

RECEIVED

DEC - 5 2005

TRUCKEE MEADOWS
WATER AUTHORITY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING
OF THE
TRUCKEE RIVER FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Friday, November 18, 2005
8:20 a.m.
McDonald Carano Wilson LLP
100 West Liberty, 10th Floor
Reno, Nevada

CERTIFIED COPY

REPORTED BY: SHANNON L. TAYLOR, CCR, CSR, RMR
Certified Court, Shorthand and Registered Merit Reporter
Nevada CCR #322, California CSR #8753, Idaho CSR #485
1381 Valley View Drive, Carson City, Nevada 89701
(775) 887-0472

A P P E A R A N C E S

Present at the Truckee River Fund Advisory Committee Meeting:

Mr. Craig Godbout

Mr. Chris Askin

Ms. Sylvia Harrison, Esq.

Ms. Janet Carson

Ms. Susan Lynn

Mr. Mark Cameron

Mr. Chris Cobb

Mr. Mark Foree

Mr. Tom Swan

Mr. Jerry Purdy

1 RENO, NEVADA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2005, 8:20 A.M.

2 -oOo-

3 MR. GODBOUT: Good morning, everybody, the day
4 of reckoning. This is the Truckee River Fund Advisory
5 Committee, November 18th, 2005.

6 I guess, we'll start with the roll call,
7 starting to my left. Jerry?

8 MR. PURDY: Oh, yeah. Jerry Purdy, here.

9 MS. LYNN: Chris?

10 MR. ASKIN: Oh. Chris Askin.

11 MS. HARRISON: Sylvia Harrison.

12 MS. CARSON: Janet Carson.

13 MS. LYNN: Susan Lynn.

14 MR. CAMERON: Michael Cameron.

15 MR. COBB: Chris Cobb.

16 MR. FOREE: Mark Foree.

17 MR. SWAN: Tom Swan.

18 MR. GODBOUT: And Craig Godbout. So, I guess,
19 we have a forum. Quorum.

20 MS. LYNN: Both.

21 MS. HARRISON: For those of you who don't know
22 Mark Foree, he's the director of operations at Truckee
23 Meadows Water Authority, standing in for Ron, who is off
24 visiting his son in Annapolis for Senior Day.

25 MR. GODBOUT: Right. Congratulations.

1 MR. ASKIN: All those in favor? (All said
2 "aye.") Those opposed? Motion carries.

3 (Motion carries.)

4 MR. PURDY: I think, we ought to compliment Ron
5 for the job he did on the minutes in some way or
6 another. He put a lot of effort into it.

7 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah. Item number four, public
8 comment, limited to no more than three minutes per
9 speaker.

10 Do we have anybody from the public that would
11 like to speak?

12 It doesn't look like it. We're not very popular
13 this morning.

14 MS. LYNN: They're leaving us to our own.

15 MR. GODBOUT: Okay. Well, I guess, number five,
16 discussion/review of the Truckee River Fund proposals
17 received on October 31st, 2005. Advisor recommendation
18 and rationale for projects to be forwarded to the TMWA
19 and Community Foundation boards for funding
20 consideration. It's an action item. So.

21 I had some thoughts about how we go about this.
22 And, I think, we start by agreeing or disagreeing on
23 eliminating some of them just right off the top. I
24 don't know if anybody has any thoughts on that, if they
25 would like to propose some of them.

1 Actually, I wanted -- Chris, you were going to
2 check to see if these all met the criteria.

3 MR. ASKIN: They do. We checked.

4 MR. GODBOUT: They do. All right. I guess, we
5 should open it up, then.

6 MS. HARRISON: Could I just interrupt?

7 MR. GODBOUT: Sure.

8 MS. HARRISON: I'm sorry. But just a point of
9 clarification. In terms of the criteria, if you
10 remember, what Chris was asked to do was solely to look
11 at determining whether they met the criteria set forth
12 on charitable contributions, not the criteria for the
13 award of the proposals themselves, but relating to the
14 purpose.

15 MR. COBB: That would be my first question, is
16 that some of them seemed, going through the minutes from
17 November 1st and our past minutes, part of our criteria
18 was limiting from the state line to, basically, Vista
19 Boulevard. Which a few of these, however, are out of
20 that scope. They go beyond that, the limits.

21 Some of the proposals, I think, are good for the
22 watershed. However, are we following that criteria?
23 Are we sticking to that for this first round? And,
24 then, we can later open it up? Can we change that
25 criteria? If we can't, then we have an issue with

1 funding.

2 MR. ASKIN: That's going to be a judgment call
3 with this group.

4 What we looked for were projects that
5 exclusively protected and enhanced the water quality and
6 resources of the Truckee River or its watershed.

7 MR. COBB: Right.

8 MR. ASKIN: Within terms of the geographic
9 scope, did the impact, the section of river that we
10 spoke about, yes, was that solely what they impacted?

11 MR. COBB: No.

12 MR. ASKIN: Not necessarily. But you guys can
13 make that judgment call.

14 We did have one or two organizations, well,
15 actually, one organization, that called and had a
16 project, which was just really up at the lake, dealing
17 with the lake and the Upper Truckee, and told them that
18 that didn't fit the geographic area. It really wasn't
19 connected directly at all to the Truckee Meadows.

20 And we also checked to make sure that they were
21 charitable beneficiaries, that they were qualified to
22 receive a charitable grant, either being a 51C3 or an
23 educational entity or a government institution, which
24 would qualify. So. And they all met that criteria.

25 MR. PURDY: Talking about deleting, my heart

1 isn't in that hundred thousand.

2 MR. GODBOUT: Okay.

3 MR. PURDY: It seemed to me, hell, you can't
4 argue with it. It's like motherhood and apple pie to
5 get the research equipment and so on. But I think the
6 needs on the river here is one hell of a lot worse and
7 more demanding and urgent than to kick out a hundred K
8 to buy a couple of these pieces of equipment, research,
9 and then hope it's going to give us something down the
10 road.

11 MR. GODBOUT: Can I call time out? I was
12 wondering if anybody would like to make disclosures.

13 MS. CARSON: That's a good idea.

14 MS. LYNN: Yes. And I am going to ask that the
15 Nature Conservancy Truckee River Yacht Club be put on
16 hold until a future round. Because we haven't been able
17 to fulfill sorting out all the details. And we think
18 there are some other grant proposals within here that
19 maybe we need to coordinate with and work with.

20 So we're going to have that one put on hold for
21 the time being.

22 And we would have a conflict, Michael and I
23 would have a conflict on that one.

24 MR. CAMERON: Actually, I'm not sure we would,
25 because --

1 MS. LYNN: Yeah, but we're not --

2 MR. CAMERON: We might. But we -- Yeah.

3 MR. GODBOUT: But you're withdrawing it for the
4 time being. So you don't.

5 MR. CAMERON: There you go. All right.

6 MR. GODBOUT: All I'd like to disclose is that
7 I'm a -- on the Rain -- Was it the Rainshadow?

8 MS. LYNN: Yeah, the Rainshadow.

9 MR. GODBOUT: Rainshadow.

10 MS. LYNN: But you don't have any direct --

11 MR. GODBOUT: No, but I know Phillip Parker.

12 MS. LYNN: Okay.

13 MR. GODBOUT: He's a personal friend and a
14 classmate.

15 I'm also on the board of supervisors of the
16 Washoe-Storey Conservation District. And I know that we
17 did not submit one, a proposal. But we are mentioned in
18 a couple of these.

19 MS. LYNN: Yes.

20 MR. GODBOUT: I'm an unpaid volunteer with that
21 organization.

22 MS. LYNN: Likewise, we hold them, too, so.

23 MR. GODBOUT: Right. I'm also a student at the
24 university.

25 MS. CARSON: You know, I take a class there,

1 too.

2 MR. CAMERON: I'm into Truckee Meadows.

3 MR. PURDY: I'd like to make a motion that we
4 defer action on that Nevada Intermountain Regional
5 Research Facility request for the hundred K, to buy
6 research equipment, to a future date.

7 MR. CAMERON: Defer action, Jerry?

8 MR. PURDY: Yeah, until some other time, not
9 approve it today, defer action.

10 MS. CARSON: Or just make a motion to reject it.

11 MR. PURDY: Okay. I'd like to modify that,
12 then. I'm just going to reject it.

13 MS. CARSON: He's trying to be nice.

14 MR. CAMERON: I think that, I mean at the risk
15 of the time it takes to do this, I think maybe --

16 MS. HARRISON: Point of order. Can we get a
17 second before we go into discussion?

18 MR. GODBOUT: Right. Do we have a second?

19 MS. CARSON: I'll second that.

20 MR. SWAN: What?

21 MS. CARSON: Jerry's motion on --

22 MR. PURDY: To reject this Nevada Intermountain
23 Regional Research Facility request for a hundred K for
24 equipment.

25 MR. GODBOUT: And Janet seconded that. Do we

1 have discussion?

2 MS. LYNN: Yes. I did not thoroughly understand
3 what this equipment did, and I -- or how frequently it
4 might be used in relationship to the Truckee River. I
5 felt like there might be -- I didn't particularly like
6 the application in terms of spending a hundred thousand
7 dollars on equipment.

8 If it were going to be used, and they didn't
9 make that relationship, or create that relationship to
10 the Truckee River in this application, I felt like we
11 ought to go back and ask them more questions.

12 And I didn't want to out-and-out reject it, but
13 I certainly wasn't going to support it for this
14 go-round.

15 MR. COBB: Can we reject these, with comment
16 back to these people, basically spelling out, here's
17 reasons of rejection under your proposal, such as like
18 she stated it?

19 They really, they kind of explained how they use
20 it for studies and this and that, but they didn't
21 earmark if there's any studies that it's really going to
22 go towards at this point.

23 So it's hard to approve something when we really
24 can't see the milestones out of it.

25 MR. ASKIN: Yeah.

1 MR. COBB: They just kind of threw some
2 beautiful fluff out there, but they really didn't
3 pinpoint. And, I think, if they could show us that
4 there's actual areas of research that are planning to be
5 done where this equipment would be used, I would feel
6 much more comfortable in approving it.

7 So, I think, some of these, if we're going to
8 reject them, we ought to give these people --

9 MS. CARSON: Some feedback.

10 MR. COBB: -- some feedback as to how they might
11 come back and request funding again, if they're meeting
12 that criteria.

13 MS. CARSON: As a person who submits
14 applications, I appreciate hearing why I was rejected.

15 MR. ASKIN: Sure. It's desirable to have the
16 comments.

17 MR. COBB: Right.

18 MR. ASKIN: It's not just okay. It's important
19 to do that if you have that. You may at some point
20 choose not to provide comments.

21 MR. COBB: Right.

22 MR. ASKIN: But it's good if you have them.

23 MR. COBB: I think, in this case, personally, I
24 feel that if they can really show that there is future
25 research, they're looking at several studies, that I

1 wouldn't have such a heartache approving it.

2 But without having really earmarked the
3 milestones of how it's going to be used to improve this
4 watershed, I can't see approving it.

5 MS. CARSON: Could I make one more comment? The
6 way I would rather see this presented is to say, "Look,
7 we're going to do this study all about the Truckee
8 River, and we're going to assign some prorated portion
9 of the cost of this capital equipment to it."

10 Because that's -- I mean, I don't know. That's
11 how you do it in business, is you have a piece of
12 equipment, you prorate it, do all the different things
13 you do. And that way, you know, maybe this, in the
14 future, maybe they're going to have a study in which
15 they assign \$15,000 worth of equipment. So.

16 MS. LYNN: Right.

17 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think, actually, you know,
18 picking up on our discussion last time, where we want --
19 we'll be setting precedent and sending a message in
20 these first few rounds --

21 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

22 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

23 MR. CAMERON: -- about how we're going to manage
24 this fund.

25 And, I think, this application reflects --

1 There's going to be a universe of applicants out there
2 that will look at this as a fairly wide-open source of
3 funds. And there was very little effort on their part
4 to kind of draw a connection between what they would
5 spend the money on and the purpose of the fund.

6 And so, I think, I'm just in agreement with what
7 everyone else is saying, in addition to the fact that, I
8 think, they made that error in their application.

9 I also think there's another side to it, which
10 is our understanding, as an advisory committee, of what
11 the priorities are out there. And, I think, there are a
12 couple other proposals that, I think, are much closer to
13 being of more merit. And we'll just see how you all
14 feel when we get there.

15 But we still, I think, are lacking, ourselves, a
16 little bit of an understanding of what the water quality
17 monitoring needs are and what constitutes really
18 valuable water quality monitoring and is going to help
19 policy makers and really improve the watershed, versus
20 what kind of water quality monitoring might look good on
21 paper but really isn't going to accomplish anything.

22 And so I'm bringing up, again, the notion that
23 somehow, whether it's a one-day forum, or somehow I'd
24 like to enrich our understanding as an advisory
25 committee of what the needs are. And I'm not -- I don't

1 presuppose how to do that. But I will probably remark
2 on that a few more times today. And we'll get to that
3 agenda item later.

4 But that strikes me as relevant for a lot of
5 these proposals. This one pretty clearly falls out.
6 But some others could come closer. I just don't feel
7 like we're making a guess that it will be useful.

8 MR. SWAN: And, again, I think, it sounds like
9 the facility's going to be ready in 2008. To buy
10 equipment now that's supposed to -- Pardon me?

11 MS. CARSON: And one of our things in here was
12 implementation in the near future.

13 MR. SWAN: Right.

14 MR. COBB: It looks like they're under a
15 remodel.

16 MR. SWAN: I think that -- I don't even think
17 they've started. Plus the fact, I think, by the time
18 the equipment is going to be used, in 2008, they're
19 going to buy it today --

20 MR. COBB: It's going to be obsolete.

21 MR. SWAN: It's going to be obsolete.

22 MR. PURDY: That's a thought.

23 MR. GODBOUT: There's no opportunity for them to
24 use it in the interim?

25 MR. SWAN: That's not what I -- I don't know

1 what they're doing. And, I think, they're going to
2 build a laboratory.

3 MR. GODBOUT: M-hm.

4 MR. SWAN: I think, UNR should do a lot more
5 work, work around getting the money for them.

6 MR. PURDY: Call for the question?

7 MR. GODBOUT: Any further discussion?

8 MS. CARSON: Could we make --

9 MR. GODBOUT: I just have one comment. Out of
10 all of these, this is the only one that I could put my
11 finger on and see some physical assets that are
12 long-term.

13 And that will -- I think, may not -- That's one
14 of the problems I have with this one, was that this
15 could be used for water quality analysis anywhere in the
16 nation. And it's not strictly confined to the Truckee
17 River watershed. So how much of it's going to get used
18 for the Truckee River?

19 MS. LYNN: That is my concern.

20 MR. GODBOUT: It could be one percent. It could
21 be a hundred percent. We don't know. And, I think,
22 perhaps that's one of the things we should send back to
23 them, to have them give us an estimate of what their --

24 MR. COBB: Percentage.

25 MR. GODBOUT: -- anticipated use is going to be.

1 I know people who did doctorates or master's
2 degrees from Canada on other subjects. But they weren't
3 local subjects, local studies. So.

4 But the positive thing's that, you know, we've
5 got some equipment. I'm all for education. And this is
6 something, you know, you can see and feel. It doesn't
7 dissipate.

8 MS. CARSON: Can I make another comment? I know
9 we want to move on.

10 On that point, when we had this thing divvied up
11 into capital projects and research studies and so forth,
12 I guess, what I thought capital projects meant was a
13 settling basin --

14 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

15 MS. CARSON: -- to get some sediment out of the
16 river or some kind of thing. I did not think we were
17 talking about equipment in a laboratory.

18 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

19 MR. GODBOUT: Wouldn't that fall under research?

20 MS. CARSON: I think so.

21 MR. CAMERON: Well, there's going to be a gray
22 area.

23 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

24 MR. CAMERON: I mean I can imagine instream
25 gauge equipment that would be a permanent fixture in the

1 Truckee River.

2 MS. CARSON: Sort of in between.

3 MR. COBB: Right. It depends on how it's
4 applied for. Is it a part of a research, or is it -- In
5 essence, it's a capital asset.

6 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

7 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

8 MR. COBB: Because it's going to be forever.
9 Just like this is. So it is capital, but it --

10 MS. LYNN: It's just got to make a connection to
11 the Truckee River.

12 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah.

13 MS. HARRISON: I know Jerry's going to hate me,
14 because I'm making one more comment.

15 I think that taking some time to go through
16 these, just the way that you are, and discuss everyone's
17 perspective on this is valuable for this first go-round,
18 because I think it will help all of us to kind of zero
19 in and focus on the criteria that we think are going to
20 be significant if we go forward.

21 So, I think, it's a useful discussion. And I
22 wouldn't, you know, urge you to move on just for the
23 sake of moving on, when I think these are really useful
24 deliberations at this time.

25 MR. CAMERON: Well, and perhaps, if this one's a

1 slam dunk, no. But if some of them -- We talked last
2 time. I used the example of the gymnastics judges
3 changing their mood and scoring as they go along. I
4 wonder if, for some of these that are coming up -- I
5 think, this one may be unique if it just falls out so
6 naturally; but whether we should discuss them as a --
7 you know, in total and then come back and vote on them.

8 I just throw that out. I just don't want us to
9 have a -- I don't want us to wind up at the end of the
10 day evaluating the last proposal with a different point
11 of view than we evaluated the first.

12 MS. CARSON: I think that's a really good
13 suggestion.

14 MR. ASKIN: We can make some notes. If you have
15 some recommendations, as you move along, regarding the
16 specific proposal, or a particular amount, or even a
17 time frame for implementation, we can start to jot that
18 down and then come back and revisit that at the end.

19 MR. GODBOUT: That's what I was wondering, that
20 we summarize what our --

21 MR. SWAN: Well, we are going to make -- we are
22 going to reject this one.

23 MS. HARRISON: You have a motion on the table.
24 Take action on it, yeah.

25 MS. CARSON: Well, can we do -- I mean I'm

1 thinking not about this one specifically, but about the
2 process. I mean can we do something like, you know, at
3 this time we vote, do we do not want to fund this?
4 Unless something really surprising comes up during the
5 remainder of our meeting, something like that?

