

TRUCKEE RIVER FLOOD MANAGEMENT

Flood Project Technical Advisory Committee

PROVISIONAL MINUTES

FRIDAY – AUGUST 31, 2007 – 10:00 AM

Washoe County Complex – Building C

Central Conference Room

1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Naomi Duerr – Flood Project Director, opened the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

CITY OF RENO PRESENT: Mary Hill - City Manager's Office; Greg Dennis – Public Works; Neil Mann – Public Works; Kerri Williams – Project Management Team; and John Hester – Community Development.

CITY OF RENO ABSENT: Andy Green – Finance.

CITY OF SPARKS PRESENT: Randy Mellinger – Manager's Office; Tom Minton – Finance Director; JoAnn Meacham – Utilities Manager; and Shawn Gooch – Project Management Team.

CITY OF SPARKS ABSENT: Shaun Carey – City Manager.

WASHOE COUNTY PRESENT: Adrian Freund – Community Development Director; Dan St. John – Public Works Director; John Sherman – Finance Director.

WASHOE COUNTY ABSENT: Dave Childs – County Manager's Office; Rosemary Menard – Washoe County Department of Water Resources; and Brent Richmond – Project Management Team.

FLOOD PROJECT STAFF PRESENT: Naomi Duerr, Mimi Fujii-Strickler, Peggy Drumm, Paul Urban; and Greg Salter, Esq. – District Attorney.

FLOOD PROJECT STAFF ABSENT: Ronda Moore.

2. APPROVE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MINUTES OF JUNE 29, 2007 & JULY 25, 2007

Naomi Duerr – Flood Project Director, asked if the members had had a chance to review the TAC minutes of June 29 and July 25 and whether there would be a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Duerr noted that the usual minute's taker is on vacation, and Peggy Drumm is filling in for this meeting.

Greg Dennis noted that his comments on page 3 of 9, of the June 29 minutes should refer only to the Sparks TRAction Project and not to the entire Flood Project. The minutes should be corrected to say "Greg Dennis commented, in reference to the discussion on TRAction projects, that the meeting minutes, in his opinion, brought forward the need to refine and enhance communications among and between the partner agencies, and that the partners should make every effort to assure that the proper personnel are in attendance at future meetings."

It was moved by Randy Mellinger, seconded by Mary Hill, to approve the June 29, 2007 minutes as amended. John Hester abstained. MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Duerr noted that the July 25 minutes are from the Joint TAC and Working Group (WG) meeting at the Community Development Room at Water Resources. JoAnn Meacham requested changes to the last paragraph on page 5 of 6. The first sentence should read, "JoAnn Meacham concurred with the recommendations, noting that the City of Sparks has maintained a low profile during this process since all of the land in question is within the corporate boundaries of the City of Reno and unincorporated Washoe County." There was discussion regarding Sparks' sphere of influence being located in Flood Zone 1.

It was moved by Dan St. John, seconded by Neil Mann, to approve the July 25, 2007 minutes as amended. John Hester and Randy Mellinger abstained. MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Duerr noted that last time there had been some questions about attendance for the first seven months of 2007, and it is believed those corrections have now been made. Members were asked to take one final look at the attendance records, and once all corrections were made they will become part of the final record. Staff has been asked to note who the alternate was so when in attendance it can be seen quickly. JoAnn Meacham thought there was one date missing for her and will double check and let Mimi Fujii-Strickler know for sure. Ms. Duerr asked members to contact Ms. Fujii-Strickler or Peggy Drumm if any additional attendance numbers need to be fixed.

3. FLOODPLAIN MITIGATION RATIOS FOLLOW-UP – NEIL MANN, CITY OF RENO

Naomi Duerr – Flood Project Director, introduced the agenda item. Neil Mann will summarize the floodplain mitigation ratios and follow up on the Reno City Council's discussion. Ms. Duerr noted there had been a joint meeting of TAC and the WG at the

request of the City of Reno to go over report and recommendations from Wood Rodgers. A number of the TAC members attended that meeting, and there has been follow-up since then.

