

# TRUCKEE RIVER FLOOD MANAGEMENT

## FLOOD PROJECT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

FRIDAY – APRIL 27, 2007 – 10:00 AM

Washoe County Complex – Building C  
Central Conference Room  
1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada

#### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

Ronda Moore – Flood Project Deputy Director, opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. and introduced Mimi Fujii-Strickler – Flood project Outreach Manager, who will coordinate meetings of the FPWG (Flood Project Working Group) and FPTWG (Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee)

**PRESENT:** Mary Hill – Assistant City Manager Reno; JoAnn Meacham – Sparks Public Works; Jeanne Ruefer – Washoe County Department of Water Resources; John Sherman – Washoe County Finance Director; Wayne Seidel – Sparks Public Works; Roger Van Alyne – Washoe County Public Works; and Kerri Williams – Reno Public Works.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ronda Moore – Deputy Director; Mimi Fujii-Strickler – Outreach Manager; and Paul Urban – Project Manager.

#### 2. UPDATE ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUCKEE RIVER COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

Ronda Moore – Deputy Director, outlined the modifications to the Cooperative Agreement including a change to the voting structure, the addition of one member of the Storey County Commission to voting member status, conversion of University of Nevada, Reno voting members to non-voting status and other minor modifications. Each of the local jurisdictions must take action to adopt and sign the amended agreement. The Storey County Commission delayed action to further study the issue, the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners accepted the modifications, the Reno City Council recommended some minor modifications to the voting structure finalized by the FPCC (Flood Project Coordinating Committee) from a super majority to simple majority, and to delay the appointment of Storey County as a voting member pending a determination of their financial commitment. The next FPCC agenda includes a reconsideration of the supermajority voting structure to add an action item to the June meeting of the FPCC. Once that action is taken the Cooperative Agreement will then be returned to the local jurisdictions for reconsideration. If no action is taken on the voting agreement, the signatory governing bodies could take action to modify the agreement.

During the discussion it was noted that the City of Sparks was awaiting a regional consensus on the final agreement before taking action. It was noted that the agreement would not be changed until such time as the agreement is formally adopted and signed by each of the governing bodies.

## *Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee* – Minutes

April 27, 2007

Page 2 of 5

### **3. UPDATE – CITY OF RENO PROPOSED TRAction PROJECT**

Paul Urban – Flood Project Manger, introduced Kerri Williams – Reno Public Works.

Ms. Williams noted that the Booth Street levee had been a preferred TRAction Project for Reno. However, the Reno City Council has asked staff to evaluate bridge replacements. The intent is to bring a TRAction project request to the FPCC to conduct a feasibility and scoping study of bridge replacements at Lake, Sierra, Virginia, as well as the Center Street Bridge.

During the discussion it was noted that Flood Project staff would have to make the presentations to the FPWG and FWTAC before taking an action item to the FPCC. Other discussion noted that the URS scope of work had been developed by the Corps (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers) for the NED (National Economic Development Plan), with the FPCC being asked to provide funding. It was suggested that the URS contract may need to be amended to include the bridge replacement. The URS agreement will allow the FPCC to approve a project with an amount not to approve. Previous TRAction projects, such as the North Truckee Drain relocation, included lower water levels, with the first phase being a feasibility study, and then moving on to design. The Washoe County TRAction project (Hidden Valley Levee) also used that conceptual format. The request is to add an agenda item to the May 11, 007, FPCC agenda to get input and preliminary FPCC approval of the Reno TRAction Project proposal. It was noted that the replacement of the Center Street Bridge had been discussed with the FPWG and would come back to their May meeting for an in-depth discussion. As the discussion continued, it was suggested that an ongoing agenda item be added to review the Corps' schedule. Other discussion noted that the staff report on Colonel Light's visit was stellar and done in a manner that is easily understood and should be used for the Corps' schedule and other issues of interest to elected officials.