6 MS. LYNN: Then we can vote to reconsider.

7 MS. CARSON: And we can do that even if we've
8 already voted? I mean this is a parliamentary question.
9 If we vote here at nine, at 8:30, that we want to reject
10 this, and then some real un -- you know, again, it's a
11 bad example. But some new information comes to light an
12 hour from now, and we want to revisit it, can we do
13 that?

14 MS. HARRISON: Under Robert's, if you want to
15 fall back to Robert's, anybody can move, if you're on
16 the prevailing side of the motion, you can move to
17 reconsider.

18 MS. CARSON: Okay.

19 MS. HARRISON: Any time.

20 MS. CARSON: Okay.

21 MS. HARRISON: Probably, you know, within
22 reason, before the next two meetings, you know.

23 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

24 MR. GODBOUT: Any further discussion?

25 So we have a motion to reject the Nevada

1 Intermountain Regional Research Facility request.

2 All those in favor? (All said "aye.") Those
3 opposed? Motion carries.

4 (Motion carries.)

5 MR. GODBOUT: How do you want to take the rest
6 of these?

7 MR. PURDY: Do you want to go in order?

8 MR. GODBOUT: I don't know.

9 MR. COBB: Sure. My thought here was with the
10 Chalk Creek, Chalk Creek ES study. Just reading through
11 it, I -- they spell out pretty specifically what they're
12 trying to accomplish, the reasons for this. I think, it
13 helps determine water quality issues with our watershed.
14 There's a good explanation of expenditures and in-kind
15 services.

16 I felt this really met part of our criteria of
17 what we're trying to do at this point. And I felt
18 comfortable in sending this up.

19 MR. PURDY: Yeah, sign me up for that. I'd like
20 to suggest that -- You mentioned once that you could
21 expand these, couldn't you?

22 MR. ASKIN: Yes, you can. You can provide a
23 funding level greater than they ask for. You could
24 award the grant, and you could ask that they resubmit
25 for an expanded project. You can handle it a number of

1 ways.

2 It's not completely unusual for a grant-making
3 organization, right from the outset, to provide a
4 greater amount of funds, with a request that the project
5 be, the scope be expanded, or perhaps to extend the time
6 frame.

7 MR. PURDY: Where I was coming from is I don't
8 mind approving this just the way it is, to keep things
9 going. But I'd like to open it up for your
10 consideration. Let's expand that to include the North
11 Truck Drain.

12 I've seen crap come down that drain. Any time
13 you ride over there, you can see stuff in the water. I
14 think, a lot of it comes from discharges that are coming
15 in from the side streams and so on. I think, it would
16 be good to check to see what's going on there, and then
17 maybe Steamboat Creek, for some things that -- fix up
18 all the water from south Reno, and that goes right
19 straight through to the Truckee River. That would give
20 us an awful lot of useful information if we could do
21 that on a weekly basis.

22 MR. COBB: The issue I have with that is we're
23 dictating to them what their study is.

24 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

25 MR. PURDY: I'm just asking for their

1 consideration.

2 MR. COBB: Right. I could see approving this,
3 and with the comment that we would like to see you come
4 to us for more money, for a study of this area.

5 MR. PURDY: M-hm.

6 MR. COBB: Just approve the funding as is, with
7 comment that here's an area, we'd like to see you come
8 back to us, if so interested, providing further study.

9 MR. PURDY: Sign me up for that.

10 MS. LYNN: I think, there's been a lot of study
11 done on Steamboat and North Truckee Drain. I think,
12 there's existing information. And, I think, it goes
13 back years, on both drainages.

14 What, I guess, I would like to see is an
15 educational program in the people in those -- that feed
16 water into those particular water bodies. Because you
17 need to educate the people around, because they're -- we
18 do the storm water stenciling program. The City of Reno
19 is taking it over. The City of Sparks is doing the same
20 thing. But until you educate people about what they're
21 dumping in the storm drains, what they're -- and those
22 all end up in Steamboat Creek or North Truckee Drain or
23 in Chalk Creek, you don't have a program.

24 You know what the problem -- you can learn what
25 the problem is through this particular grant on Chalk

1 Creek. So I think -- Yeah. But they're a nonpoint
2 source for pollution, except that they become point
3 source when they enter the river.

4 MR. COBB: But you're kind of talking about a
5 different grant that's in here, in essence.

6 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

7 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think, again, as we go
8 through these, I think, there's a number of proposals; I
9 can imagine some near-term -- I don't know if it's the
10 second round of RFPs. But I hope that it's not too far
11 distant that we're back in this room and considering
12 other proposals.

13 So one option is to simply approve it as is and
14 strongly encourage them to submit a proposal at the next
15 cycle --

16 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

17 MR. CAMERON: -- along Jerry's lines. And let's
18 just make sure that's not too distant on the calendar.

19 MR. GODBOUT: Was that a motion?

20 MS. LYNN: Make it.

21 MR. CAMERON: That's a motion.

22 MS. CARSON: Could you say it again.

23 MR. CAMERON: I would move that we approve this
24 request, and in our communication to the sponsors,
25 invite them to submit a similar proposal for monitoring

1 on -- if appropriate, at North Truckee Drain and
2 Steamboat Creek.

3 MR. PURDY: Steamboat Creek. Is there a Whites
4 Creek?

5 MR. CAMERON: And Whites Creek. Or any other
6 water --

7 MR. SWAN: Tributary.

8 MS. CARSON: Or tributary.

9 MR. CAMERON: Or any other tributary that could
10 benefit from this type of equipment and analysis.

11 MR. PURDY: I'll second that.

12 MR. GODBOUT: I'm just -- I'm sorry. I guess,
13 this is up to them. Do they have the -- Since they're
14 associated with the City of Reno and Sparks, can they go
15 outside of their jurisdictional areas to set those up?

16 MR. SWAN: Yeah.

17 MR. GODBOUT: They can. Okay. Then we have a
18 second from Jerry. All those in favor?

19 MS. CARSON: Wait a minute. Can we have some
20 discussion?

21 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion. Sorry.

22 MS. CARSON: I'd like the proposal. I guess,
23 I'm stunned that the cities don't already own a wading
24 rod, which they want to buy one for five grand. I mean
25 they could borrow one.

1 MR. COBB: I make the point --
2 MS. CARSON: What?
3 MR. COBB: I mean it's just the point, why don't
4 we have 25 plows? You know, it becomes --
5 MR. CAMERON: Why don't you have 25 plows?
6 MR. COBB: Right, why don't we have 25 plows?
7 MR. GODBOUT: Maybe you should fund that.
8 MR. COBB: Right. So it's just --
9 MS. CARSON: The cities don't have a wading rod?
10 MR. SWAN: I don't have one. If that's what
11 you're asking.
12 MS. CARSON: I'm shocked.
13 MR. SWAN: Yeah.
14 MS. LYNN: It seems like we ought to have one
15 somewhere.
16 MS. CARSON: I think, they could borrow one from
17 somebody. But they ought to have their own
18 snow-measuring equipment.
19 MS. HARRISON: They will, soon.
20 MS. LYNN: Yeah.
21 MS. CARSON: I guess, I would also like to add a
22 request to the sponsors, that on their time line and
23 milestones, if they could get us the results in time for
24 our next funding cycle, that would be nice. But, of
25 course, we don't know when that's going to be. So.

1 MR. PURDY: They're doing this one a week, the
2 way I see it, the sampling. That's really good. You
3 know exactly what's going on over a year, then.

4 MS. CARSON: And then I have another. This is
5 more of an overarching question. The valuation that's
6 put on the contribution for the grant match on labor
7 varies from \$20 an hour to \$80 an hour among these
8 different proposals.

9 MS. LYNN: M-hm.

10 MS. CARSON: And I know that for, like for
11 valuation of donated volunteer time, the IRS has some
12 rules. Obviously, it's way below what the professional
13 rate really is. I think, we need to have some kind of
14 uniform way of looking at that. Because if somebody
15 says, "Yeah, we're going to do the match by donating
16 time at 80 bucks an hour," well, that's not a very high
17 threshold to meet.

18 And I -- I don't think it matters, well, maybe
19 it matters, but we ought to at least be consistent. And
20 this one's got \$25 an hour for labor on the match.

21 MS. LYNN: Well, I think, it's -- I think, it's
22 related to who they're employing to carry out this
23 project. And at this level, I'm sure Terri Svetich will
24 be contributing her time. She's paid by the City of
25 Reno, and she isn't even --

1 MS. CARSON: She makes more than \$25 an hour.

2 MS. LYNN: Yes, she does.

3 MR. COBB: By the time you add in benefits and
4 everything else.

5 MR. PURDY: Exactly.

6 MS. LYNN: But perhaps that's what they're
7 paying somebody to install these, this equipment. And
8 it doesn't take Terri Svetich to do that. It takes a
9 technician to do that. So at \$25 an hour, I don't know
10 if that's reasonable; but if the City of Reno thinks
11 it's reasonable, I'm not going to argue with them.

12 MR. ASKIN: As far as the in-kind match goes,
13 we've always used market rate. So if a professional is
14 contributing their time, and they happen to be
15 compensated at a \$100-an-hour rate, that we could use
16 that as an in-kind contribution, because that's what it
17 would cost to hire that service.

18 If a group of volunteers is working on the
19 river, and it's more of a nondescript group, you might
20 use \$8 an hour or something like that. But for
21 professional services, where we can determine what a
22 fair market rate or range would be, I think, it's fine
23 to use that as a match.

24 MS. LYNN: I like this one. I think, it's time
25 to vote on it.

1 MR. GODBOUT: Any further discussion? All those
2 in favor? (All said "aye.") Those opposed? Motion
3 carries.

4 (Motion carries.)

5 MR. ASKIN: Okay. Let's put that one up.

6 MR. SWAN: What about the other one?

7 MS. LYNN: We're voting on that.

8 MR. GODBOUT: And then we're going to just
9 reconsider.

10 MS. LYNN: Yes, if we need to.

11 MR. GODBOUT: Does anyone have a discussion for
12 the next one to review?

13 MS. LYNN: Yes. I'd like to do the one for the
14 request for the Truckee River Cleanup Day.

15 MR. COBB: Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful?

16 MS. LYNN: Yeah, Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful
17 and Environmental Leadership combined. This group does
18 a bang-up job. We pulled about, gosh, I'd say close to
19 50 ton of stuff, all off, along the river banks and out
20 of the river, through pretty much an all volunteer
21 effort.

22 And I'm not on the board of either one of these,
23 that I know of. They do a bang-up job. And, frankly, I
24 think the amount of money that they're requesting is
25 reasonable for the amount of work that they put in on

1 these projects.

2 MR. PURDY: I agree.

3 MR. COBB: This is my number two project. The
4 one question I had was they were a little gray in
5 explaining their match. They just state that they'll be
6 providing 3100 and change and matching funds for staff
7 salaries and will secure or provide in-kind support for
8 supplies, printing costs and postage.

9 MS. LYNN: They've done it every year.

10 MR. COBB: Right. And I'm sure they will. I
11 just -- I think, they need to be a little more specific.
12 I want to approve this, and I don't know if we can
13 approve them, but ask them to submit the in-kind
14 services to us, so that we're following protocol of how
15 to set up the fund.

16 MR. CAMERON: Do we have the authority to waive
17 the match requirement, or is that in our bylaws?

18 MR. ASKIN: I think, you do; but I wouldn't do
19 that when you have a competitive grant situation where
20 it's required of all the grantees.

21 MR. CAMERON: At one point, I guess, the reason
22 it comes to mind is I recall at one point in a previous
23 meeting, we discussed that underneath a certain
24 threshold request, we were going to consider not having
25 a match requirement. And, obviously, we didn't follow

1 through with that.

2 MS. CARSON: I don't think we have to go there.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. All right.

4 MS. CARSON: I would argue. They give
5 themselves zero credit on the matching computation for a
6 thousand hours.

7 MR. CAMERON: They're volunteers.

8 MR. COBB: Right. And that's the thing, we're
9 going to say eight bucks and hour.

10 MS. LYNN: And, I think, when they do their
11 reporting back --

12 MR. COBB: That's just the documentation I'd
13 like to see, so that when people come back and say,
14 "Well, you funded that, and they really didn't spell it
15 out," well, we've asked them to provide this at the end
16 of their -- showing, "Hey, how many volunteers do you
17 have at eight bucks an hour, so that we can show your
18 in-kind services?"

19 MS. LYNN: Yeah. That's true. And they didn't
20 note that. But, I think, it's implied in here through
21 their volunteer labor.

22 MR. COBB: Right. It's just to keep us
23 aboveboard with everybody else applying.

24 MS. HARRISON: That would probably be an
25 appropriate and useful instruction to all of the people

1 that are providing in-kind services, that in conjunction
2 with the report back, it is required that they detail
3 the in-kind services that were actually provided, to
4 provide supporting documentation.

5 MS. CARSON: Another comment on the match
6 calculation that came up because two different proposals
7 computed in two different ways, and I'm sorry, this is
8 kind of nitpicky, are they supposed to provide 25
9 percent of the total, or 25 percent of the match, of our
10 grant amount?

11 MR. ASKIN: 25 percent of your grant amount.

12 MS. CARSON: Okay. Okay. So in an example
13 where a project is \$10,000 --

14 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

15 MS. CARSON: -- they don't have to come up with
16 \$2500, they could --

17 MR. ASKIN: Not if they're asking you for a
18 thousand.

19 MS. CARSON: They could ask for 8,000, come up
20 with 2,000.

21 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

22 MS. CARSON: Okay. I don't think that was
23 totally clear in our material we sent out.

24 MR. ASKIN: Okay.

25 MR. GODBOUT: So we should clarify that on the

1 next round.

2 MS. CARSON: We need to clarify that in the next
3 round.

4 MR. CAMERON: Before we get to a motion on this,
5 I'm wondering if the group would find it useful.
6 There's two other proposals that bear some relationship
7 to this one. And just for the sake of developing our
8 standards and to be consistent, I wonder if we could
9 talk -- I'd actually like to talk about all three at
10 once. I think, this one is actually the standard.

11 MS. CARSON: That's a good idea.

12 MR. CAMERON: I think, this one is solid and
13 yields very tangible benefits. As well as having an
14 educational value involving the community, it results in
15 a change on the ground in terms of the trash pickup.

16 The other two that come to mind were the
17 Rainshadow school proposal and the Lake Tahoe water
18 sampling.

19 MS. LYNN: Snapshot.

20 MR. CAMERON: Interesting. Because we talk
21 about education. And, obviously, that's a category of
22 allowable expense. But what do we want? I mean that's
23 broad. I mean education could be, you know, improving
24 our community's understanding of the watershed and its
25 vulnerabilities.

1 Education could be -- I mean in other example,
2 with the Rainshadow school, my sense is that the
3 benefits -- and I like that proposal, the part that it
4 was modest in size. And, I think, that helps it. But
5 that's going to be pretty focused on a limited number of
6 high school students who are really going to benefit
7 from it. Now, that proposal, also, is going to produce
8 some displays, which I think is valuable.

9 But it just raises the question about -- I'm
10 just curious how others feel about educational projects
11 in general, in terms of what we, what people, other
12 folks, think. Is there a line at which, gee, that's
13 really on point, some set of proposals for the Truckee
14 River Fund, and other ones that will sort of be too far
15 afield?

16 I don't really have any preconceptions, but I
17 sense that that's going to come up for us.

18 MR. COBB: I think, it's going to depend on the
19 proposal. Again, I like this project, because it is
20 modest. But they do show -- I like the fact they're
21 involving, I guess you'd call it, some at-risk youth
22 group --

23 MS. LYNN: Yes.

24 MR. COBB: -- and maybe help them educationally
25 to learn about cleaning the river. But there's also

1 something that they're going to provide back to the rest
2 of the community, what they've learned.

3 And I like how they -- they've put a lot of
4 thought in there.

5 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

6 MR. COBB: For this being an educational, and
7 it's modest, and just the way they presented how they're
8 going to go through this, I think, I can see approving
9 it. Now, future ones, I mean we're all going to see
10 them a little differently, depending on how they put
11 their proposal together.

12 I really like it. They put a lot of thought in
13 it. I think it's a good idea.

14 MR. PURDY: I'd like to offer a suggestion in
15 the way of a comment. If we approve this thing, we ask
16 them to consider including a little driftwood survey
17 between those limits.

18 In the '97 flood, this is what come down, and it
19 plugged up Arlington Bridge, and it backed water up, and
20 that raised hell with all of the downtown. Here's
21 another view of the driftwood. And if you go out and
22 look at it, there's clumps all the way from Vista clear
23 on up towards Mobil.

24 And if these youngsters are going to be going
25 out every day, checking out a section of this river, it

1 might be nice to have them take a picture of what they
2 see in the way of driftwood and include that in with
3 their other things, and maybe give them a few bucks more
4 with another modified grant.

5 MR. GODBOUT: Are you suggesting that we defer
6 this one till a later round?

7 MR. PURDY: Oh, no. No, just to come back.

8 MR. GODBOUT: To come back again?

9 MR. PURDY: Yeah, a comment, ask them to
10 consider expanding it to --

11 MR. CAMERON: Maybe we could just -- maybe a
12 shorter version would accomplish the same thing. They
13 intend to take photographs of what they see. I think,
14 maybe we could just ask them to include in their -- in
15 terms of what they're looking for, to take pictures.

16 MR. PURDY: There you go. That's a good idea.

17 MR. CAMERON: I've heard you make this remark
18 before, in the past. I happen to think all that woody
19 debris is a real plus for the river. You see it as a
20 negative for flooding.

21 So we're not going to comment about whether
22 taking pictures is good or bad.

23 MR. PURDY: Sure. Sure.

24 MR. CAMERON: But we'd just like them to do
25 some -- you know, make sure that they point their

1 cameras at the piles of debris.

2 MR. PURDY: Well, record where it's at.

3 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

4 MR. PURDY: Done.

5 MR. CAMERON: So we can leave it there.

6 MR. PURDY: Yeah. Sign me up for that.

7 MR. COBB: Your other one you wanted to talk
8 about was the Snapshot. Some of the difficulty I had
9 with Snapshot was, one, it went beyond our limits. It's
10 in our limits, and it's outside our limits of state
11 line, the way I read it. It's a good project. They
12 explain their use of funds.

13 I do have a lot of difficulty with \$3,000 of
14 their grant going for the party at the end of it. I
15 understand you do that for your volunteers. But as far
16 as taking the funds for this, I'd like to see it used
17 somewhere else than \$3,000 for a barbecue at the end.