Neil Mann recapped the Reno City Council meeting of August 22, where they provided a brief staff report to summarize Wood Rodgers recommendations and independent analysis that Council wanted to review regarding adequate mitigation in the critical flood pool. The analysis was prepared and went to the joint TAC and WG meeting (minutes included in packet). A brief staff report went to the Council that summarized the Wood Rodgers analysis and included the provisional minutes from the joint TAC and WG meeting. The actions and discussions are in draft minutes of August 22 City Council minutes and are included in the packet for this meeting. Mr. Mann noted that those who attended the July 25 joint TAC and WG meeting are aware there are differences of opinion that still exist as to what are adequate levels of flood mitigation in the critical flood pool. Reno City Council developed a series of recommendations that are on the last pages of the minutes. First, because there are issues of disagreement among the three agencies, and because the Corps of Engineers (Corps) may have an opinion on what may be proper mitigation, the Council deferred to the Flood Project to continue to take the lead to try to settle this issue among the three agencies. In addition, there is still lack of agreement and concerns regarding conflict of interest on the part of Wood Rodgers, so the Reno City Council referred it back to the Flood Project to attempt to resolve it. They also wanted input from Corps of Engineers and from the Regional Water Planning Commission.

The second item in the City of Reno Council motion was to conduct a peer review of Wood Rodgers report to allay concerns the study was biased because they work for a private developer in the study area, Butler Ranch Development. Based on lessons learned about criticism regarding conflict of interest issues with the ReTRAC Project, there is a need to have multiple peer reviews done to validate work, if at all possible, Mr. Mann stated.

The third item in the City of Reno Council motion was to amend the flood plain ordinance to require mitigation at the same level as the proposed development “where feasible.” Mr. Mann talked about vertical increment mitigation as well as adjacency, which were seen as beefing up the existing flood plain ordinance that the City currently had. The last item of the Council’s motion was for a factor of safety analysis to be incorporated into whatever is analyzed from this point forward. Wood Rodgers had acknowledged that as they run models, while they do the sensitivity analysis of running different development or obstruction scenarios within the critical flood pool, they didn’t add an additional factor of safety on top of what is already built into computer modeling.

Mr. Mann summarized that these four items were recommended and adopted by the Reno City Council. A few additional things that Mr. Mann shared at the Reno City Council meeting that were not included in the minutes, but were good food for thought for the TAC, is that there currently are a couple development proposals that are both public agency funded and that are anticipated within the critical flood pool that is

regulated by the current flood plain ordinances. One is a study only – RTC is about ready to launch their corridor alignment study for the valley corridor route for the Southeast Connector. They have been instructed to be sure they and the Flood Project staff work together, since that is a large impact on critical flood pool because it goes nearly through the middle of it. The Corps' flood model has been turned over to the RTC, and Mr. Mann believes they are using Stantec to do the corridor analysis. There is an opportunity with the Flood Project working with RTC to have a real life example of what a difference in impact various flood mitigation applications could be, based on different scenarios. A second example presented by Mr. Mann to the Reno City Council was the Hidden Valley levee TRAction Project. It could be another opportunity to look at the implications of different mitigation scenarios. This could help address some of the questions that came up at the joint meeting in July, where it sounds good to implement vertical increment mitigation and adjacency, but the question remains of what it really means and how it plays out. Peer review is a specific issue addressed by the Reno City Council, since the consultant was criticized and the validity of its work was called into question. There could be an ad hoc group from the joint TAC and WG meeting created to advise the TAC on a direction to move forward with one scenario or another. Lastly, there is the question of the definition of "No Adverse Impact" and what tool developers should use to prove they are meeting the flood plain mitigation requirements, since there is some criticism of the model Wood Rodgers used to establish adequate mitigation measures. The question is what model should be used by all three agencies to make that showing. Also, what is the meaning of "No Adverse Impact," if 1:1 mitigation at the same elevation and adjacent to the development cannot be accomplished?

Ms. Duerr advised the TAC that the Reno City Council recommendations were discussed in depth at the August 29 Working Group meeting, and would like to relate what came out of that thought process.

