (in balance with) the PSWR, or the CF is greater. If the CF is in balance with the PSWR, a finding to that effect will be sent to the RPC and the CF process will continue. Washoe County will prepare the final CF with jurisdictional splits for RPC adoption and the local governments and affected entities will use the adopted CF for master plans, facilities plans, and other similar plans.

If the CF is greater than the PSWR, the WRWC will forward the comparison and an appropriate finding to the RPC, which will cause the CF to be brought into balance with the PSWR before the final modified CF with jurisdictional splits is prepared for RPC adoption. The WRWC will also initiate an investigation for new or alternative water sources, and/or demand management strategies, the results of which may or may not allow for an increased PSWR to be included in a RWMP amendment. Finally, the WRWC will forward the investigation results to the RPC for its consideration of possible Regional Plan amendments.
A resolution to sponsor the Regional Plan and RPGB Regulations on Procedure amendments described above is attached for consideration (Attachment 4).

*County Priorities/Goals supported by this item.* Preserve and Enhance Our Quality of Life - Effectively plan and manage use of our natural assets including water, air and open space; Improve growth management, planning and land use through regional collaboration. Improve Regional Collaboration - Continue to improve communication and cooperation among regional partners.

**PREVIOUS ACTION**
No previous action.

**BACKGROUND**
On November 4, 2008, Washoe County voters passed WC#3 with 73%, or 121,555 voters, in favor. The question read: “*Shall the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County?*”

**FISCAL IMPACT**
No fiscal impact.

**RECOMMENDATION**
It is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners approve and authorize the Chairman to: 1) execute a Resolution to sponsor a Regional Plan amendment that implements Washoe County Question #3, approved by voters, which calls for the regional plan to be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County; and 2) recommend to the Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board that the Regional Plan and the Regulations on Procedure, Section XII, be amended to clarify that the Consensus Forecast is to be compared with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan.

**POSSIBLE MOTION**
Should the Board agree with staff’s recommendation, a possible motion would be: “Move to approve and authorize the Chairman to: 1) execute a Resolution to sponsor a Regional Plan amendment that implements Washoe County Question #3, approved by voters, which calls for the regional plan to be amended to reflect and to include a policy or policies requiring that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County; and 2) recommend to the Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board that the Regional Plan and the Regulations on Procedure, Section XII, be amended to clarify that the Consensus Forecast is to be compared with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan.”
RM:js:lr

Attachments:
1. Proposed Regional Plan Amendment
2. Decision Tree
3. Regulations on Procedure
4. Resolution

c: Jim Smitherman, Program Manager
   Ben Hutchins, Finance and Customer Services Manager
   Ted Rolfs, Fiscal Compliance Officer
   Betsy Mellinger, Public Information Officer
   Kimberly Robinson, Planning Manager, Community Development
INTRODUCTION

The Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) was created in 1989 by the Nevada State Legislature to foster coordination among the three local governments: The Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County.

The TMRPA is comprised of the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB), the Regional Planning Commission (RPC), the TMRPA’s Director, and staff.

The first comprehensive Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (“Regional Plan”) was adopted in March 1991 and updated for the first time as required by law in June 1996. The second update of the plan was completed in May 2002. The third update is scheduled for completion in 2007.

BACKGROUND

The area covered by the Regional Plan includes all of Washoe County except the portions within the drainage basin of Lake Tahoe (see Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.0288) and the lands of federally-recognized tribes. The effective planning area is the developed area in the southern 25% of Washoe County.

Creating and carrying out the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan is a cooperative effort involving a large number of agencies, organizations and individuals. Reno, Sparks, Washoe County and others implement the Regional Plan through their planning and regulatory efforts, capital improvement programs, and other programs.

Nevada law grants the authority and provides the direction for the regional planning process in the Truckee Meadows. The TMRPA, organized under NRS 278.026 - 278.029, was formed to develop and maintain a comprehensive Regional Plan for the jurisdictions of Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County.

Washoe County was established in 1861 and is a political subdivision of the State of Nevada operating under the provisions of the general laws of the State. It has a manager-commission form of government. The County covers an area of 6,600 square miles in the northwest section of the State bordering California and Oregon. The incorporated cities in Washoe County are Reno and Sparks. In 2005, Washoe County’s population was 396,844 (Nevada State Demographer’s Certified Population Estimates, 2005).

Reno is the largest city in Northern Nevada, covering 102 square miles. It is located in the southern part of Washoe County. Reno was incorporated in 1903 and is governed under a council-manager form of government. Reno’s population is 206,735 (NV Demographer, 2005). The City of Sparks borders the City of Reno and was incorporated in 1905. It, too, operates with a council-manager form of government. Sparks covers an area of 33 square miles and has a population of 85,618 (NV Demographer, 2005).
As set forth in the NRS, the RPC develops the Regional Plan and determines whether other plans and projects are in conformance with it (NRS 278.0272). The RPGB adopts the Regional Plan with any amendments it deems necessary, after submitting the amendments to the RPC for review and comment (NRS 278.0276).

Units of local government maintain separate master plans, in conformance with the Regional Plan (NRS 278.0282).