18 MS. LYNN: That is one thing I will point out
19 about the Truckee River Cleanup Day is that Albertson's
20 and other people contribute all the food.

21 MR. COBB: Right. And I could see them going to
22 restaurants or whoever, to provide them their lunches or
23 their outback, or whoever else, to provide for food at
24 the end. But asking us for money to go buy food for
25 barbecues?

1 MR. CAMERON: To me, this one, the difficulty I
2 had with this one -- all of your points are good and
3 appropriate. But the one that struck me as the most
4 problematic was actually my own ignorance. And there's
5 some of you sitting here that actually, I think, are
6 well-grounded in water quality programs that are out
7 there.

8 But I can't -- my suspicion is that taking a
9 single sample, at a single point in time, in every
10 stream, does not give you any scientifically valid data
11 for analysis. And --

12 MR. SWAN: I don't think that's the point.

13 MR. CAMERON: That's not the point of the
14 proposal?

15 MR. SWAN: To get them out.

16 MS. LYNN: The point is public awareness.

17 MR. GODBOUT: Get them out.

18 MR. SWAN: They would be offended by that.
19 They're not doing anything other than educating the
20 group.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, that's good. Because
22 I didn't -- Okay. I mean it did say to meet the need of
23 researchers working on water quality modeling of
24 regulators.

25 I'm reading the TRPA support letter. Which this

1 thing was sinking fast for me until I at least saw
2 somebody step up and say that it was a merit from a
3 water quality point of view.

4 But, Tom, if your main point is that they're
5 really -- this is, the real merit of this is
6 educational, then I would not be so concerned about how
7 silly the data is.

8 MR. SWAN: I hope you don't do that.

9 I also have a comment, kind of corollary to some
10 of these. I hate to see, because we are setting
11 precedence here, and I hate to see a lot of this money
12 going for labor. Because I thought a lot -- so like I
13 talked about earlier, capital, and buying things and not
14 labor.

15 And particularly when you get a lot of money
16 going to one person, for a lot of these projects, like
17 without being negative, I am -- the Rainshadow thing,
18 you get a lot of money going to one person, the
19 coordinator or the leader.

20 I mean that's not so much the point. The point
21 is I don't like to see all the money going to labor or
22 to, in respect to the University, the -- whatever they
23 call it, the compensation to the University, indirect
24 costs.

25 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

1 MR. SWAN: I'd like to see -- I imagine they can
2 play some other game where they could take the money and
3 say "We're going to buy something" and say they're going
4 to use the indirect costs.

5 MR. COBB: Matching.

6 MR. SWAN: Matching funds. I think, that's even
7 better than saying "I want money for my effort." I
8 don't think that's what we're here for. I think, we're
9 here to make projects that have tangible things on the
10 river.

11 I don't know if I made myself clear.

12 MR. CAMERON: How does that -- Does that fit
13 for, if we're funding education, if education is a
14 component of our program, does that standard that you're
15 putting out there, I mean does it apply equally?
16 Education tends to be sort of labor-intensive.

17 MR. SWAN: Yes. But I think that -- I don't
18 think we should be paying for that labor. I think, if a
19 kid wants to learn something about it, or we want to
20 teach something, I think, that should be the volunteer
21 part. And then we should buy them some tools to
22 accomplish that education.

23 But just to say "I'm leading the show, so I want
24 money to guide these people," that should be the
25 volunteer effort or the matching fund. But "I need this

1 to accomplish it, I need a truck to carry these kids
2 there, I need garbage bags, need to buy lunch for all
3 these people," I think that might be appropriate.

4 But, I think, to say "We want to pay for
5 indirect funds for somebody to guide the show," I think,
6 you're setting precedence for future problems.

7 MR. GODBOUT: If I can expand on that a little
8 bit. So you're saying that. And I don't see the
9 difference between funding a position for one of these
10 organizations to carry out a function. I don't see the
11 difference.

12 I'm not sure I see the distinction that you're
13 making between the person who is part of an
14 organization, staff member, or who could possibly be
15 hired as a future staff member, to carry out a certain
16 plan. Are you saying their time should be donated?

17 MR. SWAN: I think, in reference to future P.R.
18 and stuff, I don't think in the future you're going to
19 want people wanting money -- or you're going to get
20 people wanting money to accomplish projects. I don't
21 think you want to pay for their labor. I think, you
22 want to pay for making something, put something in the
23 river. You want to buy something to fix something.

24 I don't know if I made myself clear. But.

25 MR. COBB: It kind of falls under capital. I

1 tend to agree. When you get into research and
2 education, at times, I think, depending on the validity
3 of the project, what we're -- we're going to continue to
4 get things, the project's really good, and we're having
5 to pay for a portion of whoever that leader is, not
6 leader, or who's involved, a portion of their labor, I
7 don't see being able to get away from that.

8 It happens all the time with grants to studies
9 that universities do all over the States. It helps fund
10 a position. It's part of getting that grant and getting
11 that study.

12 So it's hard for us, even in this, to get away
13 from that. I agree with you, I'd like to see something
14 tangible from it. And, in essence, some of these
15 education research ones, we will get something tangible
16 at the end of it. Granted, we're having to pay for some
17 labor to get there.

18 But, I think, in the case of Rainshadow, we get
19 something tangible at the end of it to provide the
20 public with what they discussed about doing the
21 presentations and that. I think, we get something
22 tangible with the students being local and getting more
23 of an understanding of the river. And, hopefully,
24 they'll pass that on to their friends.

25 So, I think, we get something tangible out of

1 it, even though we're paying for some labor here.

2 MR. SWAN: Okay. I don't know what you said,
3 but I -- I don't know if you said -- I don't know if you
4 heard what I said.

5 MR. COBB: No, I did.

6 MR. SWAN: I don't have any problem with buying
7 things for people to accomplish a task.

8 MR. COBB: Right.

9 MR. SWAN: But I'm not into paying -- It's not
10 me. I don't know if the fund is into paying labor.

11 They can use the labor as in-kind support. If
12 the guide wants a -- you know, if Rainshadow wants \$4500
13 or \$4600 to do something, I think, it should be for
14 parts. And we're paying, what, 53 percent, or 47
15 percent for labor on this project.

16 MR. CAMERON: Well, let me ask you, Tom. On the
17 Truckee River Fund, if I'm looking at the budget right
18 now --

19 MS. CARSON: On which one?

20 MR. CAMERON: The Truckee River Fund for the
21 Cleanup Day. They have \$5,000 for printing, television,
22 radio spots. Which side of your line does that fall on?

23 MR. SWAN: I think, that's --

24 MR. CAMERON: That's eligible, in your point of
25 view?

1 MR. SWAN: Right.

2 MR. GODBOUT: But it takes labor to do that.

3 MR. SWAN: They're buying it.

4 MR. GODBOUT: I know. But. They're buying
5 labor to do it.

6 MR. SWAN: It's up to you guys. I mean I'm in
7 support of buying things for people. But I'm not in
8 support of paying for the volunteers, supposed
9 volunteers' labor to accomplish that task.

10 That's just my perspective.

11 MS. CARSON: Yeah. Okay.

12 MR. SWAN: And whatever you guys want to do.

13 MS. CARSON: Sure.

14 MR. SWAN: I just, I'm very uncomfortable paying
15 for the labor in this program.

16 MR. PURDY: That's a good point.

17 MS. CARSON: I think, what this also sort of
18 touches on is would these people have these jobs if our
19 fund didn't exist? I mean that gets into this.
20 Because, I think, at least from my perspective, we want
21 to fund things that probably wouldn't happen otherwise.

22 MR. GODBOUT: If you fund the positions.

23 MS. CARSON: And, I think, this is going to
24 really -- And the whole field of education is where this
25 is going to become most gray, is you have UNR, for

1 instance, the whole institution, that rolls along from
2 year to year. And education is so broad. I think, we
3 need to be pretty strict about what do we think is
4 education that's going to improve the river. Because
5 they are going to come up with all kinds of things,
6 which will be more or less beneficial.

7 The thing I like about the Rainshadow one is
8 they're going to pick up trash.

9 MR. SWAN: I like it. I think, that's great.
10 That's very appropriate.

11 MS. CARSON: I think, as Michael brought up a
12 while ago, we need to somehow connect Rainshadow with
13 Truckee River Cleanup Day.

14 MR. SWAN: That's right.

15 MS. CARSON: To me, that's a near-term tangible
16 result. It makes me think if we can have a fourth
17 category in our categories, which is maintenance, river
18 maintenance --

19 MR. GODBOUT: I like it.

20 MS. CARSON: -- that would be a good thing.

21 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah.

22 MS. CARSON: Because it doesn't really fit
23 education or research or capital.

24 MS. LYNN: Well, it hits education as a point of
25 public awareness.

1 MS. CARSON: A little bit.

2 MS. LYNN: And people can go out and work along
3 the river or do things along the river and, inevitably,
4 from my experience, form some attachment to the work
5 they've done.

6 MS. CARSON: I agree that's a good thing. But
7 what if somebody came in with a proposal that says,
8 "Hey, we're going to hire a hundred minimum wage guys to
9 go out and clean up trash on the river"?

10 MS. LYNN: Good point.

11 MS. CARSON: That might be something we think is
12 worth doing.

13 MS. LYNN: Absolutely.

14 MS. CARSON: With no educational components at
15 all.

16 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

17 MR. PURDY: Yeah. Good thought.

18 MS. CARSON: But that doesn't exist in our
19 current three categories.

20 MR. CAMERON: Well, let's say the Rainshadow
21 program wasn't going to pick up any trash, you know, the
22 flip side of that, would that --

23 MS. CARSON: Then I would have more trouble
24 supporting it.

25 MR. SWAN: I would, too.

1 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

2 MS. CARSON: I don't know. I guess, I'm a
3 little bit with Tom on -- I'm really looking for stuff
4 that's going to have a benefit to the river --

5 MR. SWAN: Impact.

6 MS. CARSON: -- in the next year.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So this is really helpful
8 to me. Because a fourth proposal that pops into my mind
9 is the storm water proposal from the City of
10 Reno.

11 MR. PURDY: We're scattering ourselves out here
12 quite a bit. I think, we ought to try to take these,
13 process them.

14 MR. CAMERON: Well, okay. Without, then,
15 bringing up that one, I'll make the point that, I think,
16 in my mind, just to follow up on Janet's point, is that,
17 I think, we should be able, in our minds, to draw --
18 this is maybe implied in our rejection of the UNR
19 hundred thousand dollar proposal, is that this should be
20 plausible, that as a result of the grant, there will be
21 some physical change, even if it's distant and diffuse.

22 You know, I can't help it, I'm going to go there
23 just for one second. Educating people who live near a
24 storm drain is not to pour motor oil in. I'm going to
25 say that has a chance to have a positive impact, even

1 though I don't think we could expect the proposal, the
2 proponents to measure it somehow.

3 But there's a test somehow, I think, maybe that
4 we're developing that any of these proposals has to
5 plausibly change the physical, improve physically the
6 future.

7 MS. CARSON: I like it.

8 MR. SWAN: Sort of like pornography, you know it
9 when you see it.

10 MR. CAMERON: Well, that may be one to apply.
11 But that's what I sense. I mean especially since we
12 like so much the picking up the trash. I think, that
13 feels good to us because it's so obvious and immediate,
14 that it helps.

15 Some of these are going to get more distant, and
16 some will fall off the edge just because we can't
17 understand how that's going to help the river.

18 MS. CARSON: Yeah. I'm in line with that. Can
19 I -- Let me just take a stab at a motion, see if anybody
20 likes it.

21 Is that my motion, if it were ever to get a
22 second, would be to not fund the Snapshot Day --

23 MR. COBB: Second.

24 MS. CARSON: Well, okay. Maybe I'll just end it
25 there.

1 MR. PURDY: Yeah. Yeah. Don't make it any more
2 complicated than we have to.

3 MS. CARSON: I'll shut up.

4 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion?

5 MR. CAMERON: I would like to know if you would
6 consider an amendment. In the communication on one of
7 our previous ones, we included in the motion part of the
8 message. And on another one we had no message, although
9 we discussed it. I guess, I'd like to know how we are
10 handling the communication back. Is that -- Are we
11 going to tie that up at the end or --

12 MR. ASKIN: Yeah. I'm making notes. And at the
13 end, I can share with you the comments I've listed, to
14 share back in a single-page letter written communication
15 back to each applicant.

16 And you can let me know how that fits what
17 you've said and what we might want to change in that
18 before I draft the letters.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So on this one, I'm not
20 sure. What do you have for this?

21 MR. ASKIN: For Snapshot?

22 MR. CAMERON: Yeah. What's our rationale?

23 MR. ASKIN: I have that \$3,000 would be -- you
24 consider that excessive for volunteer recognition. And
25 that you recognize that although the info or data that

1 they're developing is not scientifically valid, there is
2 a value in the public involvement and education. So.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So what was it about the
4 education that --

5 MS. CARSON: Oh. Can I just say, my main reason
6 for not supporting this is the geographical location.

7 MR. PURDY: Yeah. It's in there.

8 MR. CAMERON: That one is less clear to me.
9 Because it all flows downhill.

10 MR. GODBOUT: I agree, the whole watershed is
11 connected. And somebody made a comment earlier that
12 there was a project -- well, you had made it, Chris, or
13 somebody had called about it, up in the Tahoe Basin.

14 I think, that's one of the reasons why we're
15 having problems with the river, because we don't think
16 of it as an integrated watershed.

17 MS. CARSON: I agree.

18 MR. GODBOUT: Every point connects to every
19 other point. And that's why we have the problems
20 nationwide that we do with water quality and quantity,
21 because everybody looks at it piecemeal.

22 And, I think, actually, in the future I'd like
23 to open it up to the entire watershed.

24 MS. LYNN: I think, the concept is good.

25 MR. CAMERON: Well, in that respect, this is --

1 I'm sure this one is -- well, I'm not sure. I doubt it
2 will fly here. But I actually wouldn't mind providing a
3 small amount of funds to this, a partial funding of
4 this.

5 MR. GODBOUT: How about an amendment that we
6 agree to fund the entire amount with the exception of
7 the barbecue?

8 MR. CAMERON: I even think that's too much.

9 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

10 MR. CAMERON: I don't -- This one seemed very
11 rich to me. But I also -- I haven't heard that the --
12 to me, the geographic isn't an issue, because those
13 water quality problems upstream become ours. The
14 educational merits of it seem every bit as compelling to
15 me as some of the other ones we've discussed.

16 I just feel like it's too much money for what --
17 I don't think -- I guess, I would like not to send such
18 a defeated -- especially since we have an abundance of
19 funds at the moment, I wouldn't mind providing a modest
20 grant, just not on the order that they're asking.

21 MR. COBB: I take issue with the lab sample.
22 It's going to be of no benefit, one sample one day out
23 of the year. The education party. The report printing.
24 I mean you're printing a report on samples you took one
25 day out of the year. Come on. Even a layman knows that

1 it takes time to collect data over a period of time to
2 be of any benefit.

3 I could see funding the cameras, the film
4 developing, volunteer supplies, the trash bags, whatever
5 it takes to get out there and do this. But paying for
6 the University of Nevada's overhead? Come on.

7 MR. SWAN: That's my biggest problem.

8 MR. CAMERON: There's a motion on the table,
9 right, without a second at the moment?

10 MS. CARSON: Did it ever get a second?

11 MR. COBB: He seconded it, but we're under
12 discussion still.

13 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion.

14 MR. SWAN: Amendment.

15 MS. LYNN: You can withdraw, you can amend, you
16 can do whatever you want.

17 MR. CAMERON: I wonder. So can I offer an
18 amendment to the motion?

19 MR. GODBOUT: I think so.

20 MR. CAMERON: Which is that we approve -- I'm
21 going to do the math here, 2,000; basically, it's the
22 report printing.

23 MR. SWAN: 53 percent funding.

24 MR. CAMERON: 53 percent?

25 MR. SWAN: That gets rid of the labor.

1 MR. CAMERON: I was going to recommend funding
2 the total of the report printing, which is 1500;
3 volunteer supplies, 1500; film development and
4 disposable cameras, which is --

5 MS. CARSON: Why are they doing film? Why
6 aren't they doing digital?

7 MR. CAMERON: They may not have --

8 MR. COBB: Disposable cameras.

9 MR. CAMERON: How many cameras do you need?
10 Maybe --

11 MS. LYNN: They're not digital cameras. They're
12 the little throw-a-ways.

13 MS. CARSON: But don't 90 percent of their
14 volunteers own a digital camera?

15 MS. LYNN: We don't know that.

16 MR. CAMERON: For \$320.

17 MR. GODBOUT: You could buy one camera.

18 MS. CARSON: But the product that comes out of
19 that is much less useful than a digital camera.

20 MR. COBB: Well, you could develop them on a CD.

21 MS. CARSON: That's true. That's right.

22 MR. ASKIN: All right. I would suggest, if you
23 can't support substantially the request, and you're
24 going to pick it down to that much, I would suggest that
25 you decline this, and you invite them to reapply based

1 around what you're looking for.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

3 MR. GODBOUT: When are they planning on doing
4 this?

5 MR. SWAN: May.

6 MR. CAMERON: September, I think.

7 MR. SWAN: May is there. Snapshot Day.

8 MR. ASKIN: Can you ask them to reapply in
9 January?

10 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

11 MR. ASKIN: You could set whatever time frame
12 you want. It doesn't necessarily have to be part of the
13 next round.

14 MS. LYNN: And it may not be this year. It may
15 be next year, if they want to go for it again.

16 MS. CARSON: They've been doing it for five
17 years, so they must have their funding lined up.

18 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

19 MR. GODBOUT: I have to go back on something
20 that you were saying, is that I think the important
21 thing about this is getting people out on the river.

22 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

23 MR. SWAN: They're going to do it anyway.

24 MR. GODBOUT: The same with the Cleanup Day.
25 Pardon?

1 MR. SWAN: They're going to do it, even if they
2 don't -- like she said earlier, this is going to happen
3 whether you give them money or not.