Greg Dennis – Reno Public Works, joined the meeting.

Discussion then noted that the item would be placed on the FPCC's May 11, 2007, meeting with a full scope of work and project costs. As the discussion continued, it was explained that URS had been selected to do the bridge work for the Corps' NED Plan based on previous experience, and that URS is one of the Corps' approved contractors. It was noted that the scope of work in the URS agreement included some items that might parallel Reno's TRAction Proposal as far as signature bridges on a visioning level, and some coordination may be needed. Discussion then focused on the public sensitivity to the issues and that the Corps' projects tend to move toward the criteria used by the Corps, as opposed to how a local community addresses similar issues. It was suggested that the FPCC agenda clearly indicate that the URS contract focuses on the Corps NED (National Economic Development) plan, and that this proposed Reno TRAction Project item is a separate contract with a separate issue and focus. It was suggested that the components of the URS contract be revised to remove elements of the LPP (Locally Preferred Plan) to avoid confusion and overlap of work.

Mr. Dennis noted that the intent of Reno's TRAction Project was to study the geometry and height of bridges and their effect on downtown redevelopment. The issues associated with existing property owners and ramping for new bridges and specific priorities for bridge replacement would then turn to the subsequent steps. This is the feasibility and visioning study, including cost estimates and bridge and flood geometry, to assure that the project elements are coordinated. Mr. Dennis noted that the

## *Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee* – Minutes

April 27, 2007

Page 3 of 5

Reno City Council would receive updates on the study as it is done with a focus to define a result and recommendation for a specific TRAction Project.

Additional discussion noted that the FPWG has had some discussion on the issue and that the question is whether the discussion and agenda item for Reno's TRAction proposal for a feasibility and visioning study be brought to the FPCC. It was noted that the FPWG and FPTAC prefer to have input on recommendations to the FPCC beforehand. Other discussion noted that the FPCC might not take action on the TRAction proposal until the FPWG has reviewed the matter. It was noted that the LPP included the replacement of three (3) bridges. Other discussion noted that the FPWG had not discussed this as a specific TRAction project and that the matter should be agendized as a description of the project, scope of work and request for funding of the study, with notification to the FPWG to bring any concerns it may have to the FPCC at the time the item is heard at the next meeting.

Mr. Urban and Ms. Williams will develop the email notification of the agenda item to the FPWG.

Discussion then focused on appropriateness of moving the matter forward as part of meeting the Corps' analysis and other requirements to move the project forward to avoid a potential delay to the project's timeline. It was noted that staff should coordinate the work of CH2MHill and URS to avoid duplication.

A consensus was reached to add the Reno TRAction project as a feasibility study and request to use Flood Project funds with Ms. Williams and Mr. Dennis making the presentation and making the necessary presentations to the FPWG. The URS item is a contract chosen by the Corps from a pre-approved list of contractors that the region has been asked to participate in funding and involves issues that are not specifically related to the Reno TRAction project.

#### **4. UPDATE ON THE LOCALLY PREFERRED PLAN- CENTER STREET BRIDGE**

Paul Urban – Flood Project Manger, noted that the first floor of the Riverside 12 Theatre Complex was designed above the flood flows. However, a further analysis of debris loads indicates that the Center Street Bridge may cause flood levels above the original estimates, thereby inundating the first floor of the complex unless a significantly higher flood walls were constructed. A replacement of the Center Street Bridge with a clear span bridge would minimize the flood wall heights, thereby allowing the access and view of the river.

It was suggested that the consideration of the Center Street Bridge agenda item be heard before consideration of the Reno TRAction Project. Other discussion noted that the Corps (U. S Army Corps of Engineers) would provide additional information that would be distributed at the May 11, 2007, meeting.

#### **5. COLONEL LIGHT VISIT ON APRIL 18, 2007 AND REPORT ON THE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION**

Mimi Fujii-Strickler, provided an overview of the April 18, 2007, visit by Colonel Light.