The Regional Plan is a cooperative effort of the local and regional units of government, the major service providers, and the citizens of the Truckee Meadows. It is intended to represent a regional consensus reached through a process of public dialog and decision-making to provide a unifying framework for local and regional policies and services.

State law directs the RPC to update the Regional Plan not less than every five years (NRS 278.0272). The 1996 five-year revision constituted the first comprehensive revision of the 1991 Regional Plan developed by Robert Freilich. The second revision was adopted in May 2002. The 2007 update will be adopted within the requirements of state law, no later than May 2007.

The Plan focuses on the statutory mandates and measurable goals for addressing those mandates on an annual basis, as well as through the five-year update.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES**

The roles and responsibilities are delineated in NRS. Each of the following sections summarizes the roles and responsibilities of each of the entities in regards to the Regional Plan.

**Regional Planning Commission (RPC)**

The RPC has nine members, appointed by their respective governing bodies, including three each from the Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County local planning commissions. The members serve three-year terms and may be re-appointed. The RPC elects a chairperson from among its members to a one-year term, which rotates annually among the three jurisdictions.

NRS 278.0272 directs the RPC to develop a comprehensive Regional Plan for physical development and orderly management of growth in the Region for the next 20 years and hold public hearings. The statute also directs the RPC to review the plan annually, update it not less than every five years and forward its recommendations to the RPGB for final adoption.

One of the functions of the RPC is to review Projects of Regional Significance (PRS). The RPC adopts guidelines for determining whether a particular project is a PRS and, before a city or the County gives final approval to a PRS, must find it in conformance with the Regional Plan.
The RPC also reviews master plans, facilities plans, and other similar plans of local governments and affected entities to determine whether they conform to the Regional Plan. In addition, the RPC reviews plans and plan amendments of state agencies and of public utilities regulated by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) and offers suggestions regarding their conformance with the Regional Plan. The RPC also reviews for conformance the transportation plan prepared by the Regional Transportation Commission and for consistency the water plan prepared by the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission. Finally, by interlocal agreement, the RPC serves as the annexation commission for involuntary annexation proposals in the region.

Pursuant to the RPGB Regulations on Procedure, the RPC shall oversee processes for conducting and maintaining a regional population forecast for conformance review, and TMSA allocation. The adopted regional population forecast must be consistent with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources identified in the Regional Water Management Plan.

Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB)
The RPGB has ten members. The Washoe County Commission appoints three members (two of whom must reside in or represent the unincorporated area), the Reno City Council appoints four members, and the Sparks City Council appoints three members. The members serve three-year terms and may be re-appointed. The Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County governing bodies may appoint members from among their own members and traditionally have done so. The RPGB elects a chairperson from among its members to a one-year term; the chair rotates among the three jurisdictions.

Upon the recommendation of the RPC, the RPGB adopts the Regional Plan with any amendments that it deems necessary after holding required public hearings. The RPGB has all the powers and obligations that are delineated in NRS 278.0264 and NRS 278.0265.

Local Governments
Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County provide the necessary facilities and money to enable the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) to carry out its functions. To do this, they enter into an agreement to share the costs of regional planning, according to how many members each unit of government has on the RPGB. Under the NRS, local governments shall amend their master plans, facilities plans and other similar plans to conform to the provisions of the Regional Plan and submit them to the RPC for a finding of conformance. They also submit amendments to these plans for conformance findings.

The law also provides that each local government shall review and amend, if necessary, its existing ordinances to ensure their conformance with the provisions of a master plan that conforms to the Regional Plan. The local governments also prepare and submit annual comprehensive reports to the RPC.

With the involvement and cooperation of Washoe County, Reno and Sparks also adopt master plans for areas within their Spheres of Influence (SOI) designated in the Regional Plan and carry out annexation programs, which must conform with the Regional Plan.
Affected Entities

NRS defines an affected entity as a public utility, franchise holder, local or regional agency, or any other entity having responsibility for planning or providing public facilities relating to solid waste, air quality, transportation, public education, energy generation and transmission, and conventions and the promotion of tourism. However, the term does not include a State agency or a public utility subject to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN).

Thus, the list of affected entities includes (but is not limited to) Waste Management, the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority, the Washoe County School District, the Regional Transportation Commission, the Washoe County District Health Department, the Reno and Sparks redevelopment agencies, and the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority.

Affected entities are responsible for amending their master plans, facilities plans, and other similar plans to conform to the provisions of the Regional Plan. Before adopting or amending a master plan or similar plan, they must submit it to the RPC for a finding of conformance. Affected entities also submit annual reports to the RPC.

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of the Regional Plan is to implement the legislative mandate given to the RPC and RPGB. It is an opportunity to put into place a resource for the region with a collaborative structure that will serve the Truckee Meadows well into the future.

The four modules with their goals and policies focus on the coordination of master planning in Washoe County (less certain areas noted in statute) as it relates to land use, infrastructure provision, resource management, and plan implementation.

The plan includes an agreed upon feedback loop that includes annual monitoring and reporting. The reporting process feeds into the annual amendment cycle, local master plans, TMRPA’s technical work program and budget, and the five-year update. The five-year update is a continuous improvement process.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS

As described in Chapter 278 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) the master plans, facilities plans, and other similar plans of local governments and affected entities must be found in conformance with the comprehensive Regional Plan.

