

TRUCKEE RIVER FLOOD MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
March 28, 2012, 3:00 P.M.

FINAL MINUTES

Present:

| Name | Representing | Name | Representing |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Burnham Moffat | FPCC | Marge Frandsen | Hidden Valley HOA |
| Jon Simpson | Wood Rodgers | Scott Smith | Klienfelder |
| Dave Hollecker | Trails West | Shaker Gorla | AMEC |
| Brian Janes | Atkins | Patty Paulson | Property Specialists |
| Mike Cotter | USFWS | Troy Miller | UNR |
| Noel Laughlin | HDR | Steve Alastuey | Self |
| Bob Ramsey | Resident | Terri Thomas | Eastside Subdivision |
| John Martini | Sparks | Mark Forest | HDR |

Staff Present: Melissa Faigeles, Jay Aldean (intermittently), Paul Urban, Eric Scheetz (minutes), Danielle Henderson

1. Introductions - A meeting of the Working Group was held at the Truckee River Flood Management Authority Office Conference Room, 9390 Gateway, Suite 230, Reno, Nevada. Melissa Faigeles welcomed the group and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes - The minutes of the February 29, 2012 Working Group meeting were submitted for approval and passed unanimously.

3. Announcements – Melissa announced that she had accepted a job with the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony as Environmental Manager and would be serving her last day with the Flood project Friday March 30th. She noted her enjoyment of working with the group.

4. Discussion on Possible Election of Working Group Chair

At staff's request, discussion occurred on the possible election of a chair for the Working Group. The members present generally noted that at times there were differing points of views between the group and they prefer not to have a chair (due to potential bias). The group also requested that a staff member still help facilitate the meeting and produce an agenda. Mr. Urban noted that if the Working Group changed their mind and wanted a chair, the flood project staff would support this. Mrs. Thomas noted that if available she would be happy to help continue with writing a monthly consensus report for the FMA. It was noted that if other working group members wanted to create the monthly consensus report, they could too. It was agreed that at the end of each working group meeting a standing item to determine consensus items for the report will be discussed. (Action)

5. "The Way Forward"

Mr. Urban discussed how the Corps has been reanalyzing what is cost justified for federal participation and how it has delayed the project. He explained that the Board has thus asked

that staff look at various options of moving forward. Mr. Urban provided a handout describing dual “path forward” options showing: a more Corps centric process, and then a more local process which focuses on local funding. Both options have the objective of getting to construction. Mr. Urban then noted that the handout and correlated strategy question comes down to – Does the community want to move forward to construction hoping for less risk of delays (in working with the Corps) in order to more quickly provide jobs, flood protection, etc.? – or, Do we still want to maximize federal funding participation through the Corps? There was discussion from the members on how long the Corps process (14 years+) has taken and how it has been detrimental to the project (community). Mr. Urban, Ms. Paulson, and others noted that it was good strategy to keep touching base with the Corps (or others) as potential supplemental funding sources but the community needs to see something happen (construction wise). Mr. Urban noted that if we went with the Corps or if we did it ourselves, either way we need to analyze costs of a defined project as well as benefits. The group then acknowledged that with the Corps again changing their plan and now likely forcing the locals to pay much more, the community would first need to again define which locally revised plan (and level of plan) the community could best support. After additional discussion, Mr. Miller and Mr. Smith noted that the handout presented should also include value/ cost information and correlating time durations in order to better communicate strategy to the board. This could also help with the decision process.

Mr. Urban (and the group in general) noted that a lot of the decisions from the “Way Forward” handout also depend on cash flow and available funds for projects. Mr. Urban noted that in order to afford a project that the community desires we will likely need rates in place to fund the projects- especially for anything over a 50 year design. Mr. Urban noted that the Corps may still potentially outright reject our locally revised plan. Mr. Ramsey asked if our community can still derive a (locally revised) plan that gets our community out of the true floodplain. Mr. Urban noted that our lobbyist, Marcus Faust, mentioned to staff that the lower level of proposed Corps design of 50 year may not be feasible if there is impact (to our community in a higher level storm- and thus we might have to build higher). After discussion, it was noted that as a community we need to realize we might need to do our own Environmental Impact Study and other design work (aside from what the Corps did). Mr. Urban did note that it is possible that we as a community also might find other grants or income sources to pay for the project besides the Corps, or at least it could be looked at. Mr. Ramsey noted that the group should also look at stretching the funds available (without a rate/ fee) and build what is afforded through the current 1/8th cent sales tax revenue.