4 MS. CARSON: Right.

5 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

6 MR. COBB: I think, you know, we ask them to --
7 we reject it and ask them to reapply for funds that --

8 MR. CAMERON: Directly support the effort.

9 MS. COBB: Directly support that.

10 MR. CAMERON: The advantage, to me -- I'm going
11 to make one final comment in favor of some level of
12 support. To the extent people in the upper watershed
13 even begin to think that we live down here --

14 MS. LYNN: Exactly.

15 MR. CAMERON: -- I think we do ourselves a
16 service by supporting their activities upstream.

17 MS. CARSON: That's true.

18 MR. COBB: Yes.

19 MR. CAMERON: So if -- I defer to Chris's
20 professional judgment, that if it's more appropriate to
21 ask for a resubmittal, I'm going to make a motion that
22 we reject the proposal in its current form.

23 MS. CARSON: I don't think you can.

24 MR. CAMERON: Oh. Sorry.

25 MS. HARRISON: There's already a motion to

1 reject it.

2 MR. CAMERON: I withdraw my previous motion.

3 MS. CARSON: You could say what you would make a
4 motion to do if you were --

5 MS. LYNN: No, just withdraw, and get the second
6 withdrawn, and then start over again.

7 MR. CAMERON: Nobody seconded my first one, I
8 don't think.

9 MS. CARSON: What was your first one?

10 MR. GODBOUT: What was your first one?

11 MR. CAMERON: To fund \$5,000 according to those
12 direct expenses that I began adding up.

13 MR. GODBOUT: I would second that. Can I second
14 it?

15 MS. HARRISON: What you need is somebody, you
16 need to --

17 MS. CARSON: May I withdraw my original motion?

18 MR. COBB: I withdraw my second to her original
19 motion.

20 MS. CARSON: Okay. The slate is clear.

21 MR. CAMERON: I withdraw my suggested amendment.

22 MS. HARRISON: Then you can make a new motion.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So I would move that we
24 reject the proposal, as submitted, and request the
25 proponent to resubmit for a smaller award and limited

1 only to supplies needed for carrying out their volunteer
2 activities.

3 MR. COBB: Second that.

4 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion?

5 MR. SWAN: Yeah, just a quickie. On that, then,
6 are you going to fund indirect costs to the university?

7 MR. ASKIN: You may be required to. I'm not
8 sure how the university works in that respect. But why
9 don't we do this. Why don't you list the items in the
10 budget that you believe are valid.

11 MR. SWAN: I have a -- just in respect to
12 funding the overhead, do you want to make sure that you
13 get enough money to pay for those pieces and the
14 university overhead? So if it's \$5,000 worth of the
15 operating cost, you want to make sure they get the
16 \$5,000 in operating cost and the overhead, just so they
17 have enough money to do what you want them to do.

18 Is that -- Do you understand what I'm saying?

19 MR. ASKIN: Well, I think, we could, I could ask
20 them about the overhead in the question back to them.
21 You know, is this something that is required, or not?
22 You know, we didn't see overhead listed in the other
23 request for the capital expenditures, for the equipment.

24 MR. SWAN: Right.

25 MR. ASKIN: And here, if they tried and say that

1 the overhead is necessary as relates to staff positions,
2 or something like that, well, they're also charging
3 overhead here on film developing and on the disposable
4 cameras.

5 MR. SWAN: That's what I'm saying.

6 MR. ASKIN: So the two applications are
7 different, which would indicate the university doesn't
8 require overhead.

9 MS. CARSON: Unless it's a difference between
10 purchasing equipment may not require overhead, whereas
11 doing a program may, just in terms of their needs to
12 capture costs.

13 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

14 MS. CARSON: Do you really think it's such a bad
15 thing to just fund part of it? I mean, because I'd be
16 comfortable with sending them some money.

17 MR. ASKIN: Well, you did make the point that
18 they're going to do this anyway, and they've been doing
19 it for some years.

20 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

21 MR. ASKIN: So in that respect, it's not a
22 make-or-break thing to provide funding at a lower level.

23 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think, frankly, if I were
24 them, I mean the effort to put in another proposal for
25 \$5,000 is barely going to be worth it.

1 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

2 MR. PURDY: Yeah, we're cutting it pretty thin
3 on them.

4 MS. CARSON: Right.

5 MR. ASKIN: Okay. What would you want to limit
6 your grant to, in terms of the expenditures?

7 MR. COBB: I'll withdraw my second.

8 MR. CAMERON: I withdraw my motion, again.

9 MR. ASKIN: Well, now the "no" has gone from a
10 "not yet" to a "maybe yes." So, I guess, we need
11 another motion.

12 MR. CAMERON: I had previously discussed the
13 items which add up to, I think, four thousand --

14 MR. COBB: 4,120.

15 MR. CAMERON: 4,120 was report printing,
16 volunteer supplies, film developing and disposable
17 cameras.

18 MR. ASKIN: Okay.

19 MS. CARSON: What about lab costs?

20 MR. CAMERON: The remark that was made was that
21 the scientific value of the data is, if not zero, close
22 to.

23 MR. SWAN: The lab costs are zero.

24 MR. COBB: No, no. They're almost \$6,000 for a
25 single day of sampling.

1 MS. HARRISON: I'm kind of sitting on my hands
2 here, because I don't know that -- I'm not really
3 appropriately part of your deliberations. But I think
4 that if you send a message back to them that the data
5 that they are collecting is worthless, that you will
6 actually discourage the -- you may be doing more in the
7 way of discouraging this program than you really intend.

8 So while you can --

9 MR. CAMERON: Well, I don't think we can just
10 not be silent on that.

11 MS. HARRISON: What I would suggest is that you
12 might want to be silent with respect to that part of it.

13 MR. CAMERON: Right.

14 MS. HARRISON: And then just add some
15 affirmative statements about why you are supportive of
16 the direct costs.

17 MR. CAMERON: I don't see any value in sending
18 the message that science is too --

19 MR. ASKIN: I had already scratched that. And I
20 reworked it to say that the information or data from a
21 sample one day of the year is not substantial enough.

22 MS. HARRISON: Well, I wouldn't even say that,
23 if it were me.

24 MR. ASKIN: All right. Okay. Now we will just
25 say that you value the public involvement in education.

1 MS. LYNN: Yes.

2 MS. CARSON: Yes.

3 MR. GODBOUT: Do we have a motion?

4 MS. CARSON: Could I make another discussion
5 point?

6 MR. GODBOUT: Yes.

7 MS. CARSON: One of the things that struck me,
8 and they don't specify, I got the feeling that most of
9 the sampling is in the Tahoe Basin. And I have this
10 impression that the Tahoe Basin is loaded with research
11 money effort.

12 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

13 MR. ASKIN: Yeah.

14 MS. CARSON: Below Tahoe City is relatively
15 neglected.

16 MS. LYNN: Below the dam.

17 MS. CARSON: Below the dam. And so what I would
18 like, if I were the queen of the day, I would say,
19 "Look, you guys, we will fund the part below Tahoe Dam
20 to some level."

21 MR. COBB: If you prorated it.

22 MS. CARSON: Because that's where I think --

23 MR. CAMERON: Should we give them a quarter?
24 I'll send it in the mail.

25 MS. CARSON: We need more done in that reach,

1 and we don't need to put our little bit of money into
2 the Tahoe Basin. I just -- That's my perception.

3 MS. LYNN: Well, again, I get back to Craig's
4 point of view, that the lake is definitely a part of the
5 watershed. It definitely supplies the water.

6 And to get people out looking at the creeks that
7 feed into Tahoe, that feed out of -- through the river,
8 are still connected, but say we -- I think, we should
9 say that we want to see more emphasis on the Truckee
10 River portion than the lake portion.

11 MS. CARSON: Oh, I won't deny the connection.
12 But what I see is millions and millions of federal
13 dollars going into the Tahoe Basin.

14 MR. CAMERON: If we were -- I think, maybe where
15 I thought the \$24,000 request was too rich, and I think,
16 if we're talking about \$4,120 dollars, that that is a
17 modest enough contribution on our part, that we don't
18 need to feel like we're --

19 MR. COBB: No.

20 MR. CAMERON: -- being taken advantage of.

21 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

22 MR. CAMERON: I don't think that the value to us
23 of simply having our community represented on -- in
24 their minds, and that we're downstream, is worth \$4,120
25 all by itself.

1 MS. LYNN: So let me understand, then, where
2 you're getting your \$4,000 from.

3 MR. CAMERON: Report printing is 15 -- I'm going
4 from the bottom. Under Operating Costs, I'll go from
5 the top down.

6 MS. LYNN: Okay.

7 MR. CAMERON: My motion would include disposable
8 cameras, film developing, volunteer supplies, and report
9 printing.

10 MS. HARRISON: Just another point. Remember
11 that all of your recommendations for funding will be
12 going back to the board for their approval and before
13 these projects are actually funded, so that there is
14 sensitivity on the part of the board to the geographic
15 reach of these grants.

16 And the comment about, essentially, prorating
17 your grant based upon the below Tahoe City portion is
18 something that may be a good selling point with the
19 board.

20 MR. SWAN: Provide only data in the Truckee
21 River. It doesn't talk about Tahoe Basin.

22 MR. COBB: It's referring to further in there.

23 MR. SWAN: It doesn't when I do the analysis for
24 them. They're all tributaries to the Truckee River.

25 MR. PURDY: Yeah, that's what it says, all 65

1 streams that feed into Lake Tahoe, so forth, the samples
2 taken from the Little Truckee as it flows into Lake
3 Tahoe, to all 65 streams that feed Lake Tahoe.

4 MS. CARSON: And there's a gap in the program
5 from Third Creek to Ward Creek.

6 Do we have a motion on the table?

7 MS. HARRISON: No.

8 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to -- On the latest
9 point that was made about pro rata, I just think that
10 we're talking about a level of funding that's so modest,
11 and I don't know that they would even be able to
12 necessarily calculate how they could do it.

13 MR. COBB: No, I meant more prorating the other
14 costs here. As far as what we're looking at in your
15 motion, the operating costs, I don't think I have a
16 problem with that.

17 MS. LYNN: Well, even though Tom talks about the
18 lab costs, if you don't support that, essentially,
19 you're not supporting the water collection, which sends
20 the message that we talked about.

21 MR. SWAN: I'm okay with that.

22 MS. LYNN: You're okay with that?

23 MR. SWAN: I mean the lab work.

24 MS. LYNN: What the lab costs? Yeah.

25 MR. SWAN: I do lab, but they don't charge. I

1 think, they must get -- I think, I think they send the
2 forms to the state health lab. And I don't do those.
3 So, I guess, the state health lab is charging \$47 a
4 sample to do that. But I don't. I'm okay with the
5 state health lab.

6 MS. LYNN: Okay. If we removed everything from
7 operating costs, or removed the bulk now -- What am I
8 looking for here? Oh. Removed the volunteer education
9 and appreciation party from this budget, that would be
10 \$9,760. Is that an unreasonable expense for the public
11 education?

12 MS. CARSON: To fund that?

13 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

14 MS. CARSON: Was that a motion?

15 MS. LYNN: I haven't made it one. I'm just
16 tossing it out for discussion.

17 MR. GODBOUT: You're still in the middle of a
18 motion, aren't you?

19 MS. HARRISON: I don't think we have a motion.
20 I think, they've all been withdrawn.

21 MR. GODBOUT: No, you were making a motion.

22 MR. COBB: No, he made a motion.

23 MR. GODBOUT: He was making a motion about
24 funding, what items to fund.

25 MS. LYNN: Yeah. Sorry.

1 MR. PURDY: That's defensible, to fund what
2 you're talking about and skip the party.

3 MR. GODBOUT: Because I'm not opposed to funding
4 some of the labor, like the Clean Water Team Plan.

5 MR. PURDY: Yeah, it takes time to set that up.

6 MR. CAMERON: They didn't ask for that, though.

7 MS. CARSON: What I would like, I guess, what I
8 would like to see is fund a portion of this and send
9 them a message we would like them to emphasize the
10 Truckee River below Tahoe Dam.

11 MS. LYNN: Yes, and no money for parties.

12 MS. CARSON: Yeah. And I'm okay with the 9,760
13 figure.

14 MR. SWAN: You're going to fund the other party,
15 aren't you, the Truckee River Cleanup Day?

16 MS. LYNN: No. That's donated.

17 MR. SWAN: I thought that was a party. I
18 thought they were getting money for that.

19 MS. LYNN: No. They're donated.

20 MR. CAMERON: Well, I'm hearing the question
21 right now seems to be boiling down to how much. And do
22 we want to -- are we going to base a number by adding up
23 elements that we like, or are we simply going to come up
24 with a number that's just comfortable as a fraction of
25 what they ask for?

1 MR. ASKIN: Well, based on what Sylvia said, I
2 think you should come up with a number, not tie it to
3 specific expenses on this project.

4 MR. COBB: Right.

5 MR. ASKIN: And limit it to activities below the
6 Truckee River Dam on the Truckee River.

7 MS. CARSON: Yeah. Can we send them a message
8 saying, "You know, we are interested in funding that
9 portion of your project which is below Tahoe City, but
10 we can't determine from your proposal what that is"?

11 MR. CAMERON: That seems -- or Tahoe City itself
12 is arbitrary. I don't understand, I mean.

13 MS. CARSON: That's where all of that money for
14 the Tahoe Basin research cuts off.

15 MR. COBB: You have to state state line, though.
16 Because right now, our geographic boundaries are
17 supposed to be state line.

18 MS. CARSON: Is what?

19 MR. COBB: Right now, our geographic boundaries
20 are supposed to be state line.

21 MS. LYNN: That eliminates the project.

22 MS. CARSON: Okay. So your impression is they
23 don't do anything below the state line?

24 MS. LYNN: No, my impression is -- No. My
25 impression is they don't do anything.

1 MS. CARSON: Well, then, I want to vote against
2 the thing entirely.

3 MR. CAMERON: Well, now, they say they go all
4 the way down to Pyramid Lake.

5 MS. CARSON: They do say that?

6 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

7 MS. LYNN: I have a hard time with that. I'm
8 skeptical of that.

9 MS. CARSON: What if we said, "Look, we're
10 rejecting you now. We'd welcome a proposal in the
11 future which covers Nevada or covers" --

12 MR. GODBOUT: Or we change our criteria.

13 MS. LYNN: Or we change our criteria.

14 MS. CARSON: -- "to the Tahoe Dam"?

15 MR. CAMERON: But, frankly, right now, I don't
16 necessarily think our criteria reads so rigidly that
17 this falls without it.

18 MR. COBB: I think, you fund a portion that we
19 feel is appropriate of your level of what we're doing
20 from state line to this. And by funding a portion of
21 it, we're sending the message that you need to --

22 MS. CARSON: And we don't know what that is, do
23 we?

24 MR. GODBOUT: If you look at the cover letter on
25 the Request for Approval: For this initial round of

1 funding, capital projects.

2 Capital projects. Well, this isn't a capital
3 project.

4 MR. CAMERON: But then it said educational and
5 research projects should fall within the same
6 boundaries.

7 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah. So for initial round of
8 funding, capital projects should -- will be considered
9 only if they focus primarily within the geographic
10 boundaries of Nevada, state line to the west and Vista
11 Boulevard to the east. So, I think, under that --

12 MS. CARSON: We really ought to follow our own
13 guidelines.

14 MR. GODBOUT: We should. Out of here. With a
15 recommendation that they come back and either follow
16 this criteria more closely, or we change our criteria
17 before the second go-round.

18 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

19 MR. CAMERON: But, frankly, if you take their
20 proposal at face value, they say they go -- they have
21 that reach in there. Now, they haven't specified how.

22 MR. COBB: Primarily.

23 MS. CARSON: But our criteria is primarily. And
24 we know it's not that.

25 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

2 MS. LYNN: I mean I like the concept of this
3 project for public awareness and public education. It
4 doesn't do everything we want it to do. I think, we
5 need to maybe go back and change our criteria to go to
6 the dam, then, and go into California; but understanding
7 that it's the watershed. But for this go-round, we need
8 to follow our own criteria.

9 MR. ASKIN: So regarding future criteria, from
10 what you've spoken about so far this morning, I had two
11 points I listed for our discussion under item seven or
12 eight.

13 One is that you wish to support capital
14 projects. You've expressed that two or three times
15 again this morning. You're looking for capital projects
16 that have a direct impact. And opening the geographic
17 boundaries. And with that, partly because the whole
18 watershed is so interconnected, but, also, partly
19 because you have a substantial amount of funds --

20 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

21 MR. ASKIN: -- to distribute. And we need that
22 next round to be much bigger. And, I think, that'll
23 happen with the geographic boundaries, but even more so
24 with an understanding of the amount of money that you
25 have and that this process is moving forward, and with

1 all of the organizations becoming more familiar with
2 this. I think, a lot of them are out there working
3 right now, thinking about what they're going to ask for
4 next time.

5 MR. COBB: I think, that's good when you look at
6 the criteria; but we have to always remember the fact
7 that we're going to be sending this to the TMWA Board.
8 So the validity of what we send to them, they're going
9 to have to explain to the public why they're also
10 approving these expenditures.

11 MR. CAMERON: Our drinking water comes out of
12 the lake.

13 MR. COBB: I agree. I agree.

14 MR. CAMERON: But, I think, we are making a
15 mistake by not providing some level of support to this
16 project. I'll make my last comment before this
17 commission.

18 MS. HARRISON: Just to follow up, though, on
19 what Chris was saying, just because you weren't present
20 when the board was deliberating this month, to begin
21 with. And the geographic reach of this grant is a
22 sensitive issue.

23 MR. COBB: Very sensitive.

24 MS. HARRISON: Very sensitive. And I would even
25 recommend that before you expand your geographic reach

1 beyond what your current criteria suggests is that you
2 would take that to the board and make a case, as the
3 advisors, so that they can make a case to the public, so
4 that you can support, support those future decisions.

5 But I wouldn't go there now. I don't think you
6 want to be in the position of having the board have to
7 second-guess your decisions with respect to the
8 geographic extent of these grants.

9 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

10 MS. HARRISON: Until you've had that discussion
11 with them.

12 MS. LYNN: Okay.

13 MR. GODBOUT: Do we have a motion?

14 MR. SWAN: I make a motion that we reject this.

15 MR. GODBOUT: Do we have a second?

16 MR. PURDY: Yeah, I'll second it.

17 MR. GODBOUT: Any discussion?

18 MS. CARSON: Do we want to be specific in our
19 message to them about why? I think we do.

20 MR. SWAN: It's not a motion.

21 MS. LYNN: I think we just did.

22 MR. PURDY: Isn't it kind of part of it? He's
23 taking notes.

24 MR. ASKIN: Yeah.

25 MS. CARSON: It seems the message is -- there's

1 two messages. One is this first round of funding
2 focuses geographically, primarily.