In addition to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, two other entities within the region are designated with planning for region-wide facilities, infrastructure or resources; the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission, and the Regional Transportation Commission. [Amended 9/11/08]

Regional Water Planning

The Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission (NNWPC) established pursuant to Chapter 531 Statutes of Nevada 2007 of the Nevada Special Acts is required to develop a plan for:

- quality of surface water
quality of groundwater
- supply of surface water
- supply of underground water
- control of floods and drainage of storm water, as it relates to surface water
- control of floods and drainage of storm water, as it relates to underground water
- cost and financing related to facilities, sources of water, or other requirements of the plan

Chapter 531 Statutes of Nevada 2007 requires that the Regional Water Management Plan (RWMP), developed by the NNWPC and adopted by the Western Regional Water Commission, must also be found to be consistent with the comprehensive Regional Plan. For goals and policies related to these topics please see the adopted Washoe County Regional Water Management Plan.

[Amended 9/11/08]

For the purpose of determining consistency, the RPC shall utilize the adopted conformance review methodology pursuant to the conformance policies contained in the Regional Plan.

[Amended 1/15/09]

Pursuant to the RPGB Regulations on Procedure that establish processes for conducting and maintaining a regional population forecast for conformance review and TMSA allocation, the NNWPC and WRWC will make findings, and forward those findings to the RPC, regarding comparison of the regional population forecast to the population estimate that can be supported by the sustainable water resources identified in the RWMP.

[Amended xx/xx/xx]

Regional Transportation Planning
The Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and pursuant to Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations, part 450, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, part 613, is required to develop and update the Regional Transportation Plan. The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), adopted November 18, 2004, includes goals, objectives, and policies on the following major elements:

- streets and highways;
- public transportation;
- bicycle and pedestrian;
- aviation and goods movement;
- transportation management/intelligent transportation systems;
- financial;
- congestion management;
- air quality analysis and conformity determination; and,
- regional transportation plan conformity determination
Pursuant to Chapter 278 of NRS, the RTC is classified as an affected entity; therefore, the Regional Transportation Plan must be found in conformance with the comprehensive Regional Plan.

The interactions, duties, and obligations of the various local governments and affected entities is governed by the applicable sections of NRS.

STRUCTURE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL PLAN

The Regional Plan is structured around the four modules developed during the 2002 Regional Plan update process.

Module #1 provides direction and standards for how and where development occurs in the Truckee Meadows. Module #2 addresses the management of natural resources. Module #3 is focused on the coordination of public services and facilities. Module #4 is the implementation framework for the plan.

The Truckee Meadows Regional Plan is a work in progress based on the needs of the local governments and the affected entities.

REGIONAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY

The desired outcome for the 2007 update of the Regional Plan is to ensure a process with strong stakeholder and public involvement, active participation by local governments, affected entities, and key public sector partners. The resulting plan is a consensus-based document that focuses on a revision of goals and policies within the existing plan rather than a wholesale rewrite of the plan.

The Regional Planning Commission (RPC) established a process oversight committee comprised of three members of the RPC (one from each jurisdiction). In addition, it established a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of staff from entities and organizations throughout the region to review and propose changes to the plan. The role of the TAC was to review the current Regional Plan, propose amendments to the plan, discuss alternatives, participate in dialogue, liaise with the entity/organization they represent, receive input from stakeholders and the public, participate in outreach activities, and work toward consensus on changes to each module of the Regional Plan.

A joint meeting of the RPC, RPGB, and TAC was held in September 2005 to review the Regional Plan and prioritize a broad list of issues to guide the update.

The TAC met twice monthly between October 2005 and December 2006 and used the services of a professional facilitator to accomplish consensus-based recommendations for changes to the plan. A springboard process was used whereby TAC members, when bringing forward problems, issues or concerns, also brought forward possible solutions to the issue raised.
FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS

The following is a set of fundamental assumptions that the region has considered in planning for efficient land use, public services, and facilities through the year 2030.

THE GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF THE REGIONAL PLAN IS:

Geographic Coverage
Within the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), the geographic area covered by the Regional Plan includes all of Washoe County except the portions within the drainage basin of Lake Tahoe (NRS 278.0288) and the lands of federally-recognized tribes.

While the primary planning focus of the Regional Plan is on the southern 25% of Washoe County, with a northern boundary at T25N/T26N (north of Winnemucca Ranch), see Map 1, the Regional Plan continues to have relevant jurisdiction over the broader area of Washoe County noted above.

The Regional Plan does not have jurisdiction over neighboring counties, nor lands managed by other entities (i.e., Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and local tribes). However, the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) attempts to monitor impacts of development within the designated plan areas of Washoe County on surrounding counties and entities, and the impact that development in surrounding counties and entities has on the well being of the region covered by the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

THE POPULATION IN 2030 WILL BE CHARACTERIZED AS FOLLOWS:

Population Growth
As noted in the introduction of the Regional Plan, Washoe County’s population in 2005 was just under 400,000 people. The State Demographer estimates the population of Washoe County will be in excess of 575,000 people by 2025.