There was then discussion on the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR), community support, and strategy with regards to helping us with data to move forward. Mrs. Thomas noted that the community coalition has been important and we still need that to continue (-in regards to discussion of changes in the plan). Mrs. Thomas then asked what was required in developing a new revised plan that the community might want to move forward. (which led to discussion of the next item)

6. Discussion on Possible Revisions to the Locally Preferred Plan (LPP)

Mr. Urban noted that the Corps had not yet specifically told staff what the Corps 50 year workshop plan contained. However, he was able to get an idea of what was not in the Corps workshop 50 year plan. He mentioned that the Corps was excluding the Vista Benching, the bridge extensions at Rock and McCarran, as well as most of the benching at UNR (farms). There was discussion on the repercussions of not doing the above items and how the Corps suggestion of (removing the element of) Vista Benching was seen to derive a lot of impact. There was also discussion on the hydraulic separation between downtown Reno and Sparks/

Reno Industrial area. It was discussed that it might be better bang for the buck to look at not extending the Rock and McCarran Bridges and instead build the adjacent levees a foot higher. A member asked how much “freeboard” was to be included as extra height above the levees. Mr. Urban and Mr. Aldean noted that the Corps generally had placed about 3’ for freeboard with some spots possibly at 4’. Ms. Frandsen and others noted that all the options should be modeled appropriately to determine the ramifications adequately. Mrs. Paulson noted that one or two scenarios should also be developed so that we have fall back ideas (in case something stalls progress forward through this approval process).

There was then discussion on modeling requirements and data available with members generally having no qualms with Mr. Urban taking a first attempt at presenting a plan during the next meeting(s). The goal was to maximize “bang for the buck”. It was noted that any plan modification may take many iterations and much discussion. Mr. Moffat asked for clarification on what the current LPP for the downtown Reno level of protection was considered. Mr. Urban (with concurrence from Mrs. Lanza) noted that Downtown Reno was currently being considered for a design that will allow passing of a 100 year event. It was asked how much has already been given to Reno for the Virginia Street Bridge Design. Mr. Aldean responded noting that \$5 million had already been given (budgeted) to date for design of the bridge and Reno is asking for an additional \$10 million for construction. It was discussed by members that if \$10 million went to the city of Reno now, there could be no money left to do the work (needed to identify and start anything else on our own local project) without rates set up. After additional discussion it was again agreed that the strategy handout, with added costs and time scales, could be used to help with the overall project decisions.

There was discussion again on rates. It was noted that instituting the rates would likely be difficult. Mr. Aldean added that there were a lot of factors to consider such as large square footage buildings (schools, the airport, etc.). He noted that he had assigned Danielle Henderson to coordinate with the various local and federal agencies to have them also confirm specifically what their requirements would be for a potential revised plan. This would allow our financial people to forecast budget requirements, thus driving (a portion of) the rate determination. He did note that the FMA did not have the power to tax as has been reported incorrectly.

Mrs. Frandsen reiterated that the Flood Project should again look at retaining PIO services to better communicate the benefits of the project. She also asked why CH2MHill was not positive on their costs for the project estimate. Mr. Aldean noted that there was not enough design information from the Corps, especially related to the Environmental aspects, yet available to them. For now CH2MHill was focusing on big ticket items, since small changes in big quantity items can add up quickly.

7. Working Group Member Comments and Requests for Future Agenda Items

Mrs. Thomas asked for clarification on consensus items of the Working Group. It was noted that it seemed like it may be best to do this project without the Corps.

Ms. Faigeles called for additional comments, hearing none and there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by 5:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by, E. Scheetz, Licensed Engineer