3 MR. GODBOUT: For this round.

4 MR. ASKIN: That's the message. And I have to
5 add --

6 MS. CARSON: Here.

7 MR. ASKIN: -- that we decline to fund their
8 request because the project falls primarily outside the
9 geographic boundaries of state line to Vista Boulevard.
10 However, you like the project and --

11 MS. CARSON: I think, we want to encourage them
12 to conduct their activities downstream.

13 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

14 MS. CARSON: And we will be seeking to expand
15 the scope of our operation.

16 MR. CAMERON: We may.

17 MS. CARSON: We may.

18 MR. CAMERON: We may.

19 MS. CARSON: Okay.

20 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

21 MR. GODBOUT: Was that an amendment to the
22 motion?

23 MR. CAMERON: I don't think it's necessary.

24 MS. CARSON: I don't think it needs to be.

25 MR. ASKIN: I'll just put down that you

1 encourage them to expand their activity downstream. And
2 we can, amongst ourselves, discuss the geographic
3 boundaries.

4 MR. COBB: Right.

5 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

6 MR. GODBOUT: Any further discussion?

7 MR. ASKIN: Okay.

8 MR. GODBOUT: All those in favor, say "aye."

9 (All but one said "aye.") Those opposed?

10 MS. LYNN: No.

11 MR. GODBOUT: The motion carries.

12 (Motion carries.)

13 MR. SWAN: Do we still have the other
14 educational one to approve?

15 MS. LYNN: Yes, we do.

16 MR. SWAN: I need a -- Excuse me for a moment.

17 MR. GODBOUT: One-minute break to refill cups.

18 * * * * *

19 (A break was taken, 9:40 to 9:50 a.m.)

20 * * * * *

21 MR. GODBOUT: Shall we reconvene?

22 MS. HARRISON: Yeah.

23 MR. GODBOUT: Where are we?

24 MS. CARSON: We have those three we pulled out
25 to look at, and we dealt with one of them.

1 MR. GODBOUT: One of them?

2 MS. LYNN: Yes.

3 MR. GODBOUT: So we're still looking at --

4 MR. COBB: The first one that was brought out
5 was Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful. And I feel I've had
6 enough discussion on it that I would approve the \$9,400
7 and change for the project. I feel it falls primarily
8 within the geographic area and what we're trying to
9 accomplish.

10 MR. PURDY: I second that discussion.

11 MS. CARSON: I wondered if we could ask them if
12 they could do more with more money.

13 MR. PURDY: Yeah. It would be a comment.

14 MS. CARSON: I think, this is a terrific
15 program. It does immediate good things for the river.
16 And I just wondered, does it need to be bigger?

17 MR. GODBOUT: Or more often?

18 MS. LYNN: My sense is they're stretched about
19 as far as they can go. But, understanding that there
20 might be additional funding, I would give them what they
21 asked for this time and ask them to consider expanding
22 their proposal next year.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. But this is for next --
24 When does this happen?

25 MS. LYNN: It happens next fall.

1 MR. CAMERON: In September. A variation of your
2 suggestion, Susan, would be even in the interim, not for
3 September '07, consider something bigger, but they could
4 come back if they can envision an expansion of the
5 program, September of '06, that we would entertain an --
6 MS. CARSON: Additional funding.
7 MS. LYNN: Additional funding.
8 MR. CAMERON: For, essentially, the same
9 programming on a bigger scale from --
10 MR. PURDY: Yeah.
11 MS. CARSON: The one that specifically struck me
12 is couldn't we do more than 20 storm drains, for
13 instance?
14 MR. CAMERON: Exactly.
15 MS. CARSON: I mean aren't there hundreds of
16 storm drains?
17 MS. LYNN: There are thousands of storm drains,
18 and it's a very tedious project. Getting people out to
19 do that project is very difficult.
20 MR. CAMERON: Why don't we pay them to do it?
21 MR. PURDY: Yeah, let them do that.
22 MS. LYNN: Well, there are the prison crews.
23 MS. CARSON: That's another great source.
24 MR. CAMERON: A great house down the street
25 needs a stencil on the driveway. The kid keeps changing

1 his oil.

2 MS. LYNN: The City of Reno is taking over the
3 storm drain stenciling. Sparks does it on a limited
4 basis. Maybe we ought to ask the cities to undertake
5 that project.

6 MR. ASKIN: Okay. I made a couple notes. I've
7 started to make a list of specific projects that you may
8 like to see with the next round of funding. So I've
9 just gone ahead and added storm drain stenciling to
10 that, as we hit that point later on in our agenda.

11 MS. LYNN: Good.

12 MR. ASKIN: And in addition to what you just
13 mentioned about providing the full funding that the Keep
14 Truckee Meadows Beautiful group has asked for, the
15 letter encouraging them to apply for additional funds
16 should they be able to expand their efforts next fall
17 and, also, suggesting that they list the 1,000 hours of
18 volunteer time in their budget in any future proposal or
19 volunteer time to substantiate that.

20 MS. LYNN: Exactly.

21 MS. CARSON: We had that motion already, didn't
22 we?

23 MR. GODBOUT: We're in discussion.

24 MS. CARSON: Call for the question.

25 MR. GODBOUT: Pardon?

1 MS. CARSON: Call for the question.

2 MR. GODBOUT: Call for the question. All those
3 in favor of approving the Truckee River Cleanup Day, say
4 "aye." (All said "aye.") Those opposed? Motion
5 carries.

6 (Motion carries.)

7 MS. CARSON: So, then, we were on to the
8 Rainshadow.

9 MR. COBB: Rainshadow.

10 MR. GODBOUT: Open for discussion?

11 MS. LYNN: I liked this project. And I didn't
12 have problems with the 2,160 for labor associated with
13 it. They, too, are providing snacks and lunches. So if
14 we aren't consistent, we may want to suggest that we not
15 fund the \$675.

16 But in the case, to keep kids, to keep them
17 interested and to keep them going and keep their energy
18 up, \$675 for --

19 MR. COBB: This isn't really appreciation, this
20 is a part of --

21 MR. PURDY: They're out there all day. They got
22 to eat.

23 MR. COBB: I think, in essence, with each
24 proposal, there's going to be some differences of --

25 MS. LYNN: Okay.

1 MR. COBB: -- food source, et cetera, so.

2 MS. LYNN: And my thought, you know, this is
3 another one where I think they may need more supplies
4 than they've budgeted for.

5 MR. COBB: Yes.

6 MS. LYNN: I thought they were rather frugal on
7 their bus and their digital cameras and their art
8 supplies.

9 MR. CAMERON: Well, and, you know, it's funny,
10 because I don't want to say anything contrary to this
11 proposal. But the idea that Tom -- I don't agree with
12 what Tom said, in its most absolute form, about labor.

13 But in this case, the lead teacher, Phillip
14 Parker -- I mean we are, basically -- you know, this is
15 a position at the school that needs to be paid whether
16 our project exists or not. That does trouble me a
17 little bit.

18 MR. COBB: Right.

19 MR. CAMERON: I don't want to take that out of
20 the risk of this project not happening. But that sort
21 of seems like one of their sort of overhead costs.

22 MS. LYNN: Well, I look at it as a value added.
23 They probably won't do this project unless they get some
24 funds for it.

25 MR. PURDY: These youngsters are at-risk.

1 They've got a lot of things working against them anyway.
2 I'd kind of hate to chintz on them.

3 MS. LYNN: I have no problem with helping pay
4 his salary, because I think it is a value added to the
5 program.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

7 MR. COBB: And, I guess, the modesty of the
8 proposal --

9 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

10 MR. COBB: -- I think, that helps me send it up.

11 MS. LYNN: Get past that.

12 MR. COBB: Send it up to take a look at, for the
13 boards to deal with.

14 MR. CAMERON: I raised it mostly because I
15 thought we were having a good discussion on that point.

16 MR. COBB: Most definitely.

17 MR. CAMERON: It played into that.

18 MR. COBB: I totally agree.

19 MS. CARSON: Can we send them a message we
20 like -- I mean they're going to be done by June.
21 Somehow I'd like to encourage them to participate in the
22 Truckee River Cleanup Day.

23 MS. LYNN: They did last year.

24 MS. CARSON: They did?

25 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

1 MS. CARSON: Okay.

2 MR. ASKIN: Would you like to try additional
3 funding on our transportation?

4 MS. LYNN: I was going to suggest that we bump
5 this up to 5,000 and that the additional increase be
6 used for transportation and supplies.

7 MR. PURDY: We were talking about getting them
8 to take a few pictures of the driftwood and stuff.

9 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to get really crazy and
10 bump it up to 6,000.

11 MS. LYNN: Okay.

12 MR. CAMERON: Especially if -- you know, I
13 actually think one of the more compelling parts of this
14 is they're able to present their final results. I
15 think, if the -- because I mean that building, but the
16 Reno City Hall, in a public forum or at the library,
17 that if we can, if we can help that be a more -- higher
18 impact, higher quality product.

19 MR. GODBOUT: M-hm.

20 MR. CAMERON: By providing more money.

21 MR. COBB: Better presentation.

22 MS. LYNN: Better presentation.

23 MS. CARSON: Why don't we ask them to make a
24 presentation for the board?

25 MS. LYNN: Yes.

1 MR. CAMERON: So in that respect, I don't think
2 we need to be -- whatever.

3 MR. PURDY: I like the six grand, and then I
4 think this goes good for presentations. The city,
5 they're concerned about -- it's pretty graphic.

6 MR. GODBOUT: How do we reconcile the 25 percent
7 match, though?

8 MR. COBB: Well, you can consider the students'
9 time as in-kind services, because they're labor.

10 MR. GODBOUT: Okay.

11 MR. PURDY: That's a good point.

12 MR. COBB: So as part of their documentation,
13 they can provide us with a number of hours the students
14 spend on it, so we can justify in-kind services.

15 MS. CARSON: In terms of getting the results
16 out, I wonder if we couldn't buy some space in the
17 Gazette-Journal to get a broader audience, to see what
18 they found.

19 MS. LYNN: I think, it is a newsworthy story. I
20 don't think we need to buy space. I think, it's a
21 newsworthy story. And, I think, that's -- you know, you
22 don't need to buy space for it.

23 MS. CARSON: Maybe we need to just tell them to
24 be sure to -- press release.

25 MS. LYNN: Get the Gazette-Journal to follow

1 them along as an ongoing story.

2 MS. CARSON: Yeah, there's plenty of use of
3 media outlet.

4 MR. PURDY: I'd like to increase it to six K.

5 MR. CAMERON: We're really on the edge here.

6 MR. GODBOUT: I thought it was underfunded, too.

7 MR. ASKIN: Can I add one thing? We have little
8 control over what the Reno Gazette-Journal will cover or
9 publish.

10 MR. COBB: Right.

11 MR. ASKIN: However, you guys love this project.
12 It involves at-risk kids. It's definitely a feel-good
13 project. It has a direct impact on the river. So I'm
14 going to suggest that the Community Foundation do a
15 story in one of our newsletters.

16 MS. LYNN: That would be good.

17 MR. GODBOUT: Ooh.

18 MR. ASKIN: We have a good list of public
19 leaders, all the elected leaders and, of course, all the
20 private foundation funds and others.

21 MR. COBB: Good idea.

22 MS. LYNN: Good idea.

23 MR. CAMERON: Is 6,000 enough?

24 MR. GODBOUT: I'm going to float 7,500, to be
25 honest with you. I thought this one, when I read it --

1 Which it's not because I know Phillip. When I read this
2 one, to me, this was the most interesting out of all of
3 them. It really was. It serves a lot of different
4 purposes.

5 If we can just turn around just one kid, it's
6 worth 7,500 bucks. If we can turn one of these kids
7 into an activist or advocat or --

8 MS. LYNN: Or scientist.

9 MR. GODBOUT: Or scientist. That's fantastic.
10 Plus, I think, the part that I really liked most was
11 their public presentation.

12 MS. LYNN: Yes.

13 MR. GODBOUT: That, to me --

14 MR. PURDY: Yes.

15 MR. GODBOUT: That, to me, was not just to
16 educate the public, it gives them this huge boost of
17 confidence. It gives them the ability to come out of
18 their shells and express themselves.

19 MS. HARRISON: Do you want to make that subject
20 to their supporting what they would do without
21 additional money, as opposed to --

22 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

23 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah.

24 MS. HARRISON: Just say maybe six K, because I
25 think that -- but we'll bump it up to 75 if you can

1 support --

2 MR. CAMERON: We resubmit a budget for final
3 approval of the 7,500, with the understanding that the
4 additional funds beyond what we requested would go
5 toward --

6 MR. GODBOUT: Transportation.

7 MR. CAMERON: Transportation and presentation --
8 well --

9 MR. GODBOUT: And possibly digital cameras
10 with -- you know, those last three categories, the
11 transportation, digital camera and art supplies.

12 MS. LYNN: Maybe they can get two digital
13 cameras.

14 MR. GODBOUT: How many kids?

15 MR. PURDY: Ten in the program.

16 MS. HARRISON: This was a proposal that had
17 quite a lot of detail, specificity as to the funding.
18 And, I think, they should maintain that standard so that
19 they can easily report the results. But if you give
20 them a pile of dough that they just have to use because
21 you gave it to them, then you may undercut the standard
22 they've already set.

23 So, I think, resubmitting a budget for an up-to
24 amount is probably a good way to go on that.

25 MS. CARSON: I really feel like they're going to

1 go to a lot of trouble to prepare a presentation, and it
2 needs to get out to more than whoever wanders into City
3 Hall and happens to be at the TMWA Board meeting. And I
4 mean you can't control what the Gazette's going to cover
5 or not cover.

6 MR. CAMERON: What about SNCAT?

7 MS. HARRISON: All of the TMWA Board meetings
8 are covered by SNCAT.

9 MR. CAMERON: But I'm talking about a SNCAT
10 half-hour show, if we can get a film crew out to film
11 these kids in the river, you know, doing, kind of going
12 through their exercise.

13 MS. LYNN: And hiring the film crew is an
14 expense that we may want to suggest they put in their
15 budget.

16 MR. GODBOUT: Wow.

17 MR. PURDY: M-hm.

18 MR. CAMERON: What if we did \$7,500 now and ask
19 them to investigate? Because SNCAT is always looking
20 for ideas --

21 MS. LYNN: Yes.

22 MR. CAMERON: -- as to basically -- if it seems
23 workable, to come back for another, within our next
24 round, to fund a SNCAT or --

25 MR. GODBOUT: Is that the Media Center?

1 MS. LYNN: Yes.

2 MR. GODBOUT: Okay. All right.

3 MS. CARSON: Can't they do that any time?

4 MR. GODBOUT: I don't know.

5 MR. ASKIN: Yeah.

6 MS. CARSON: Because they want to do this in
7 January.

8 MR. ASKIN: I would just put that down. I know
9 Vivian French over at the Media Center real well. She'd
10 jump up all over this.

11 MS. LYNN: Yes, she would.

12 MR. ASKIN: If we included \$1,500 for them to
13 work with the Media Center to -- basically, do a
14 documentary and a public awareness piece on this.

15 MS. LYNN: Is \$1,500 enough? I tend to think
16 it's not.

17 MR. COBB: If you look at what they've got here,
18 they've got their project, 72 hours of in-kind
19 contribution, 2,160.

20 MR. GODBOUT: M-hm.

21 MR. COBB: They've got -- How many? They've got
22 10 students doing this.

23 MS. LYNN: Yes.

24 MR. COBB: Also, at 72 hours?

25 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

1 MR. COBB: So you're looking at -- if you set
2 eight bucks an hour for the kids, that's about \$5,700.
3 So there's a little over \$7,000 right now that they have
4 in-kind. So.

5 MS. CARSON: So you're saying a match isn't the
6 problem?

7 MR. COBB: No.

8 MR. ASKIN: I would just say this. I think, if
9 you approved the grant for \$7,500, \$6,000, with some
10 additional funds for the art supplies, transportation
11 and camera, and an additional \$1,500 to work with the
12 Media Center to do a video production to use as part of
13 their public presentations.

14 MS. LYNN: And if they need more, please come
15 back and ask for it.

16 MR. GODBOUT: You're invited to submit on the
17 next round.

18 MR. ASKIN: You're going to be doing cartwheels,
19 you know. This is a small school. This is exciting for
20 them. You're going to have another round of funding.
21 And you're going to be sending out invitations for
22 everybody to reapply anyway.

23 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

24 MR. CAMERON: Let me just ask, then, Chris, your
25 estimate of \$1,500, where is that? What we're paying

1 for, essentially, we have to pay for the camera time and
2 the editing time, and so that's an educated guess,
3 \$1,500 is.

4 MS. LYNN: They're going to have to have the
5 camera person out there following these kids for a day.

6 MR. ASKIN: But probably just on one day they
7 were there.

8 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

9 MR. CAMERON: I think, the Media Center would be
10 excited about this. And there would be future
11 opportunities too. So. Okay. They'll make do. They
12 provide \$7,500, they'll come up with a nice expanded
13 version of this.

14 MR. ASKIN: I think, they might do it.

15 MR. GODBOUT: Give them a chance. So where are
16 we? Is there any motion?

17 MS. LYNN: Need a motion?

18 MR. CAMERON: Somebody want to take what Chris
19 just said and turn it into a motion?

20 MR. GODBOUT: We didn't have an original motion.
21 We're still in discussion.

22 MS. LYNN: We're still in discussion.

23 MR. GODBOUT: Somebody would like to entertain a
24 motion?

25 MS. LYNN: I would so move.

1 MR. GODBOUT: And that would be?
2 MR. ASKIN: Let me repeat.
3 MS. HARRISON: Okay.
4 MR. ASKIN: So the committee has suggested
5 making a grant of \$7,500; \$6,000 would be provided,
6 above and beyond the 4,585 requested, to provide
7 additional money for art supplies, transportation and
8 camera, digital camera or cameras, equipment. Plus, an
9 additional \$1,500 in respect of the quality public
10 presentation that the committee would like to see the
11 Rainshadow Community Charter School do, to work with the
12 Media Center to develop a video production to use in
13 their public presentations.
14 MR. PURDY: Yeah, I move we approve the grant,
15 subject to the inclusion of those comments, in the
16 amount of \$7,500.
17 MR. GODBOUT: I think, that was your original
18 motion.
19 MS. LYNN: That was the original motion. Do you
20 want to second it?
21 MR. GODBOUT: Jerry, do you want to second it?
22 MR. PURDY: Yeah.
23 MR. GODBOUT: Any discussion? All those in
24 favor, say "aye." (All said "aye.") Those opposed?
25 Motion carries.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Motion carries.)