Ethnic and Cultural Diversity
In the future we will have a community that is more ethnically and culturally diverse. Trends show a growing proportion of minority residents in Washoe County. Based on U.S. Census Bureau population projections (1995 – 2025) this trend will continue over the next 20 years, leading to a more culturally diverse region.

Age Structure
According to the Consensus Forecast, the age distribution of the population is expected to change over the next two decades. Change of significance includes a net decrease in the percent of population under the age of 20 and a continued aging of the baby boomers. The decrease in the working group will see a greater proportion of retired senior citizens in our region.
THE NEEDS OF RESIDENTS ARE CHARACTERIZED AS FOLLOWS:

Housing Products
A growing and diversifying population will require a broader range of housing products such as multi-family housing units, assisted living facilities, and student housing. The population will also require a diverse range of opportunities in housing location and style including high-density living, suburban residential, and large-lot ranchettes.

Economic and Environmental Sustainability
In the future we will continue to see, and plan for, a strong and expanding economic base that not only emphasizes sustainable resource management, particularly in the areas of air quality and water quality and quantity, and promotes the advancement of renewable energies.

[Amended 12/13/07]
PLANNING PRINCIPLES, GOALS AND POLICIES

To create a well-planned region and to plan for the fundamental assumptions and manage their impacts, the Regional Plan will address the following issues:

- development in our region including our regional form, infrastructure provision, open space and greenways;
- management of our unique resources including wildlife habitat, air and water quality, and water quantity;
- provision of public services including roads, utilities, water and sewer services; and,
- efficiently implementing the Regional Plan.

These issues have been further refined into four modules and the associated goals and policies that implement them.

Terms and their definitions used in the modules, goals, and policies are included in Appendix 2 - Glossary of Terms.
[Notes]
MODULE #1:

REGIONAL FORM AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

INTRODUCTION
The goals and policies associated with Module #1, along with related goals and policies listed under the other modules, will address a number of the following important objectives within the Truckee Meadows region:

- Promote sustainable growth and efficient growth patterns through a defined area within which municipal services and infrastructure will be provided;
- Ensure that the population forecast prescribed in the Regional Plan is consistent with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan; [Amended xx/xx/xx]
- Provide land use patterns which promote a world class tourist and destination resort community;
- Provide a land use pattern which will promote a more diverse and expanding economic base;
- Ensure that necessary public services and facilities to support new development are or will be available and adequate, based on adopted levels of service (LOS) standards, at the time the impact of new development occurs;
- Lessen sprawl and support a higher intensity and density of development within designated centers, transit corridors, and areas suitable for infill development;
- Promote the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of the region’s households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type, and density;
- Recognize the need for regional corridors that emphasize automobile and freight mobility;
- Promote compatibility of land use and development with regional airport operations;
- Promote the coordination and compatibility of land uses with each military installation in the region, taking into account the location, purpose and stated mission of the military installation; [Amended 11/8/07]
- Preserve our designated natural resources and open space;
- Create a more compact, mixed pattern of residential units and employment locations, served by a region-wide multi-modal transportation system, to reduce levels of travel demand, facilitate efficient service provision, and promote a jobs/housing balance;
- Plan for an increasing and diversifying population base;
- Place residential, commercial, civic and other uses in close proximity to each other to reduce the dependency upon the private automobile, reduce vehicle miles traveled, conserve energy, and achieve other goals as defined by the Regional Planning Commission (RPC);
• Support the revitalization of, and maintain the character of, established neighborhoods and communities while encouraging infill development that is appropriate for its surroundings;

• Embrace the importance of place-making as the creation of spaces that are lively, inviting, enduring, and distinct in character. Important factors include access, comfort, image, activities, and social interactions. Place-making fosters a strong sense of community.

• Ensure implementation of designs that contribute to safe, diverse, and vital, bicycle-oriented and pedestrian-oriented communities; [Amended 12/13/07]

• Create a system of incentives to support a sustainable and economically healthy region; and,

• Place a high priority on improving transit efficiency, reliability, and the interface between land uses and transit within designated centers and transit corridors.

OVERVIEW OF THE GOALS AND POLICIES

This portion of the Regional Plan aims to limit the spread of the urban footprint and direct more development of homes and jobs toward the traditional core of the region, while promoting infill where it enhances the community – including but not limited to downtowns, designated centers, transit corridors and redevelopment areas. [Amended 12/13/07]

This strategy will make more efficient use of land, natural resources and community services; save money on infrastructure, reduce dependence on the private automobile; promote multi-modal transportation choices; protect air quality; conserve energy; preserve designated open space; and create more affordable communities.

This strategy, which will result in a more compact form of future development, as well as a more diverse mix of uses, will provide a variety of living and working situations, and will promote human, natural and economic capital, strengthen our communities and ensure that the region’s assets are accessible to all.

The Core Areas

The traditional core consists of the two downtowns, other designated Regional Centers, and the transportation links among them. The core will be characterized by a vital mix of uses, including parks and civic uses, with a high priority on pedestrian activity. It will be well-served by public transit, and will have more intense residential and employment use than elsewhere in the urban footprint. The core has a priority for the provision of public improvements and services, with the highest priority assigned to the downtowns.