Dan St. John expressed that the County is very supportive of what Reno is trying to do. However, although the County will be a partner, there isn't a lot of property in the critical zone 1 area within County jurisdiction other than UNR Farms. The county is in more of a support role in this case he said. Mr. St. John also indicated approval of incremental mitigation. He noted that when sites are in large areas of flat ground, you can't really do incremental mitigation and an engineer would have to be hired to run the model to demonstrate "No Adverse Impact" would result from the alternative mitigation strategy proposed. There could be another alternative whereby developers would have some options, especially for small projects such as a one-acre convenience store, for example. Mr. St. John expressed support of using the RTC's Southeast Connector as a demonstration project since it is large enough in scale to address cumulative impacts, for example. Mr. St. John suggested the Hidden Valley project's amount of fill and volume going into the flood plain is going to be relatively small, and there are additional issues, so it may not be as good of a demonstration project as the RTC roadway project.

Neil Mann distributed a map showing Critical Flood Zone 1, which is largely in the City of Reno's jurisdiction, with some land being in the County's jurisdiction, and some being in Sparks' sphere of influence that also falls currently under Washoe County land use jurisdiction. He noted that some of the land in the area is privately and some publicly owned. A discussion followed regarding which lands would or would not likely be developed and which areas may or may not be considered within the critical flood pool for the mitigation requirements and need to be part of the process.

Randy Mellinger added that the City of Sparks is developing policies for this critical zone area that would address mitigation. The question about mitigation is the contained within the definition of "No Adverse Impact." For example, what strategies is the developer using to keep a project itself out of harm's way and what is it doing to protect the other properties from increased flood impacts as a result? The City of Sparks' policies will probably go a step further, he said, similar to policies that Sparks has in a cooperative land use plan with Washoe County in the East Truckee Canyon, which has some fairly significant development standards of requiring mitigations of the impacts of development to the area between I-80 and the Truckee River. It is the opposite of what has been done over the decades in the Truckee Meadows. The river would be treated as an asset, and the Living River concepts would be incorporated into Sparks' draft policies.

Dan St. John commented on the idea of conducting a peer review of Wood Rodgers' work. He noted that at the July joint meeting, most of the technical and professional people in the room had a positive response, but the laymen had doubts – possibly an image issue. There was a question whether the model has the capacity to show whether flood impacts were getting worse or better. Mr. St. John suggested that an assignment to UNR or that type of an academic institution might be a good source to develop confidence in the results.

Greg Dennis suggested looking at flood volumes in relation to remaining developable areas to create equity in the system when considering mitigation. A report could be provided.

Paul Urban commented that the Wood Rodgers study tells us it is critical to know exactly where these volumes are occurring, so it is necessary to have the model show what the impact of fill and excavation is. It isn't just the same as looking at total volume versus fill volume. Naomi Duerr concurred, based on the comments of the consultants at the Working Group meeting, that the relation to the locations of the fill and the mitigation was the critical aspect, not looking at the whole thing as total pool, as if it didn't matter if the mitigation was not adjacent to the development or miles away.

JoAnn Meacham inquired whether the Reno City Council was still planning to amend the ordinance in the near future. Neil Mann said they are not crafting any language right now.

Keri Williams and Naomi Duerr noted that Ms. Williams had indicated to the Working Group that the City of Reno was going to go forth with amending the ordinance, at least with respect to following Wood Rodgers' recommendation to require 1:1 mitigation at the same elevation and near the development site. No one objected to it, the Working Group supported it, and Wood Rodgers supported it. Based on the Takings Seminar, if it is based on the best current knowledge and provides a demonstrable betterment, and it is agreed upon, then improving the regulations should be done.

Ms. Meacham commented that Sparks needs to go ahead with an ordinance this fall, pending policy discussions. If the group could rally around certain things, Sparks could do an identical ordinance to Reno and then proceed with the other things that need to be answered, such as the safety factor and the model.

Neil Mann clarified that the reason the City of Reno is not crafting any language right now, is that "No Adverse Impact" needs to be defined before adopting an ordinance.

Further discussion followed regarding the definitions of vertical increment and adjacency.

Greg Dennis asked whether there are any specific recommendations from this group for the Water Planning Commission to consider.