MR. GODBOUT: Would anybody like to suggest the next proposal for review? We have, I think, three left.

MR. CAMERON: I'd like to take the Business, Residential and Environmental Partnership.

MR. GODBOUT: Open for discussion?

MR. CAMERON: I'm going to give an opening comment in support of this for the following reason, which is the Living River alternative for the flood project will indeed be expert from a water quality point of view than any other alternative I'm aware of in the flood project.

I suppose the worst-case scenario that might come out would be an L.A. river type, vertical flood walls, cement entrainment. And, clearly, from a water quality point of view, that is inferior to what is implied by the Living River concept of, where possible, reconnecting the river to the floodplain, introducing meanders, et cetera.

So I think that the Living River flood alternative is very much in keeping with the spirit of the fund.

I also think the Business, Residential and Environmental Partnership, while, you know, sort of the quasi-nonprofit governmental, but has really played an

1 instrumental role in the facilitation of this
2 alternative in the flood project. And I think their
3 ongoing participation is going to be important for the
4 flood project.

5 So, I think, it is in the interest of our
6 healthy river to support this project.

7 MS. CARSON: One thing I'd like to -- I noticed.
8 I also support the project. It has a characteristic
9 that none of the other ones do, which is that our money
10 seems to leverage a large amount of federal money, which
11 gives it a multiplier benefit. It seemed to me really
12 good.

13 And then the other point I noticed is there
14 seems to be -- on page four, the footnote, there's kind
15 of critical timing that they need to do something in the
16 spring of '06, which suggests to me they ought not to be
17 postponed till a future round.

18 MS. LYNN: Well, there is the Corps' deadline.
19 And the Corps' deadline keeps slipping and slipping and
20 slipping and slipping. And this group is the group who
21 really helps keep the locals primed to want the Corps to
22 stay on track. Otherwise, frankly, if this group hadn't
23 existed, we would be nowhere.

24 And local governments acknowledge that they need
25 to do something about the flood, but without this group

1 pushing them.

2 MR. CAMERON: And there's a little bit of
3 tension, also.

4 MS. LYNN: Yes, there is.

5 MR. CAMERON: These folks kind of create some
6 friction periodically. But I do think that we have, to
7 our benefit -- to our benefits, this flood project has a
8 level of public participation and citizen involvement
9 that is unusual in our community. And, I think, it is
10 especially necessary for this type of project, less so
11 than if you're expanding a sewer plant; I don't think
12 that you need to have citizen opinion on that kind of a
13 project.

14 But on a flood project, and for all of the
15 impact, visual as well as functional, that the flood
16 project will have on our community, it's critical that
17 we have citizen participation. And this group is it.
18 And they have been doing it on a shoestring. And,
19 again, I think, it's worthy of our support.

20 MR. PURDY: Well, I can't argue support to this
21 to some extent. It's like motherhood and apple pie and
22 the flag. But what bothers me is that we're sliding so
23 far behind.

24 On page two, it says: For the next 15 months,
25 the partnership's Living River Education and Outreach

1 Program will focus on achieving critical milestones up
2 to the release of EIS in December 2006.

3 Well, that sounds good. But the county's own
4 time line that comes out of the magazine is -- they put
5 out in the spring of '02, final study was selected. I'm
6 not being --

7 MS. CARSON: That's how far --

8 MR. PURDY: Well, it's serious, in my view.
9 Final studies alternatives are supposed to be selected,
10 and the Corps of Engineers writes the environmental
11 impact statement. That was the time line that the
12 official county documents show. And we don't have any
13 indication we're going to need any of this.

14 I don't mind funding it, but we've got so damn
15 many critical things that need to be done here, I'd hate
16 to underwrite this whole expedition here for 25,000 and
17 the Corps delay it.

18 MR. CAMERON: Well, Jerry, I would make the
19 point in favor.

20 MR. GODBOUT: I'm sympathetic to the constant
21 delays of the flood project. But I would say it would
22 be further behind if not for the effort of this group.

23 So these guys are actually part of -- I think,
24 this is what's helping keep it to the extent it's even
25 tracking at all. I think, this group is sort of a

1 watchdog that is always raising the alarm that we're
2 falling behind. I don't know that anybody else would be
3 raising the alarms if not for this group.

4 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

5 MR. PURDY: Another side of the coin is that
6 we've been -- this isn't the first study. The first
7 official Corps environmental impact study was put out in
8 1985. We're looking at 20 years of studies.

9 In the interim since 1985, we've had two major
10 floods, one for about 20 million, the last one for 600
11 million. And we haven't done a goddamn thing in the way
12 of physical improvements in the river, to protect the
13 Hilton, to protect the airport, to protect the people
14 downstream. The Truckee River's 40 feet higher than the
15 airport. So when the river goes over, hi-ho, it's right
16 down.

17 Some of this could be a lot better spent to
18 money out under the Glendale Bridge, so we don't flood
19 TMWA's intake systems. If you go out there and look at
20 that poor old landfill -- And it's a great big modern
21 bridge. I remember that from the days when I was
22 involved in it. And that thing is packed solid with
23 debris and --

24 MS. CARSON: Maybe that ought to be a --

25 MR. PURDY: -- logs.

1 MR. GODBOUT: I was going to bring it up some
2 time when it's appropriate. So rather than throw 24 K
3 into this, I'd like to see us put some of it in there.
4 And then we'll see about cleaning out some.

5 MS. CARSON: I guess, my response to that would
6 be that may very well be something we need to fund,
7 also. But this is the only thread that's keeping the
8 big picture moving forward.

9 MR. PURDY: Yeah, I agree.

10 MR. COBB: So what's the Community Coalition
11 Group that's made up of citizens?

12 MS. LYNN: It doesn't meet unless this group
13 pushes to get it to meet. The local governments have
14 not been very responsive. And I'm just being very
15 blunt, in terms of pushing a Living River concept or any
16 flood project. It is kind of the bastard child of this
17 community.

18 MR. PURDY: It's pretty scary.

19 MS. LYNN: It is.

20 MR. COBB: You say that. But, fortunately, I
21 work for a government, and I know it's of major concern
22 to our city manager.

23 MS. LYNN: I know it's a major concern. But
24 nobody wants to put any urgency behind that.

25 MR. CAMERON: I think, there's a middle ground

1 to it.

2 MS. LYNN: Right.

3 MR. CAMERON: There's a lot of energy in defense
4 of --

5 MS. LYNN: Okay. I'll refrain.

6 MR. CAMERON: There's a huge amount of effort
7 that has gone there. But, I think, there's a division
8 of roles. There's a real stuck nickel process point of
9 view that, I think, the cities and the county have done
10 a reasonable job of following.

11 At the same time, I think it does require the
12 sort of citizen involvement, and it's the dynamics
13 that's created between all of those parties that is
14 moving it forward. Neither one or the other would
15 suffice on its own. And, whereas, the cities and the
16 county have a dedicated revenue source to keep there,
17 the eight cent sales tax to fund their staffing and
18 their operations, the citizen involvement really is a --
19 and, again, it's kind of quasi, sort of an odd, odd
20 composition. But it had been volunteer for a long time
21 and simply couldn't sustain itself on a volunteer basis;
22 it would not hold together.

23 And in response to Jerry's comment, I don't see
24 it as an either/or, Jerry. And we have almost a million
25 dollars. And if the Glendale mucking-out is an

1 appropriate expense, I think we should try to have a
2 proposal for that brought forward. I don't see that
3 this, funding this at its full level precludes us from
4 doing other projects.

5 MR. PURDY: I'm not sure. It's just that we're
6 nine years in. We have a flood about every 10 years.
7 The ninth year is coming up here in another month and a
8 few days. And the people, the river goes over the same
9 place. Glendale. It goes over this river at the same
10 place, and it floods out of south Reno, channels 14,000
11 cubic feet down to Glendale, and is it necked down to
12 7,000. Because it used to flood the Truckee Meadows.
13 That was great. There were just ducks out there. We
14 haven't done a thing to beef up the dikes on the other
15 side of the river.

16 I think, if you approve this thing, I think that
17 group should go a little more proactive. Instead of
18 meeting once a month, 12 meetings, and you tear another
19 year off the calendar.

20 MR. CAMERON: They say in the approval. I mean
21 you say nothing has been done. And, in fact, a couple
22 pieces of property, at least, important ones, has been
23 purchased. And if it weren't for the --

24 MR. PURDY: Agreed.

25 MR. CAMERON: Call it whining if you want.

1 Without this group, that early land acquisition program
2 certainly would not be as far along as it is today.

3 So I think --

4 MR. PURDY: I agree. You're right. Sure.

5 MR. CAMERON: They are actually in complete
6 agreement with you on urgency and trying to make it go
7 faster.

8 MR. COBB: But what are we paying for here? To
9 me, what I'm looking at is we're only paying for the
10 project manager?

11 MR. GODBOUT: M-hm.

12 MR. COBB: That's what I see we're funding.

13 MR. GODBOUT: Right. And that's my question, is
14 what is this person actually going to do? This is the
15 one I had the most trouble with.

16 MR. COBB: I had a lot of difficulty with this.

17 MR. GODBOUT: I had to read it probably three
18 times. I'm still not --

19 MR. COBB: What we've got here, and from reading
20 this, that's where my difficulty lies, reading this and
21 reading this. I understand the Living River and what
22 we're trying to accomplish with that, and I agree with
23 that. I think, that's where I'd want to see it go. And
24 it's getting the Corps to understand the benefit of
25 going that route.

1 But the way we've laid this out, and the way
2 this is written, that's where my difficulty lies, in how
3 and what is funded.

4 MR. CAMERON: Well, and having been an active
5 member of this -- I actually haven't been for the last
6 couple of years. But. The flood project, taking off
7 on Jerry's comments, has been meeting since 2000. It
8 used to be an every-other-week. Now it's a monthly
9 basis.

10 And you want to have citizen involvement over a
11 10-year period on the monthly basis, you cannot sustain
12 that entirely on a volunteer basis. What this project
13 manager, I think, does is, you know, is essentially
14 representing, although unofficially, attending all of
15 these meetings and being a conduit between the, you
16 know, frequent and, you know, voluminous number of
17 meetings that happen on this and being able to come back
18 to more the citizen element, the homeowners' groups, and
19 making sure that connection remains between citizen
20 interest and the process.

21 And, yeah, it's, you know coming back to Tom's
22 point there, absolutely. But, I think, the nature of
23 this long, long project requires professional staffing
24 in order to make sure the citizen participation is
25 sustained.

1 And I -- you know, frankly, if they weren't
2 there, this flood project will go. I mean my sense is
3 it's already at risk of going belly up. But I think the
4 chances would only be greater if this group failed to
5 sustain itself. I think, I just think it's that
6 important.

7 MR. GODBOUT: I have a couple comments and a
8 couple of questions. I guess, my biggest question,
9 biggest challenge I have with this one is what Tom
10 mentioned. What is this person actually going to do?

11 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

12 MR. GODBOUT: And what's the likelihood of
13 success? And I have never really been directly involved
14 in the EIS process or the decision process, but my
15 feeling is, is that sometimes when the Corps gets on a
16 path, man, it takes off. It's like trying to move a
17 battleship with a tugboat.

18 There are decisions to be made. And, honestly,
19 what is the likelihood of this \$24,000 achieving the
20 implementation of the Living River proposal in the final
21 outcome of the EIS and the record of decision?

22 MS. LYNN: And my feeling is that without this
23 group, because the Corps won't go down there --

24 MR. CAMERON: Right.

25 MR. COBB: I don't think this --

1 MR. GODBOUT: That's not my question now.

2 MS. LYNN: Okay.

3 MR. GODBOUT: If we fund it, or if this group
4 does get funding from some other source, what's the
5 likelihood of their being able to get the Corps to agree
6 to a course of action?

7 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to say, with citizen
8 involvement, the Living River concept has a 50/50 chance
9 of -- I'm, obviously, shooting from the hip here.

10 MR. GODBOUT: I know.

11 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to say, with citizen
12 involvement, is the Living River concept has a 50/50
13 chance of making it through the EIS and being a selected
14 project. Without citizen involvement, I would say it's
15 probably down at around 10 percent. And I would say the
16 cost of failing to get the Living River concept, with
17 respect to the purposes of this fund, would be
18 significant.

19 MR. GODBOUT: M-hm.

20 MR. CAMERON: And, therefore, it's a modest
21 investment, almost considered an insurance policy,
22 against vertical concrete flood walls from Verdi to
23 Vista.

24 MR. ASKIN: Could I throw in one thing? As you
25 look at your funding, I know you're having discussions

1 about whether, you know, you pay for labor versus
2 capital expenses, versus operating expenses, versus
3 overhead. But what it really comes down to, as funders,
4 is making a grant to accomplish a particular purpose.

5 Now, in this application, on page four, at the
6 bottom, it says "Project Goals and Measurable
7 Objectives." I think, rather than focusing on exactly
8 how the money might be spent, whether it's spent on a
9 person who's working on this, or whether it's on a
10 project, if you look at these, their objectives and the
11 measurable outcomes -- And these are nicely laid out.
12 It's easy to review over this page and a half, two
13 pages. Whether or not you consider these measurable
14 outcomes worth the \$24,000 investment.

15 MR. PURDY: That's what's eating on me.

16 MR. COBB: Well, the other thing is, I mean
17 we're talking about, here again, going well beyond our
18 geographic boundaries, I think: improve coordination
19 with Storey County and the Pyramid Lake Tribe, Pyramid
20 Lake Paiute Tribe. I mean it ought part of the Living
21 River.

22 MR. CAMERON: If they don't, if Storey County
23 and the Tribe do not participate, the main outcome being
24 sustained consensus, and, again, if Pyramid Lake and
25 Storey County decide to fight this project, then Truckee

1 Meadows, between state line and Vista, is going to be
2 the area of impact.

3 So consultation with people out of that, you
4 know, those geographic boundaries, I don't think
5 constitutes a violation of that direction.

6 MS. CARSON: I guess, I -- back to the tugboat
7 scenario, we got a -- what, several hundred million
8 dollar battleship moving along, slowly; and if we don't
9 have our little \$24,000 tugboat working on it, it's
10 going to go somewhere we don't want it to go. And I
11 think it's well worth it.

12 MR. GODBOUT: You know, Janet, you had mentioned
13 something that this money -- I had a difficult time
14 comprehending this proposal.

15 MR. CAMERON: It's difficult to put your arms
16 around it.

17 MR. GODBOUT: Because the measurable outcomes to
18 me are very subjective.

19 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

20 MR. GODBOUT: And very hard to quantify.

21 MR. PURDY: Exactly.

22 MR. GODBOUT: So that's one of the problems of a
23 few I have with this one.

24 But you mentioned something that this money was
25 leveraged, can be leveraged to get other funds involved.

1 And I was wondering if you could point that out, if you
2 can, I mean.

3 MS. CARSON: Well, what I visualize --

4 MR. GODBOUT: Because if we could get this money
5 to help that cause, to get additional money to help that
6 cause, then I might be more inclined to support it.

7 MS. CARSON: Well, this is just my impression.
8 And I'm not real close to the flood work, so I may be
9 wrong. But the federal government ultimately may spend
10 hundreds of millions of dollars on our community's flood
11 problem. If we don't have some community involvement
12 and steering, then that may never happen. The Corps may
13 just do nothing. Which means hundreds of millions of
14 dollars in federal money doesn't come to Reno-Sparks.

15 MR. GODBOUT: Or if it does, it's spent in the
16 wrong way.

17 MS. CARSON: Right. And, now, maybe I'm
18 misunderstanding how this, the big picture, works; but
19 somebody else maybe can correct me.

20 MR. CAMERON: It's only by the concerted efforts
21 of, for example, the Sparks county manager, who has been
22 committed to this from the get-go, and the dedication of
23 the cities, combined with citizen involvement, is why,
24 even though, Jerry, you're right, we got lots of reasons
25 to be crying in our beer over how slow and how

1 inadequate it's all been, to look at it as a glass a
2 quarter full instead of three-quarters empty, if not for
3 the combined chemistry of the community involvement and
4 the professional staffing of our local governments, we
5 would not be here.

6 And I'm not going to try to represent that the
7 BRE would go away, this Business Residential and
8 Environment Partnership would go away if we don't fund
9 it. I just think that it has -- it's a critical
10 ingredient. And, I think, I will repeat that I think
11 the nexus with, you know, clean water and the
12 alternative they're putting forward is pretty clear.

13 On the ambiguity of the outcomes, unfortunately,
14 I think, it's the nature of the exercise. This is a
15 very unpredictable process. It takes lots of twists and
16 turns. And, you know, it sounds, on the one hand,
17 pretty soft to have somebody attending meetings. But I,
18 but I wouldn't -- I might be troubled by it, also,
19 except that I have participated enough in this process
20 to appreciate that if you don't have the community
21 represented in these 10 years worth of several meetings
22 a month, it will go astray.

23 MS. LYNN: I think, what you're going to get is
24 a community surprise without this group, and that it's
25 going to be an unacceptable surprise. If the community

1 can't support, then the project will go away.

2 MR. CAMERON: For his division, Senator Reid,
3 he's going to want -- he wants consensus, obviously, but
4 he's going to ask for a couple hundred million dollars.
5 If we fall in infighting in this community over this
6 selected project, and we're at war with each other, it's
7 gone.

8 MR. PURDY: I think, at some point you need a
9 pretty dynamic budget manager. In major projects I've
10 been involved in most of my life, they had
11 knowledgeable, experience, dynamic, decisive,
12 aggressive-as-hell people.

13 And the underlying fact of everything I ever
14 experienced was three things: to protect the public
15 health, safety and welfare, second.

16 Third, there are no other considerations. I
17 don't get any sense of urgency. I kind of wonder about
18 the manager's background and experience. It just seems
19 out of step. But a \$350 million project. Now we went
20 with the retract. They got a team of experts in.
21 They --

22 MR. CAMERON: Jerry, I think, you're a little
23 confused now. The project director is Naomi Doerr.
24 She's, you know, highly trained, competent, selected
25 through a critical period. There is a nonprofit

1 community representative who is only one of, you know,
2 several actors on the stage and is not lead project
3 manager for the flood project.