The eight identified Regional Centers have facilities or services that serve a population beyond the Truckee Meadows and contain unique regional assets, resources, or facilities that are not duplicated elsewhere within the region. They include such locations as the University of Nevada-Reno, the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, and the Meadowood retail area. The Regional Plan is designed to direct and enhance the provision of services and balance employment and residential uses in these Regional Centers.
The Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Corridors (as defined in Policy 1.2.9) will provide efficient, attractive links between downtowns and Regional Centers, and promote a more interconnected region. The Regional Plan will prioritize the provision of programs, policies, capital infrastructure and services to support infill, intensification, and revitalization in TOD Corridors.

**The Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA)**

The TMSA is the defined area within which municipal services and infrastructure (including water supply, sanitary sewer, flood management, transportation [streets, transit, pedestrian, bicycle], public safety, parks, and schools) will be provided. The purpose of the TMSA is:

- to guide urban and suburban development and ensure orderly provision of services and infrastructure;
- to encourage the use and maintenance of existing infrastructure capacity to accommodate infill and new development;
- to guide urban and suburban development away from unsuitable areas, while recognizing that:
  - existing resources to support urban and suburban development are constrained;
  - the TMSA and the Rural Development Area (RDA) are interconnected; and,
  - the capacity of the TMSA will be absorbed over time and must, therefore, be monitored and expanded.

To promote efficient use of lands within the TMSA, the Regional Plan will encourage the removal of barriers to, and encourage the creation of incentives for, infill development and revitalization by directing mixed use development to Regional Centers, Emerging Employment Centers, transit corridors, and other appropriate areas.

In order to accommodate a growing population, the Regional Plan will promote the creation of adequate infrastructure capacity within the TMSA based on the desired levels of density articulated in the plan. As areas for TMSA expansion are required, suitable lands identified in the Future Service Areas (FSA) or RDA may be converted to TMSA.

The Regional Plan identifies unincorporated areas located within the TMSA, but outside the two cities and their spheres of influence (SOI).

The TMSA for each city is also the SOI for that city and the remaining portions of the TMSA are for unincorporated development.
Within the unincorporated areas, communities may be designed as a component of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the goals and policies contained in the Regional Plan, and upon designation will:

- constitute a comprehensive planning tool that will provide appropriate local opportunities for services and employment, reduce trips, and discourage linear low-density development;
- identify and plan for the areas in the unincorporated County that are expected to absorb their share of the planned 20-year growth;
- identify the services required in the developed and developing areas of the unincorporated County;
- identify funding sources for the provision of those services; and,
- identify land uses and services that will act to preserve community character and identity.

**The Future Service Areas (FSA)**

The Future Service Areas (FSA) are areas identified for future (beyond the 20 year Truckee Meadows Regional Plan horizon) inclusion in the TMSA (and SOI, if a city) for each jurisdiction. To add land to its TMSA, each jurisdiction must first prepare a natural resource management plan for the area to be added and must meet minimum density thresholds in its existing TMSA.

**The Rural Development Area (RDA)**

The RDA is outside the Truckee Meadows Service Areas, and contains dispersed development and employment on large parcels of land. The RDA will only receive limited public services and facilities. Ranches, agriculture, forestry, scattered residences and business or commercial services, and certain types of industrial and recreational uses not compatible with urban or suburban development, characterize the rural area. It is important to recognize, however, that future Regional Plan updates and amendments may extend the Truckee Meadows Service Areas into portions of the Rural Development Area.

**The Development Constraints Area (DCA)**

The DCA consists of playas, significant water bodies, jurisdictional water/wetland in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, designated FEMA floodway areas within the floodplain Zone AE, natural slopes over 30%, publicly-owned open spaces, and properties that are deed restricted to prevent development. Constrained lands less than 1/3 acre in size will not be included in the DCA. The DCA overlay takes precedence over otherwise applicable policies describing the desired density and intensity of development within the TMSA, FSA, and RDA. In order to preserve the scenic, natural, public safety, recreational, and environmental values of these areas, local government and affected entity master plans must include components to preserve development constrained lands in an undeveloped state wherever possible.

[Amended 12/13/07; 9/11/08]
PLANNING PRINCIPLES

The Regional Plan will promote the following development patterns:

Regional Economy

- The Regional Plan will encourage and support a strong and expanding economic base comprised of the existing gaming sector along with the growth in diversified industry sectors such as business and financial services, software, clean energy, advanced manufacturing, advanced logistics, and life sciences (EDAWN, Target 2010, Report #2, Target Industry Identification and Analysis, prepared by Angelou Economics, dated July, 2006). The plan anticipates that our diversified economy will provide a higher proportion of higher paying jobs and an increased per capita disposable income. The Regional Plan recognizes that business attraction is in part based upon the availability of cultural and recreational opportunities within the region.
- Our land use decisions will support sustainable economic development in the region, which results in efficient use of resources and brings ‘high export value’ to the economy.
- The plan will support the provision of compatible development around existing educational infrastructure.
- The Regional Plan will provide for appropriate land stock for a wide range of land uses necessary to meet a growing and changing economy, and will encourage local governments to address adjacency issues as necessary.