Naomi Duerr advised the TAC that the WG had same feeling as Mr. Mann – that people were looking for a clearer definition of "No Adverse Impact." She noted that there is a whole section of the national Association of State Floodplain Managers' website devoted to "No Adverse Impact." It was recommended that every member of the WG and the TAC study that information in order to have an informed conversation about it. The Flood Project will email out the website link. The WG agreed on spending money to lay out some alternatives. Secondly, the WG feels, going back to Takings Seminar, that the Council's first responsibility is to protect public health and safety, not to facilitate development. Considering various tests, it may be that someone cannot build on a site no matter what the mitigation. For example, some places do not allow people to build on certain slopes. There may be alternatives such as land exchanges, compensation, or other offers. Ms. Duerr reminded the group why this is important, directing attention to the map. She pointed out the area to the south of the River that is a critical component of the Flood Project providing a passive storage area, meaning it is not bounded by a levee and it is an area that is expected to flood. Because of the flood project elements, it is going to flood lower than it does now. UNR Farms is going to experience lower flood depths, but it still will flood. Where there is already development, such as the Hidden Valley area noted on the map, the Flood Project will provide protection for that area. The plan is to elevate 60 homes in the area rather than build a levee around them, as it is half the cost to elevate the homes. We are having consultants do analyses, she explained. For example, the Hidden Valley Project is a combination of buyouts, home elevations, a levee, and a flood wall. The objective is to protect the most homes for the least cost. Similarly, there will be a levee to the north to protect the Sparks industrial area. The point is that the blue shaded area on the Living

River brochure must be allowed to flood and store high waters naturally, but as part of the Flood Project it is already better because it will flood less. Therefore, if mitigation strategies have to be employed, the flood elevations will be lowered and made much better. The question is - what is reasonable government regulation, remembering that the duty is to protect the public safety and welfare, not to facilitate development.

John Hester agreed and pointed out that we can't just take somebody's property, but the question is how much we can regulate before courts will consider it a taking. Neil Mann agreed and added that it must be legally defensible.

Paul Urban pointed out that many of the places within the blue area are rural, not high intensity commercial development like between Rock Boulevard and McCarran, although development may be what some of those property owners had in mind for the area.

Naomi Duerr stated that the Flood Project is going to bring back the Takings Seminar in October and confirmed that the city attorneys are invited again and are a critical component.

There was a brief discussion regarding the City of Reno's 117-year flood pool elevation ordinance and how it relates to the 1:1 mitigation ratio and built-in safety factors.

Naomi Duerr advised the group that the Flood Project had sent a letter to the Reno City Council summarizing the ten pages of notes with salient points from the TAC and WG meeting. Also included were a few comments from the Flood Project, which included that the project does go further south and it does depend on critical flood zone 1 providing passive storage. The WG made the point that 1:1 mitigation ratio is a bare minimum, and in many cases something more would be needed.

Referring to the four elements of the City of Reno's motion, the WG said:

Regarding item 1, the WG did not support spending another two to three years conducting studies with a slightly different set of people. They felt the FPCC, TAC and WG are the right places to have these conversations, since they are focused 100% on flood, whereas the Regional Water Planning Commission focuses a little on flooding, its focus constitutes a much broader umbrella. The WG felt the FPCC has already expressed their position on establishing mitigation requirements and could write a letter to the Reno City Council reiterating the FPCC position and, per Jessica Sferrazza's request, the item is on the next FPCC agenda. The Flood Project will also ask the Corps to do an early read on the ordinance to be sure it meets the PCA's requirement for there to be a good floodplain management regulatory scheme in place, including ordinances, that are designed to adequately "protect the protection" of the flood project.

Regarding item 2, conducting a peer review, the WG agreed with many of the TAC's comments. The engineers, in particular, had no issue with the Wood Rodgers analysis. They acknowledge that it is a perception issue with the public. They recommended not

spending money doing a peer review of the Wood Rodgers analysis. Instead, money would be better spent finishing out the Wood Rodgers analysis and defining “No Adverse Impact,” recognizing that the \$25,000 only buys a limited amount of technical work.

Regarding item 3, amending the ordinance, the WG had felt that the City of Reno would move forward and amend the ordinance in a fairly timely manner. They felt the term “where feasible” in the proposed ordinance was too broad and they preferred a standard of showing “No Adverse Impact.”

Ms. Duerr said the WG was fine moving forward with an ordinance, with some caveats.

Neil Mann added that he believes Reno City Council expects model ordinance language that the TAC agrees upon, is acceptable to all three agencies and their attorneys who work in the area of land use regulation, and that the WG supports. He said the Reno City Council will look for input from the Corps and the Water Planning Commission, that “No Adverse Impact” is clearly defined to show what that it means in practice on the ground, and that whatever studies the Flood Project decides should be required of developers are justifiable and supported by a consensus of the partners. The Flood Project may have to present the package that is acceptable to the Reno City Council and to make sure that all interests are represented adequately.