4 MR. PURDY: Well, this project manager relating
5 to this particular grant, then.

6 MR. CAMERON: Right. But what you're asking
7 for, the equivalent of the project director, I think,
8 would be in this case, Naomi Doerr, who is the paid
9 staff representative of the three local governments. So
10 just to try to alleviate any confusion.

11 MR. PURDY: Yes.

12 MR. GODBOUT: Also, Elisa's -- I mean I've had
13 some indirect contact with her, but I know she's been
14 directly involved as a facilitator from the very
15 beginning when she was employed by MIG. So she knows
16 this. As far as I know, she's probably the most
17 knowledgeable person.

18 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

19 MR. GODBOUT: Maybe even more than Naomi.
20 Because Elisa's been involved with this from day one.

21 MS. LYNN: At this point, she has more knowledge
22 than Naomi, but Naomi is a rapid study, and I think
23 they're working together.

24 The object of -- The fact that we have a project
25 director comes as a result of this group, too. Because

1 the cities, I think, the problem with the county, and
2 the county had limited staff to deal with it. And so
3 from that point of view, I think, Elisa has worked with
4 the cities and the county, and she's not without her
5 baggage. But I think she's worked very hard to keep all
6 the groups focused to meet the requirement of unity in
7 this community towards this project.

8 MR. SWAN: Is there a motion one direction or
9 the other? Have we had enough argument?

10 MR. GODBOUT: I was at a public meeting several
11 months ago, and she mentioned she was going to be
12 running for county commissioner. So is that going to
13 interrupt her ability to carry out the goals of this
14 proposal?

15 MS. LYNN: If she goes into that role, and maybe
16 we ought to make that a condition, but I think that
17 there will be somebody following in her footsteps. I
18 just don't know who at this stage of the game.

19 MS. HARRISON: I think, the proposal is to fund
20 a project manager, not the project manager.

21 MR. GODBOUT: No, it's specific.

22 MS. HARRISON: Well, the project manager is
23 identified, but.

24 MR. ASKIN: Well, when is the county commission
25 elections? When would that take place?

1 MR. CAMERON: A year from now.

2 MS. LYNN: A year from now.

3 MR. ASKIN: Fall of 2006?

4 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

5 MR. ASKIN: So you could approve funding for 12
6 months rather than the 14 months you requested, and
7 you're fine.

8 MS. CARSON: But they take their position in the
9 following January, don't they?

10 MS. LYNN: January.

11 MR. ASKIN: So if you can approve this, there's
12 going to be no conflict. That would be in a future
13 request, that you may have that conflict.

14 MR. CAMERON: We can make it exclusive that this
15 grant, we would just reinforce that it would conclude in
16 December 2006, and it will terminate at this point.

17 MR. ASKIN: Yes, we can do that.

18 MR. GODBOUT: If she's elected?

19 MR. ASKIN: Well --

20 MR. CAMERON: Well, if not. They can come back
21 and ask for more. We would no longer be in the awkward
22 position of paying for a county commissioner.

23 MS. LYNN: By that time, if there may be -- the
24 project may have reached a stage where there is some
25 decision.

1 MR. GODBOUT: You hope so. That's what the
2 \$24,000 is for.

3 MR. PURDY: Pretty soft.

4 MR. GODBOUT: Any further discussion?

5 MR. ASKIN: I would just add, again, that the
6 money point, they've got a million dollars. So far,
7 we're up to 40, what, 42, is that right, 42 and a half?

8 MR. PURDY: That's right.

9 MR. ASKIN: So you have plenty of funding in the
10 scope of the grant you're going to be making. This is
11 not a particularly significant amount.

12 MR. PURDY: That's true.

13 MR. CAMERON: I move --

14 MR. SWAN: I don't like that argument.

15 MR. GODBOUT: I agree with you. I think --

16 MR. SWAN: I move that we reject this proposal.

17 MR. COBB: I second it.

18 MR. GODBOUT: Any discussion?

19 MS. CARSON: I'll just -- I'd like to make one
20 observation. I think, we all bring to this our
21 professional experience.

22 MR. COBB: M-hm.

23 MS. CARSON: You know, I spent 10 years in the
24 TROA process, where you got a bunch of parties. Nobody
25 has control. There is no big boss. And you have to

1 somehow move all these groups along toward an outcome.
2 And it's slow. And it's inefficient. And it's just
3 lots and lots of hours. You know. And it's just not
4 like building a bridge or something else. It's a
5 different kind of product.

6 MR. GODBOUT: That's not easy anymore.

7 MR. PURDY: That's true.

8 MS. CARSON: So I'm very empathetic with the
9 process and the importance of it.

10 MR. SWAN: I would support the building a
11 bridge.

12 MR. PURDY: Yeah. I hear what she's saying.
13 This, we're gambling against God and betting against the
14 Lord that we're somehow going to get the Corps money and
15 get this built before the next flood.

16 MS. CARSON: I don't understand what you're
17 saying, Jerry. Without the community pushing --

18 MR. GODBOUT: Nothing will happen.

19 MS. CARSON: Probably nothing will happen.

20 MR. GODBOUT: Then we're at the mercies.

21 MS. CARSON: With the community pushing, maybe
22 something will happen. I would say maybe something
23 happening is a whole lot better than, for sure,
24 nothing's going to happen.

25 MR. GODBOUT: Or something we don't like.

1 MS. CARSON: Yeah. I just don't understand
2 where you're coming from on this.

3 MR. GODBOUT: We can handle it by, you know,
4 suggesting on our next round, on our next announcement
5 of projects that we would like to see come in, address
6 that.

7 MR. PURDY: Good. Good. You're right.

8 MR. GODBOUT: Further discussion? What's the
9 term you use, call for the question?

10 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

11 MR. GODBOUT: Call for the question. All those
12 in favor --

13 MS. CARSON: The motion is to reject it.

14 MS. LYNN: Reject.

15 MR. GODBOUT: All those in favor of the motion
16 to reject, say "aye." (Some said "aye.") All of those
17 opposed, say "aye." (Some said "aye.") We have three,
18 for rejecting, four for not rejecting.

19 MR. SWAN: How many?

20 MR. GODBOUT: Four for not.

21 MS. CARSON: Maybe we should have a show of
22 hands.

23 MR. GODBOUT: All those in favor of rejection,
24 raise your hand. (Some raised their hands.)

25 MS. HARRISON: In favor of the motion.

1 MR. GODBOUT: In favor of the motion. That's
2 three. All of those opposed to the motion? (Some
3 raised their hands.) So the motion dies.

4 (The motion dies.)

5 MS. HARRISON: The motion is rejected four to
6 three.

7 MR. GODBOUT: Discuss, or somebody would like to
8 make a motion?

9 MS. CARSON: I make a motion that we fund that
10 proposal.

11 MR. CAMERON: Second.

12 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion? All those in favor of
13 the motion, raise your hand. (Some raised their hands.)
14 All those opposed, raise your hand. (Some raised their
15 hands.) Four to three, the motion carries.

16 (Motion carries.)

17 MR. GODBOUT: We have two left. Who would like
18 to suggest the next one?

19 MR. CAMERON: I'd like to leave one that Susan
20 and I submitted for the end, since, essentially, we're
21 kind of tabling it.

22 MR. COBB: Actually, three.

23 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay.

24 MR. GODBOUT: We have three.

25 MS. CARSON: We only have two, don't we?

1 MR. GODBOUT: I have two.

2 MS. LYNN: Two.

3 MR. GODBOUT: Two plus --

4 MS. LYNN: Still on the table.

5 MR. GODBOUT: Okay. Anybody would like to
6 suggest one?

7 MS. CARSON: I'd like to suggest we go to the
8 storm water one next.

9 MR. GODBOUT: Which would be the one from --

10 MR. SWAN: City of Reno.

11 MR. GODBOUT: City of Reno. It's open for
12 discussion.

13 MR. SWAN: I'm against this one, because I --
14 again, I'm actually in support of everything similar to
15 the last proposal. It's all cash to buy some -- I
16 think, they're interested in getting the storm water. I
17 think, they should fund it, have it part of their
18 budget. If we need a storm water educator, I think,
19 that should be in their proposals.

20 MR. CAMERON: One of the opportunities, I think,
21 this fund created, or one of my perceptions is that, you
22 know, we have multiple jurisdictions working on this
23 river, with a lot of similar interests, for trying to
24 protect water for different purposes. But they're still
25 trying to -- you know, water quality is the objective.

1 And, I think, one of the opportunities about
2 the -- created by the Truckee River Fund is, to the
3 extent there are areas right now, gaps where there are
4 projects that don't fall clearly to one jurisdiction or
5 another, and, therefore, aren't moving forward at all,
6 this Truckee River Fund creates an opportunity for
7 bringing jurisdictions together to cover those gaps.

8 Whether this project is one of those, you know,
9 I'm not going to presuppose that. But I do think that
10 part of the spirit and the potential is to look for
11 projects that, again, don't fall naturally to one entity
12 or another, but are in the larger interest of our
13 community and where joint funding will help things get
14 done that otherwise wouldn't.

15 Maybe Tom --

16 MR. SWAN: Maybe, unless a joint funding
17 thing -- I mean this is a storm water committee. It's
18 multidisciplined.

19 MS. LYNN: Yes.

20 MR. SWAN: I think, she's just asking for -- it
21 might be overwhelmed. If they're overwhelmed, they
22 might not put in the budget to hire somebody. I don't
23 think it's part of our fund, TMWA's fund to hire this
24 person. If they need help, then they should put it in
25 their budget to get help.

1 MS. CARSON: You think the activity's okay, but
2 this isn't appropriate?

3 MR. SWAN: I think, you're right.

4 MR. CAMERON: Now, if our guidelines say that
5 projects that protect and enhance water quality or water
6 resources, are you adding an extra level of kind of
7 criteria that is, essentially, what you're -- you're
8 saying, Tom, is that they already have been with
9 insufficient resources to do this work?

10 MR. SWAN: I think so.

11 MS. LYNN: Does that, some of that come from
12 Reno?

13 MR. SWAN: It's multi. It comes from Reno,
14 Sparks, and Washoe County.

15 MR. GODBOUT: And the State.

16 MS. LYNN: And the State.

17 MR. GODBOUT: The NEP is involved. I've had
18 several of those forums that were called, that were held
19 for professionals. So I, in some -- I agree with Tom,
20 there's already an ongoing effort. I have a -- I just
21 think that the government agencies should fund this one.

22 I don't think that it's -- It's a good project.
23 Or it's a -- I agree with what they're trying to do. I
24 just don't know if this is the right way to fund it.

25 MR. CAMERON: Does TMWA participate, are they

1 officially represented somehow in storm water policy and
2 part of the storm water committee?

3 MR. FOREE: Not that I'm aware of.

4 MR. CAMERON: I mean there are a lot of storms.
5 Why would TMWA? It's already covered by others.

6 MR. FOREE: Well, haven't gotten to it yet.
7 Maybe not. I don't know. I'm not sure.

8 MS. LYNN: Well, I guess, I'm kind of curious,
9 because this is, obviously, that when you go to the
10 project goals, it says "Develop education outreach
11 program for residents." And "Outreach would be focused
12 on three sub-watersheds, Chalk Creek, the North Truckee
13 Drain, and Whites Creek"; which we had already talked
14 about, to expand projects.

15 And I see this as leveraging. I mean, I think,
16 the local governments and participants are already
17 funding a lot of this program. But maybe we could help
18 it along by giving it the 24,800. Because, I think,
19 storm water quality is getting to be a huge issue in
20 this community.

21 And since some of these, at least two of
22 these -- well, actually, I'm not sure. Whites Creek
23 flows into Steamboat Creek, which flows into the Truckee
24 River. And I don't -- I'm not -- I can't remember what
25 that problem is. But it seems to me that Chalk Creek,

1 which captures a lot of runoff, possibly from storm
2 water drains, but just from natural flows, and the North
3 Truckee Drain, which is also capturing more and more
4 urban runoff, this is not a bad project. It seems like
5 it falls within the constraints of this grant.

6 MR. COBB: It's a government committee, is it
7 not, that's applies for this?

8 MS. LYNN: It is.

9 MR. COBB: So. And I understand that, goals and
10 objectives. But as part of their meeting -- I mean it
11 talks about newsletter development, researching formats,
12 identifying sponsors, coordinating participants. I mean
13 isn't that -- they're asking for almost \$5,000, of which
14 isn't that part of what they're doing at this meeting?
15 Isn't that what that committee's getting together to do?

16 MR. GOUBOUT: They have a storm water site
17 already, don't they?

18 MS. LYNN: Yes. But this is --

19 MR. COBB: They want to expand it.

20 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

21 MR. COBB: But I know we should look at the
22 goals and objectives. But when I look at where they're
23 asking for this money to apply, I mean I could see maybe
24 the cities and county and whatever having enough money
25 to print the literature, to go out and get that. But as

1 far as them sitting down together, to develop a
2 newsletter, isn't that what they're doing at their
3 meetings?

4 MR. CAMERON: I'm guessing, it could be
5 outsourced.

6 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

7 MR. COBB: Okay.

8 MS. LYNN: I'm guessing that it would be, too,
9 but that's not clear. My sense is that they're kind of
10 the policy direction group. They kind of set the
11 projects and the goals for the storm water committee.
12 And then it's up to them, I think, to expend what money
13 they have.

14 And this may not be -- they may not have money,
15 sources for this particular, the programs that they've
16 put in here. I don't know. I just happen to think it's
17 a really good program. And it just supplements.

18 Go ahead.

19 MR. GODBOUT: One thing. One of the things that
20 I thought was curious about that is that they want to be
21 involved with Snapshot Day. And we've already rejected
22 that one.

23 MS. LYNN: Well, it's Snapshot Day here.

24 MS. CARSON: Here.

25 MR. COBB: It is.

1 MR. GODBOUT: Well, isn't Snapshot Day, that one
2 was rejected?

3 MR. CAMERON: This would accomplish the focused
4 part.

5 MS. LYNN: The focused part of the Tahoe.

6 MR. GODBOUT: Even if there were parts of that
7 that we didn't agree with, that were sort of --

8 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

9 MR. GODBOUT: We're going to fund the scientific
10 end of it, which is really of questionable value.

11 MS. CARSON: Is Snapshot Day in this connection
12 actual photographs, or is it water quality grab?

13 MR. SWAN: Water quality grab.

14 MS. CARSON: So it is similar.

15 MR. CAMERON: What I find interesting is -- Tom
16 raises, I think, an interesting question. Which I
17 actually agree that probably, if push came to shove, if
18 the storm water committee decided this were important
19 enough, they probably would find the funds within their
20 own. But.

21 MS. LYNN: Okay.

22 MR. CAMERON: They probably do it on their own.
23 To me, I still think the opportunity for
24 cross-jurisdictional collaboration is part of the
25 opportunity that's important here. And if TMWA has a

1 material interest in storm water management, and right
2 now is not part of the process, if this thing needs to
3 be funded, part of me actually thinks, to play devil's
4 advocate, I'd rather fund it with Truckee Meadows
5 Truckee River Fund and get TMWA engaged, so that we get
6 some of the -- build some of the cross-understandings of
7 the TMWA Board as this goes buy them. So.

8 Appreciate that they aren't just running a water
9 treatment program, safety, guarding water rights, they
10 actually have to worry about storm water policy in order
11 to safeguard our water. I like the symbology, I guess,
12 of the multiparty engagement. And I'd almost rather
13 have a diffuse set of sources of funding than just
14 leaving it back.

15 Now, I can argue it the other way, too. I
16 think, I could just as easily argue from Tom's point of
17 view of clarity and focus of mission. Let them do their
18 job. But I'm not sure.

19 MR. SWAN: Again, devil's advocat. I think, if
20 they were interested in that, then I think they should
21 have gone to TMWA and said, I think, we want funding to
22 be part of that group. I don't know if we should be
23 pushing them to do that.

24 MR. CAMERON: Right.

25 MR. GODBOUT: Policy decision for the TMWA

1 Board?

2 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

3 MR. FOREE: I think, we have had some
4 conversations about that -- not me personally, but it
5 seems to me, between the City of Reno and some folks at
6 TMWA.

7 MR. CAMERON: That would be more front door, but
8 sometimes the front door doesn't work. I think, that's
9 part of the reason we're here.

10 MS. LYNN: Well, and this proposal also included
11 this professional forum thing, too, which was part of
12 Michael's and my proposal, for much lesser amount,
13 because they were using city staff to do it.

14 But this is an area where we thought there
15 should be some more coordination, talk about that
16 further.

17 MR. COBB: I guess, are they outsourcing for
18 this? I mean it doesn't explain really. Are they
19 outsourcing?

20 MS. LYNN: Yeah, it's not clear.

21 MS. CARSON: It says principals involved is
22 Terri Svetich.

23 MR. COBB: Right. So are we paying her salary?

24 MR. SWAN: I think, she's going to hire
25 somebody.

1 MR. ASKIN: She works for the city, right?

2 MS. LYNN: Yes.

3 MR. ASKIN: In this case, the City of Reno
4 serving as a lead agency for the storm water permit
5 committee, this is a nonincorporated group, right? So
6 the Storm Water Permit Coordinating Committee, which is
7 as I read this, this is their activity, can't apply.
8 They have to have either a nonprofit or a government
9 sponsor who serves, essentially, as their fiscal
10 sponsor. So.

11 MR. CAMERON: So the checks would go to the City
12 of Reno?

13 MR. ASKIN: The checks go to the City of Reno,
14 and the City of Reno then --

15 MR. CAMERON: Tom's vote just got thrown.

16 MR. ASKIN: Because of the lead agency, and
17 they're basically -- they're the reason that the Storm
18 Water Permit Coordinating Committee is qualified to
19 apply floor these things.

20 And the Community Foundation works frequently
21 with groups that are working through some other
22 organization, because they, themselves, don't have the
23 accounting system, don't have the -- you know, let alone
24 qualifying. But aside from that, because we can't --
25 the Foundation could do grants to an entity that's not

1 incorporated, but on which they just don't have the
2 systems of checks and balances, and so on, to serve as a
3 fiduciary.