Regional Form and Pattern

- The Regional Plan will promote a Regional Form that lessens sprawl and supports a higher intensity and density of development within centers and transit corridors. The plan will strongly promote infill development within centers and transit corridors, and areas appropriate for infill development to optimize existing infrastructure. The plan will encourage development that promotes:
  - the integration of mixed land uses;
  - the optimization of existing infrastructure;
  - human-scale design;
  - a range of housing choices;
  - a sense of place through distinct and attractive communities;
  - walkability;
  - new communities that are complementary to existing communities;
  - a range of transportation choices;
  - the preservation of open space, natural resources, and critical environmental areas; and,
  - the visual integrity of surrounding viewsheds.
- The combination of Centers, Emerging Employment Centers, Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Corridors, Secondary Corridors, residential areas, open space, greenways, and natural features will define the Regional Form.
• Intensification within the region will be directed toward appropriate areas including, but not limited to, Centers and Corridors.

• Centers will be categorized as Downtown Centers, Regional Centers, and Emerging Employment Centers to reflect the impact that they have within the surrounding region. Corridors will be categorized as TOD or Secondary to reflect the impact they have within the region.

• The Regional Plan identifies the desired distribution of forecasted population and employment growth within the region. Downtown Centers, Regional Centers, Emerging Employment Centers, TOD Corridors, and Secondary Corridors will be the highest priority areas for intensification and development. These areas will accommodate an increasing proportion of the region’s population and employment growth over the next 20 years.

• The portion of the TMSA for each city is also the SOI for that city, and the remaining portions of the TMSA are for unincorporated development (see Policy 3.3.1).

• Within the unincorporated areas, communities may be designated as a component of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the goals and policies contained in the Regional Plan.

**Centers and Corridors**

• Within the Regional Plan, Centers, Emerging Employment Centers, TOD Corridors, and Secondary Corridors will help to define the Regional Form.

• The region will plan Centers and TOD Corridors that attract increasing levels of investment and development capital. These Centers and TOD Corridors will grow to absorb our increasing population through the development of high-density residential development. Commercial and mixed-use development will be directed to centers and transit corridors. Local government master plans may designate Secondary Corridors that provide for intensification, are walkable and mixed-use, connect to other Centers and TOD Corridors through multi-modal access, and support the increasing demand for transit.

• The Downtown Centers of the City of Reno and City of Sparks will be significant economic centers in our region. These regional mixed-use centers will include retail, high density residential, entertainment, office buildings, and public facilities.

• All Downtown and Regional Centers will be sited along or near TOD Corridors.

• All Centers will have internal circulation networks that promote interconnection between individual facilities or enterprises. Local government master plans will include design features that promote a pedestrian or bicycle friendly environment within Centers.

• Downtown Centers, Regional Centers, and TOD Corridors will be mixed-use, visually attractive, and will entice both local residents and visitors to the area, day and night. These Centers and TOD Corridors will promote multi-modal transportation and may support a range of activities including shopping, recreation, dining and entertainment, gaming and accommodation, employment, cultural or community events, as well as providing high density residential opportunities.
Some Centers and portions of Corridors may require specialized planning to ensure compatibility with airport and military operations (e.g., Reno-Tahoe Regional Center); the Regional Plan allows for alternative densities in certain circumstances (see Policy 1.2.14). [Amended 11/8/07]

TOD Corridors will promote a pedestrian-friendly environment that supports integrated transit opportunities (1/4 mile walking distance). These transit corridors should not be automobile dependent.

TOD Corridors will provide for mixed-use, transit-oriented development and will be supported by multi-modal transportation opportunities. Development will be directed to TOD Corridors.

To accommodate our changing population’s needs, the Regional Plan will support the provision of more diverse market-rate and affordable housing products and opportunities, such as, assisted care and other elderly housing facilities, multi-family units, student housing, and mid to high rise apartments.

Intense development will be directed to the Downtown Centers, Regional Centers, Emerging Employment Centers, and TOD Corridors.

Specialized land use may be permitted in areas separated from the community. Specialized use may include quarries, sewage treatment facilities, land fills, hazardous waste disposal facilities, and power generation facilities or other designated enterprises that are not compatible with high-density areas.

**Infrastructure**

- All Downtown and Regional Centers will be linked by a multi-modal transportation system and supported with transit services.

- The Regional Plan will encourage the use of multi-modal transportation to reduce single vehicle trips. Our land use pattern will support reduced dependence upon the automobile.

- The plan will both clearly identify utility needs and encourage and report on the provision of infrastructure, including the location of utility corridors, in accordance with the Regional Utility Corridor Report, and evaluate the regional impact of future power generation and transmission prior to approval of development.

- Local service providers will anticipate right-of-way needs and make provisions in their facilities and master plans.

- The Regional Plan will identify the projected demand and projected capacity of major facilities within the region.

- The Regional Plan will promote the coordination and availability of infrastructure to support economic development within the region. This infrastructure includes, but is not limited to, support for cargo and passenger services through airports, rail, and interstate automobile corridors.