Naomi Duerr agreed and noted that it is very important they gain a good understanding of flood plain management and the takings issue. The Flood Project is working to bring the Takings Seminar back in October, so Reno Council Members and attorneys can make it. Then there can be a level of comfort moving into the ordinance.

After further discussion on the adequacy of the Wood Rodgers model and mitigation ratios, Ms. Duerr returned to the item 4 of the Reno City Council motion. The WG still feels the issue of using a safety factor is still important. They believe it is not all about a volume calculation, and that something needs to be added in that recognizes that.

Dan St. John suggested that Neil Mann made a compelling argument about what’s happening with the current 117 year flood elevation that Reno plans to, which is a factor of safety. The other thing for the City’s consideration might be to add to the ordinance as written the caveat that you can run the model and prove your proposed mitigation will work, but you can never go below 1:1, which would always be the minimum floor.

Naomi Duerr commented, and Paul Urban agreed, that we must make sure we protect against the 117-year not the 100-year flood. Neil Mann agreed, as long as the basis is legally defensible.

It was moved by John Hester, and seconded by Neil Mann, that the TAC recommend the Reno Code be changed in accordance with the Wood Rodgers recommended amendments regarding incremental and adjacent mitigation, plus change the current 1:1 ratio standard to a minimum of 1:1, with adjacency defined

by the map, so that it has to be within each of the cell areas, and at the same vertical elevation or plane. If they can't mitigate at least 1:1 in an adjacent area in the same vertical increment or plane, they can run a model and identify an alternative effective mitigation or they can mitigate at a 1:1.25 ratio.

Naomi Duerr asked for discussion. There was a discussion on the safety factor, the current flood elevation regulation, and the vertical and horizontal mitigation ratio. It was suggested that it might be useful, as an example, how the Lennar development would have been handled under this scenario.

The motion was restated by John Hester, and seconded by Dan St. John, per the discussion, that the TAC recommend the Reno Code with the Wood Rodgers amendments, plus change the 1:1 to a minimum of 1:1, adjacency as defined by the map, so that it has to be within each of the cell areas, and at the same vertical increment or plane. If still adjacent but not in the same vertical increment or plane, the mitigation ratio is 1:1.25. If not adjacent and not in the same vertical increment or plane, then they must run the model and identify an alternate mitigation.

Shawn Gooch noted that to be comfortable, he would need to discuss what they refer to as the increment concept, increasing the volume at different increments or see how the model performs in that model. A brief discussion regarding acceptable elevation ranges followed.

Naomi Duerr requested an addition to ordinance. Since the ordinance is focused on completely protecting the Flood Project, she would like to add the whole mapped area of the 1997 flood. Since it is going to apply to Reno, Washoe County and Sparks, it needs to include the whole critical flood zone 1 that is mapped in the Regional Water Plan. Bottom line, there is additional blue area that goes to the south and she wants to be sure it applies to the whole area in critical flood zone 1 and not just a piece of it because of an artifact of a rulemaking process some years ago. She wants to be sure it covers all the area important to the Flood Project.

Greg Dennis noted that if the 1997 flood elevation is used as the mitigation elevation, then anything in Huffaker Narrows and beyond is above that elevation. There was some disagreement.

There was discussion that some were not familiar with those boundaries. Ms. Duerr reiterated that this particular area is important to Flood Project and is not reflected on this map. It was agreed that it could be brought back next month with maps to determine a final boundary. Ms. Duerr noted that the FPCC might make an amendment to the proposal.

Neil Mann asked if the Hidden Valley levee and flood wall is in critical flood zone 1. Ms. Duerr explained that the Hidden Valley levee is not in critical flood zone 1; it is just outside of it and in the 100-year flood plain. Paul Urban added that it is in the flood

plain but not in the zone number because it was anticipated there would be levees there the same as on the north side in Sparks. The flood zone was determined as the area of volume needed *after* a flood project is built, not where it currently is mapped at.

Ms. Duerr noted that the area north of the blue area on the map was wet in the 1997 flood. It was excluded because they knew it would be protected by the flood wall. Paul Urban added that if the Hidden Valley levee is kept up on the bank, then it is right on the border because that is what was intended as the containment area when it was developed. If Hidden Valley has to extend the embankment off of the existing bank and into Steamboat Creek, then it needs to do mitigation, he explained.