## *Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee* – Minutes

April 27, 2007

Page 4 of 5

During a brief discussion it was noted that Flood Project Director Naomi Duerr was meeting with state legislators on flood control and funding issues, and that Colonel Light had made a strong statement during his visit that bureaucracy should not be allowed to delay the project. Additionally, there was discussion about the 6,700 acre feet of water and the statutory language regarding looking at the project as a single project, instead of breaking it into separate components for comparing benefits to costs. It was noted that Senators Reid and Ensign, and Representative Heller, were all represented at the April 18, 2007, meeting, and that Mia O'Connell and others attended as well. Other discussion recalled the discussion during the meeting that the Corps (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers) believes that the 6,700 acre feet of water is already in the river and should not be eligible for credit to the local sponsors of the flood project. It was pointed out that Colonel Light had indicated that some level of credit would be approved, and with the legislation being reviewed and possibly revised through a vertical team that includes the Corps attorneys, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Senator Reid's staff and others, there was reason to be hopeful that the issues and interpretation of Senator Reid's legislation could be resolved in a manner that will not delay the flood project schedule. It was suggested that updates on the team meetings on those legislative issues be added to future FPTAC (Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee) agendas.

Ms. Fujii-Strickler outlined the Colonel's tour of the flood project and explained that the Colonel was impressed by the scope and breadth of the project.

Other discussion noted that Tim Kelleher had been asked to explain the project schedule, and noted that the current schedule is the optimum schedule that could be affected by a variety of issues. Additionally, project partners will be asked to provide assistance where possible to keep the project on schedule. Other discussion noted that the Corps perceived that the region is asking for something that is not in the current schedule, and that the region will be notified of any change in the timeline and additional costs that may be incurred. It was noted that the Gant chart and the project timeline will be provided.

### **6. DRAFT FPCC (Flood Project Coordinating Committee) AGENDA – MAY 11, 2007**

There was discussion about the addition of the Center Street Bridge as part of the LPP (Locally Preferred Plan), followed by the presentation on the Reno TRAction Project to fund a feasibility study of the replacement of the downtown bridges. The next item would be the approval of the URS contract, noting that URS was chosen by the Corps (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers) from a preferred contractor list. Other discussion suggested that all TRAction Projects be handled consecutively.

Ronda Moore – Deputy Director, noted that the agenda item on the FPCC's Bylaws was about possibly adding a Bylaw that would specifically allow the FPCC (Flood Project Coordinating Committee) to reconsider previous actions and establish a procedure for that. Typically the rule is that if reconsideration of a past action is not specifically prohibited, a board/commission has inherent authority to reconsider the action and take a new vote on it.

Greg Dennis – Reno Public Works, recalled a previous discussion with Reno Tahoe Airport Authority, on the construction of a levee to protect the airport. Mr. Dennis noted that Flood Project Director Naomi Duerr had been discussing the issue with Grand Sierra Resort.

## *Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee* – Minutes

April 27, 2007

Page 5 of 5

JoAnn Meacham – Sparks Utilities Manager, commented that the City of Sparks governing body had expressed some concern about the Interlocal Agreement to fund the North Truckee Drain and project update. The intent is to provide an update on the progress in development of the Interlocal Agreement.

Discussion then turned to an update on the regional hydrological model. It was noted that the City of Sparks wants a technically supported model demonstrating what the mitigation ratios should be. Other discussion noted that the City of Reno had asked that an independent evaluation of the appropriate mitigation ratios be completed and presented to the Reno City Council within 90-days for Critical Zone 1. However, staff from the City of Sparks and Washoe County will be asked to review the data and determine their concurrence with the results of the study. The scope of work will be shared with sponsor partners. It was pointed out that the Reno City Council had declined a 90-day development moratorium in Critical Zone 1.

### **7. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

No new items were identified.

The meeting ended at approximately 11:20 a.m.