- Infrastructure may be provided to communities to support public health, safety and welfare standards but does not necessarily imply a right to further intensify development.
In recognizing the complex nature of infill development, the Regional Plan will encourage a cooperative approach for infill planning which includes careful coordination between service and infrastructure providers, including public health agencies, with appropriate jurisdictional staff at the early stages of planning and project conceptualization, and thoughtful consideration of:

- parks and greenways;
- natural resources;
- floodplains, floodways and drainage ways;
- walkability;
- alternative modes of transportation;
- public health impacts related to land use decisions;
- amenities; and,
- recreation opportunities.

[Amended 9/11/08]

**Open Space and Greenways Network**

- Within the Regional Plan, open space and the greenways network will help to define the Regional Form.
- The Regional Plan will promote an integrated open space and greenways network that links centers and transit corridors to parks, bikeways, floodplains that are or will be maintained as open space, drainage ways, open space, surrounding public lands and facilities, and other outdoor recreation opportunities such as trails, and connects schools, neighborhoods and shopping centers.
- The Regional Plan will promote the development and management of a greater number of community, regional and neighborhood parks to support the intensification of land use within the region, associated smaller lot sizes, and higher density housing.

[Amended 9/11/08]

**Infill Development**

- To minimize sprawl and optimize infrastructure efficiency, the Regional Plan will give priority to infill development within Centers, TOD Corridors, and areas designated by local governments, and must take into account open space, facilities and utility corridor plans.  [Amended 12/13/07]
GOALS AND POLICIES

GOAL 1.1
Between 2007 and 2030, at least 99% of the region’s population growth and 99% of the region’s jobs growth will be located in the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA).

Policy 1.1.1
To conform with the Regional Plan, the master plans, facilities plans, and other similar plans of local governments and affected entities must utilize the adopted Consensus Forecast for determining future regional population estimates for the formulation of goals, policies, and service plans. [Amended xx/xx/xx]

The Regional Plan recognizes that some affected entities due to service area size or targeted services need to utilize additional or supplementary population data. If these affected entities utilize additional or supplementary population data, the source and methodology must be clearly described in master plans, facilities plans, and other similar plans. These plans must clearly relate back to the adopted Consensus Forecast.

The RPC shall adopt a Consensus Forecast that is consistent with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan. [Amended xx/xx/xx]

The adopted RPGB Regulations on Procedure, section XII, shall be used to update and maintain the Consensus Forecast including comparison with the estimated population that can be supported by the sustainable water resources as identified in the Regional Water Management Plan, jurisdictional splits and the allocation of population to smaller geographic units of the region. [Amended 12/13/07; Amended xx/xx/xx]

Policy 1.1.2
To conform with the Regional Plan, master plans of local governments and affected entities must be consistent with the forecasts of population and employment growth in the service area by providing appropriate density and intensity of use, and by providing for the necessary services and resources to support the population and employment growth consistent with Goal 1.1.

Policy 1.1.3
For Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County the Regional Plan defines Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) and Future Service Areas (FSA) that avoid environmental degradation, optimize infrastructure, and maintain a compact form while providing for a variety of living and working situations. The TMSA for each jurisdiction are adopted on Map 1 and the FSA for each jurisdiction are adopted on Map 5. Amendments to the TMSA and FSA are defined in Policy 1.1.6, Policy 1.1.7 and in Module #4.
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XII. POPULATION FORECASTING

1. Applicability. The purpose of these rules is to establish processes for conducting and maintaining a regional population forecast for conformance review and Truckee Meadows Services Area allocation. These rules outline major components in the preparation and maintenance of a locally developed consensus population forecast, and describe an alternative methodology if the consensus population forecast is not maintained according to the agreement.

2. 2008 Interim data for forecasting. Until the process established in Section 3 or 4 below is completed the following table will be utilized for population forecasting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population forecast horizon¹ (year)</th>
<th>Population forecast by jurisdiction to the horizon year¹ (# people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>319,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>133,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Washoe County</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>118,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Population horizons and forecasts for each jurisdiction are based on the last conforming master plan

3. Development of the consensus forecast. The method for the development of the consensus forecast is described below:

a. The data sets that will be used for the consensus forecast shall be the most current published or available data from: the State Demographer, Woods & Poole, Global Insight, NPA Data Sources and TMWA, and shall not be more than two (2) years old at the time the information is used to derive the population forecast.

b. The County shall collect or purchase the data and prepare a preliminary consensus forecast for distribution to Reno, Sparks, and TMRPA by January 15th of even numbered years for review and comment, including at a minimum conducting one (1) collaborative meeting of all parties.

c. The County will prepare a county-wide forecast for distribution and comment to Reno, Sparks and TMRPA by February 1st of even numbered years.
d. Prior to submission to the RPC, the county-wide consensus forecast must include jurisdictional splits based on one of the following:

i. To develop a method and implementation plan for jurisdictional splits the TMRPA shall convene a staff team made up of at least one member from each jurisdiction and the TMRPA. Once consensus has been reached the method and implementation plan shall be reviewed and approved by each local jurisdiction and TMRPA.

ii. The method established in 3.d.i shall be reviewed, and potentially modified by March 1 of even numbered years in conjunction with each update of the consensus forecast.

e. The forecast will be submitted to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) by April 1 in even numbered years. If the forecast is not received by the RPC by the due date, the RPC may consider adoption of an alternative population forecast as described in Section 4.