JoAnn Meacham added that if it has to move off the existing bank or on top of that, it will encroach on the flood plain. Ms. Duerr noted that, similarly, after talking to Wayne Seidel recently, any areas that were on the dry side of the levee, like Mill Street – if they are put on the wet side of the levee, we will get credit for that new storage that is created.

The question was called. **THE MOTION CARRIED.**

4. EXCEL BUILDING – LONG TERM PLANNING

Deferred due to time constraints.

5. TRACTION PROJECT SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION

Naomi Duerr introduced the topic of cash flow. Concern has been expressed about not enough money. Ms. Duerr wants to start to work with the TAC to discuss how to prioritize and move through a decision making process. JoAnn Meacham referred to notes from the Finance Subcommittee, meeting, noting that there are criteria for approving projects out of sequence if we run out of money.

Ms. Duerr stated that, due to time constraints, this is only an introduction to the topic and more time will be devoted to discuss this issue at the next TAC meeting.

6. SCHEDULES

- a. Milestone Time Lines**
- b. Detailed Schedule**

Deferred due to time constraints.

7. REVIEW DRAFT FPCC AGENDA – SEPTEMBER 14, 2007

Due to the preceding lengthy but valuable discussion, Naomi Duerr stated she may take agenda item #4, Excel Building – Long Term Planning, and #5, TRAction Project Sequence of Construction, off the next FPCC agenda.

Ms. Duerr explained that Flood Project staff had met with Mary Hill and toured the Edison Way building for the Holland Project. Mary noted that the tour was great, but the zoning will not work.

Naomi Duerr wanted to make the TAC aware that there is another proposal to use the Edison Way building for a temporary homeless shelter again next year. There is also a proposal coming to use the Bristlecone Property. The Flood Project has been in conversation with the Great Basin Initiative, a private nonprofit associated with the University that does restoration, reforestation and revegetation work around the state of Nevada. They have a large AmeriCorps component. They could potentially rehab and restore the Bristlecone site to use as an interpretive center. In exchange for using the site, they could do some revegetation and terrace construction work for us. They could do also a site plan. In the future, they could potentially flood proof the building and relocate their operations there, which are currently on University property. Mimi Fuji-Strickler has been the outreach person on this.

Randy Mellinger asked if other nonprofits would be interested. Ms. Duerr noted there are others such as the Food Bank and the Nevada Woodchucks at the Bristlecone site, and they have been fully informed of historical uses there. The Flood Project is going to meet with Tom Clark, Bristlecone's lobbyist next week.

Naomi Duerr advised the group that the Corps will be here for FPCC meeting, and their report of activities is on the agenda.

Naomi Duerr noted that there is an agenda item that is an update from Garth Oksol, who represents the RTC at the WG meetings on the SE Connector.

JoAnn Meacham inquired about a work plan bar chart that is supposed to be put on the Flood Project website. Ms. Duerr said both the Scheduling graphic and the Work Plan would be brought back to the TAC and put on the October FPCC agenda. It was noted that there are five other Work Plans that will be brought back to the TAC.

Naomi Duerr advised the TAC that the Corps experienced a major server crash at their Sacramento office. All of the Flood Project modeling was lost. Ms. Duerr described the Corps system for storing all data and backup on same server, which is common technology. We have recommended that the Corps send a copy to us, sealed, and are having conversations with the County IT people. Meanwhile, Corps has recovered all the data, but the situation put them a month behind – with a net effect of one week behind. They say they will keep to the key milestones, though. Ms. Duerr is calling Corps senior management and has talked to Bob Larkin about it. This will be reported on at the FPCC meeting.

8. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Suggested future agenda items included a discussion on the Corps EIS, the TRAction construction sequence, and model ordinance language. Naomi Duerr noted the flood storage mitigation issue will be brought back.

JoAnn Meacham requested that Paul Urban e-mail the timeline that he gave FPCC and the TRAction plan to her.

It was discussed and agreed that the TAC meeting time will remain from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm.

Neil Mann requested that the next meeting date always be put on the agenda so people can schedule it.

Meeting ended at 12:05 pm