4. Alternative to the consensus forecast. The following describes the process to be used if Section 3 has not been completed.

a. If the consensus forecast has not been submitted to the RPC for adoption as described in Section 3, above, the RPC may adopt and utilize the most current, published State Demographer’s Forecast data when exercising its duties under NRS and the Regional Plan.

b. As the State Demographer only produces a county-wide population forecast, the following methods will be used to develop jurisdictional splits to be applied to the State Demographer’s forecast.

i. If a previous consensus forecast, developed pursuant to section 3.d.i., above, established jurisdictional splits approved by all local governments and TMRPA, it will continue to be used for the first alternate forecast.

ii. If no previous consensus forecast has established jurisdictional splits, as described in section 4.b.i, or if it appears for a second consecutive forecast period that the alternate forecast will be used, then the RPC may chose to develop a method and implementation plan for jurisdictional splits. The TMRPA shall convene a staff team, made up of at least one member from each jurisdiction and the TMRPA, to advise the RPC on this process.

5. Maintenance and update of the consensus forecast. The consensus forecast will be prepared by the County not less often than every two years, beginning with the next publication in 2008.
6. **Establishment of a process to disaggregate population by smaller geographic units.**

The following process shall be used to disaggregate population by small area geographic units, consistent with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan.

a. Following the adoption of the Consensus Forecast by the RPC, each local government shall allocate their respective population forecast, consistent with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan, to traffic analysis zones (TAZs) provided by Regional Transportation Commission staff.

b. No later than September 1, once the task identified in Section 6.a. is complete, the tabular data and GIS data will be provided to the TMRPA for use in exercising duties outlined in NRS, the Regional Plan, or the RPGB adopted work program.

c. The TMRPA may aggregate the TAZ level forecasts to create a forecast for other geographic units for planning or conformance review purposes.
RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION SPONSORING A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE 2007 TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN AND THE REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD’S REGULATIONS ON PROCEDURE, SECTION XII, TO INCLUDE THAT THE SUSTAINABLE WATER RESOURCES IDENTIFIED IN THE REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN SUPPORT THE POPULATION CONSENSUS FORECAST

WHEREAS, Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0272(7) provides that a local government may sponsor proposed amendments to the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (Regional Plan); and

WHEREAS, NRS 278.0272(8) further provides that proposed amendments to the Regional Plan sponsored by a local government may be matters necessary for the health and welfare of the community or substantially benefits the community in general; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Plan, as set forth currently in the Introduction to Module No. 1 and Policy 1.1.1, identifies its goals and policies relating to conformance of local planning documents with the regional population forecast developed under the Regional Plan; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Section XII of the Regional Planning Governing Board’s Regulations on Procedure, the Regional Planning Commission shall oversee processes for conducting and maintaining a regional population forecast for conformance review with the Truckee Meadows Service Area allocation; and

WHEREAS, On November 4, 2008 Washoe County voters passed Ballot Question Washoe County #3 (WC#3), which required amendment of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan to include a policy that local government land use plans be based upon and in balance with identified and sustainable water resources available within Washoe County; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Chapter 531, Statutes of Nevada, 2007, the Western Regional Water Commission is charged with adopting the Washoe County Regional Water Management Plan, which identifies the sustainable water resources in the region as developed by the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, Neither the Regional Plan’s Introduction to Module No. 1, its Policy 1.1.1 nor Section XII of the Regulations on Procedure, provide that the sustainable water resources identified in the Regional Water Management Plan support or be consistent with the population Consensus Forecast; and

WHEREAS, The foregoing proposed amendments to the Regional Plan and Section XII of the Regional Planning Governing Board’s Regulations on Procedure will ensure and clarify that the Regional Plan’s population Consensus Forecast is supported by the sustainable water resources identified in the Regional Water Management Plan and will accomplish the expressed will of Washoe County voters who passed WC#3; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, pursuant to NRS 278.0272(7) and (8), does hereby sponsor amendments to the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, and recommends that the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan Module No. 1, its Policy 1.1.1 and the Regional Planning Governing Board’s Regulations on Procedure, Section XII, be amended to provide that the sustainable water resources identified in the Regional Water Management Plan will support the population Consensus Forecast established by the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 2009.

[Signature]
David E. Humke, Chairman

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Amy Harvey, County Clerk
Western Regional Water Commission

STAFF REPORT

DATE: October 28, 2009

TO: Chairman and Members, Western Regional Water Commission

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Discussion and Possible Direction to Staff Regarding Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items for the December 11, 2009 Commission Meeting

1. Status of funding for stream gauges.

2. Possible recommendation from the NNWPC concerning DRI cloud seeding program, formation of a coalition, long-term funding, and direction to staff.

3. Status report on SCR 2 and Cooperative Monitoring Program MOU -- NDEP

January 8, 2010 meeting:

1. Draft Water Resources chapter and definition of sustainable water resources, and possible direction to staff.