4 MR. SWAN: Well, they have hired people to do
5 work for them. They've hired Kenny James to help them
6 write a storm water permit.

7 MS. LYNN: Yes.

8 MS. CARSON: The committee has?

9 MR. SWAN: M-hm.

10 MS. LYNN: Yes. And they do it through the City
11 of Reno. The city is the fiscal agent for the group.

12 MR. ASKIN: Right. The restrictions that we set
13 for your group here is that you can only make a grant to
14 a 51C3, an educational entity or a government. Period.

15 MR. CAMERON: I mean, Tom, I'm curious, also.
16 We talk about some of -- couldn't we say the same thing
17 about the Chalk Bluff monitoring? I mean.

18 MR. SWAN: We're not paying for any labor. And
19 it's a project that, essentially, capital concern,
20 trying to put something --

21 MS. HARRISON: The river to -- you know, they're
22 going to put flumes in and --

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. But those are two different
24 points.

25 MR. SWAN: He's already saying they're giving

1 money to government agencies to make --

2 MR. CAMERON: Where does the -- Where does the
3 Chalk Bluff monitoring, where does that go?

4 MS. LYNN: If the same group applies, and I'm
5 not sure that it is.

6 MR. SWAN: It's not the same group.

7 MR. CAMERON: But it seems to me -- Okay.
8 There's two separate points that, I think, are both
9 critical for you on this. One is that there's a labor
10 issue versus capital. And the other one that I've heard
11 you say is simply that there is already pursuit of
12 existing government, and they should be able to do it
13 within their existing means and authorities. Is that --

14 MR. SWAN: I kind of agree with you in respect
15 to the Chalk Bluff or Chalk Creek thing.

16 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

17 MR. SWAN: I think, it was important enough for
18 Svetich and Brisbin to study. They called to the
19 finance people and had them do it. But, again, it
20 seemed like something that this group wanted to do.

21 I heard Mr. Purdy wanted to study the Chalk
22 Creek problem with TDS. So I'm in support of doing
23 that. And I don't know who else is going to do that.

24 I don't know if that answered your question. I
25 think, in order to get that done, I think, it might mean

1 they're going to have to do it. So. Unless somebody
2 out in the public is going to do it. I understand what
3 you're saying. But I see this as a kind of a different
4 issue.

5 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

6 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

7 MR. SWAN: I see this as hiring a person to do
8 something, whereas they're going to do something on
9 their own, not volunteer time. But I know there seems
10 to be some sort of going on --

11 MR. CAMERON: So, it's shades of gray, I think.

12 MR. SWAN: I agree that there's shades of gray.
13 I think, if the City of Reno wants to hire a person,
14 that they should hire a person. Again, it's different.

15 MR. COBB: If they could show me their
16 outsourcing and how they're doing that.

17 MS. HARRISON: Does anybody know whether this is
18 governed by interlocal agreement?

19 MS. LYNN: Yes, it is.

20 MS. HARRISON: Governed by the interlocal
21 agreement. It would probably be helpful if you could
22 see that interlocal agreement and see exactly what
23 direction that gives to the committee and what their
24 authority is.

25 The assumption here is that Reno is going to

1 hire somebody, but it may make a difference as to how
2 you evaluate that if the person or entity that is hired
3 to do this work is specifically hired personally to the
4 authority of the interlocal agreement and only through
5 that, as opposed to just funding some employee of Reno.
6 I think, that's a distinction with a difference.

7 MS. LYNN: I would agree. And perhaps, then, we
8 ought to reject this one and ask them to come back with
9 a proposal that substantiates what they're going to do
10 with funding, whether they're going to hire somebody or
11 whether they're going to use people already on staff, or
12 outsource it, or whatever they're going to do.

13 Because I do think there's a need to do public
14 outreach on storm water. But. And the storm drain
15 stenciling project also might fall into this.

16 MR. SWAN: I think, it's more in your purview to
17 do that, to do those things. I think, if you guys were
18 to do that in your proposal, to do what Svetich wants to
19 do, I could be more supportive.

20 But you guys don't have that money to go get
21 somebody to go out and do public P.R. type things. That
22 seems like what she wants to do, for the most part.
23 But, I think, for a government agency, again, it just
24 doesn't seem right.

25 MS. LYNN: Okay.

1 MR. GODBOUT: One of the issues I have with this
2 one is I'm part of the professional community. We're
3 well aware of storm drainage issues. And I don't
4 understand what they're targeting in the professional
5 community. Are they targeting hydrologists to work for
6 government agencies?

7 Are they -- I mean I'm in civil engineering. We
8 do development all the time. And we're very well aware
9 of the State's requirement of the storm discharge
10 permit. And we're well aware of the storm requirements
11 for all of our construction projects, no matter what
12 size they are. We're well -- Some are aware of the loan
13 pack development standards that are being proposed.

14 These issues, for my sector of the profession,
15 we're well aware of these things. The City and the
16 State have had storm water discharge conferences or
17 seminars that everyone's been aware of. I've been to
18 one of them. And there's a very good cross-section of
19 the professional community, as far as builders,
20 consultants at those. So I think that the professional
21 community doesn't need to be any more educated on this
22 issue.

23 MS. LYNN: No, and I don't think that that's
24 what this proposal is all about. I think, it's about --

25 MR. CAMERON: Residents.

1 MS. LYNN: Residents. Newsletter and
2 development of residential outreach. And then the
3 professional forum, which I agree may be inside or
4 outside. And the Web site modification. I think,
5 that's generally not for professionals, it's for people
6 browsing the Web.

7 MR. COBB: That's one of their goals, number
8 two, their goals.

9 MS. LYNN: Is it?

10 MR. GODBOUT: Yes. And, also, at the top of the
11 page, two, it says "The professional community."

12 MS. LYNN: Okay. I missed that, then.

13 MR. GODBOUT: If that's what they mean by "The
14 professional community" is the consulting community or
15 the building industries, we're all very well aware of
16 those, especially since things have happened where
17 people have gotten substantial fines. And, also,
18 through cooperative extensions.

19 So that is not just for professionals, that is
20 for anybody. But, I guess, it was targeted for
21 municipal.

22 MS. LYNN: Officials.

23 MR. GODBOUT: Officials. So, I think, that
24 perspective, I think, it's -- that's already been
25 covered. I think, I kind of agree with Tom, that -- and

1 I want to take something that Jerry said. I don't think
2 it's part of the government's responsibility to protect
3 our health, safety and welfare, and that's by educating
4 the public.

5 I'm not saying private organizations shouldn't
6 do it. But, I think, for a government to discuss to
7 fund something that they should already be doing, to me,
8 is --

9 MR. SWAN: You're saying it much better.

10 MR. PURDY: Sign me up for that.

11 MR. GODBOUT: I'm not saying it -- Parts of it,
12 I really like. But how they're going about doing it is
13 questionable.

14 MR. CAMERON: I'm fast-forwarding a little bit
15 to what -- the proposal that Susan and I put together,
16 and, basically, our agenda item seven, about trying to
17 get our arms around the bigger problem here.

18 It may be that resident -- There's a real need
19 and opportunity to go out and educate residents. It may
20 be more appropriate for a private organization to do
21 that.

22 MR. GODBOUT: You mean it might be more accepted
23 than the government?

24 MR. COBB: Well, in ways. But the government.
25 You mentioned your neighbor or whoever does oil changes.

1 MR. CAMERON: He's 18 years old. He's 18.

2 MR. GODBOUT: My dad was a biology teacher, and
3 he threw his oil in the little neck down the hill
4 outside his house.

5 MR. SWAN: So no one could see it. He knew he
6 was doing something wrong.

7 MR. COBB: Look at all the other things the
8 government puts together and distributes information on.
9 Now, with all the transcripts, you've got pamphlets and
10 whatever. This is a real issue that I take heart in.
11 In essence, the government should be leading in public
12 safety. Okay. Health and welfare.

13 So it's hard for me to approve this with that
14 committee. This should already be provided as something
15 to our citizens.

16 MS. CARSON: I don't have a strong feeling, up
17 or down, on this proposal. But the general question of,
18 well, this or that government agency should be doing
19 this, I think, if it's something we feel needs to be
20 done, it's important to be done and is not being done,
21 we need to put our money where our mouth is.

22 MR. SWAN: Yes, I agree. But, I think, they
23 should be doing it. Or the City of Reno should hire
24 somebody to do it.

25 MR. FOREE: Or other; how about TMWA?

1 MR. SWAN: Yes.

2 MS. LYNN: Yes.

3 MR. FOREE: That would be something.

4 MR. SWAN: I think, you're -- by having a
5 government agency hiring somebody, you're going to pay
6 for them to hire somebody.

7 MR. GODBOUT: What happens when the money runs
8 out?

9 MR. SWAN: Exactly. Good point.

10 MS. HARRISON: Let me just throw something out.
11 Because you're going to be confronting this question
12 over.

13 MR. GODBOUT: I agree.

14 MS. HARRISON: One of the things that you need
15 to keep in the back of your mind is the ultimate source
16 of the money that you are funding these projects with is
17 people, TMWA ratepayers.

18 MS. LYNN: Yes.

19 MR. SWAN: Right.

20 MS. HARRISON: That's the ultimate source. As
21 opposed to taxpayer money. I mean, you know, for a
22 governmental employee, for example. So, you know, not
23 that all of the projects have to be solely for the
24 benefit of TMWA ratepayers.

25 With respect to this case, this fund wouldn't

1 exist, because you would be just funding it out of TMWA
2 revenues, as opposed to going through this effort. But
3 when you're defending the projects, that the board
4 members are ultimately going to be asking themselves
5 "Can I defend the use of the TMWA revenues to fund this
6 project?"

7 And, I think, that's kind of what Tom is getting
8 at, is, is this truly a governmental, solely a
9 governmental function that ought to be taken care of by
10 a local government, or is it something that, you know,
11 you've sometimes articulated a standard, would this
12 project exist but for our contribution? So.

13 MR. FOREE: TMWA has a huge stake in this stuff,
14 because Chalk Creek, it dumps in right -- a thousand
15 feet upstream of our intake, our pump station, and many
16 other, you know, storm drains as well that, you know,
17 ultimately get to our treatment plants.

18 So really is it something that staff supports
19 the position that TMWA should be considering.

20 MS. LYNN: Yes.

21 MS. HARRISON: Yeah.

22 MR. FOREE: That's just another question.

23 MS. LYNN: And my question is, is this of
24 benefit to TMWA to educate people about this? Now,
25 maybe government shouldn't be doing it. But TMWA set up

1 this fund to do exactly this kind of thing, I think. Or
2 at least that was my understanding. And I may be wrong.
3 To do some of the things that it would normally do
4 through this fund and have other people do them. I
5 don't know.

6 MR. CAMERON: The fact that TMWA right now is
7 not participating directly in this is -- I'm trying
8 to -- to me, that's the most conspicuous problem or
9 opportunity in some ways that this fund can address.

10 And I'm sitting here not as -- it's easier for
11 me, not being a representative of any of the public
12 jurisdictions, to sort of say I would like to see better
13 coordination. I am assuming there are some gaps and
14 that this fund is one of the ways to help close them.

15 I'm wondering if, as an intermediate step -- and
16 again, I'm back on the same theme of trying to identify,
17 through some exercise, whether that's a one-day forum
18 and workshop or having somebody, hiring somebody to go
19 canvas the jurisdiction. But to identify the gaps if,
20 in fact, the residents need more education, if, in fact,
21 more storm drains need to be stenciled, and identify
22 those areas where the existing set of programs aren't
23 covering it.

24 That's where I feel like our -- where our fund
25 can make the most difference. And it may be that,

1 actually, the substance of the proposal and some of the
2 educational outreach is really one of the grants and one
3 that is needed. But, I don't know that sitting here.

4 And I am troubled by the fact that we have storm
5 water program going on without the actual drinking
6 customers as part of a solution. I mean I'm glad that
7 we have it. Don't get me wrong. But it seems like TMWA
8 already ought to be part of it. Now, if it's not, how
9 do we, as the Truckee River Fund, help solve that
10 problem?

11 I mean this is one way, this is, you know, go
12 put some money into a project and supplement it. But
13 maybe that's too indirect.

14 MR. COBB: I think, that's something that as
15 this committee sits here, go back and request the board
16 that we'd like to expand our geographic boundaries, that
17 here are some issues that arise that maybe you should
18 consider taking back to your entities to entertain,
19 making them a part of it.

20 And it's not, we're not giving them a proposal.
21 Just something to think about as we review these.

22 MR. CAMERON: M-hm.

23 MR. COBB: Would we be out of line in doing
24 that?

25 MS. LYNN: I don't think you're out of line

1 talking, making any request or statements to the board,
2 any messages that you can deliver.

3 MR. COBB: Okay.

4 MR. ASKIN: I think, it's helpful, too, I mean
5 it would indicate the thought you've been going through
6 and let them know, you know, how productive these
7 conversations have been, and clearly this type of
8 thought is going to be very helpful in making good
9 decisions and recommendations moving forward. I would
10 think this would help build confidence in our early
11 efforts here.

12 MR. CAMERON: More work needs to be done, I
13 think, is kind of -- is that part of the message that --
14 maybe TMWA, through its own operating expenses, not
15 through the Truckee River Fund, ought to be helping to
16 support. If this is an activity that's needed.

17 And, I think, Craig actually raised some
18 questions as to whether it actually is, or parts of it
19 may not be. But I'm trying to see if I'm understanding
20 Chris's point. But part of our -- if we chose to deny
21 this, that we were actually recommending that TMWA
22 engage it directly.

23 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

24 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah.

25 MR. ASKIN: But you're really thinking about the

1 whole big picture and that some cases you're not just
2 reacting to the actions of the comment. You're thinking
3 about a more logical way to address the issue, because
4 the issue does need to be addressed.

5 MS. CARSON: I guess, I'm struggling a little
6 bit with why is it that we approve the Chalk Bluff TDS
7 monitoring with relatively little debate, which was a
8 City of Reno, City of Sparks sponsored proposal?

9 MR. SWAN: We can come back and reject that, and
10 then we're all done.

11 MS. CARSON: And now we're struggling with this.
12 And I'm just stuck on the physical situation, where you
13 have this contribution directly above the intake of the
14 plant.

15 MS. LYNN: Yes.

16 MS. CARSON: Which is clearly within the scope
17 of what we're supposed to be trying to fix. Why are we
18 not supporting this?

19 MR. FOREE: Well, I think, we're talking more
20 about where should, you know, where should the position
21 be if there's a position? Aren't we? I mean is this
22 the right place for it? I don't --

23 MS. CARSON: And do we have a decision on where
24 we think it ought to be, if not here?

25 MR. SWAN: What is your question?

1 MS. CARSON: I'm really stuck on just the
2 activity being proposed.

3 MS. HARRISON: I think that --

4 MR. SWAN: Which activity? I don't know where
5 you are yet.

6 MS. CARSON: Well, the --

7 MR. SWAN: Of the TDS?

8 MS. CARSON: The TDS program, we said, "Hey,
9 this is great, let's approve it." And now we've got one
10 that's going to be outreach and education and so forth,
11 on the same drainage, among others. Why are we not
12 supporting this?

13 MR. PURDY: There already exists a program for
14 it.

15 MS. CARSON: In fact, in the Chalk Creek TDS
16 program, we said they ought to expand to the other
17 drains, which they have in their proposal.

18 MR. GODBOUT: So what you're saying is we
19 suggest they monitor it, but we don't do anything to
20 solve it?

21 MS. CARSON: Yeah. We're saying monitor's okay,
22 but outreach is --

23 MR. SWAN: I don't think you've established what
24 the problem is yet. I understand what you're saying,
25 that -- and I think that I -- and, I guess, I'm the one

1 that had some conflict with it. It sounds like other
2 people have a conflict with this.

3 But I think the TDS one has been brought up as a
4 proposed problem that needs to be studied, where this
5 one is a different thing, a whole different ball of wax.
6 I think, it's a good idea. I think, somebody should do
7 this, what Svetich is wanting done.

8 But I don't think the City of Reno should be
9 asking this group to get the money to go hire somebody
10 to do it. If the City of Reno wants it done, they
11 should go hire a person, staff member. Like he says,
12 when the money falls out, what's going to happen next
13 year? Do they ask again?

14 MR. FOREE: That was what I was thinking about.
15 Is this meant to be a permanent position that's ongoing?
16 Because they talk about --

17 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

18 MR. FOREE: They talk about a six-month project.

19 (A break was requested by the Reporter, for the
20 purpose of changing steno paper.)

21 * * * * *

22 (A break was taken, 11:05 to 11:15 a.m.)

23 * * * * *

24 MR. GODBOUT: Shall we reconvene?

25 MS. LYNN: Yes.

1 MR. GODBOUT: Where were we?

2 MS. LYNN: I want to just raise the issue that
3 this project falls under an interlocal agreement. So it
4 is just not the City of Sparks, not the City of Reno,
5 and not Washoe County. It is a joint group that, I
6 think, came about, if I recall correctly, the Water
7 Planning Commission saw a -- Regional Water Planning
8 Commission saw a gap here. And rather than have the
9 group under one entity, Reno is the fiscal agent only,
10 but the group is multijurisdictional.

11 Now, whether TMWA is a member of that group,
12 probably not, but it was, this group filled a gap in the
13 need for the MPDEF permit.

14 MR. CAMERON: Right.

15 MR. COBB: M-hm.

16 MS. LYNN: So I see it as not as a single
17 entity, but what they're asking to do is public
18 education. How they do that is not clear by this
19 proposal. But I still think, in some ways --

20 MR. COBB: Based on that, though, maybe -- I
21 would feel more comfortable rejecting it and having them
22 reapply with a better explanation of -- I mean you've
23 given an explanation, but you really haven't given an
24 explanation of use of these funds.

25 And, then, not only -- I guess, it gives me a

1 better comfort level, but then maybe it will give the
2 board at TMWA a better comfort level.

3 MS. LYNN: Okay.

4 MR. COBB: That's my own personal thought.
5 Because I want to see this happen. I think it is good.

6 MR. CAMERON: Right.

7 MR. COBB: But, I guess, for me it's not really
8 clearly defined. Are they outsourcing it, or is it a
9 position that's hired? Is this something that you're
10 going to come back to us continually to fund this
11 position? Or how is this being accomplished?

12 MS. LYNN: I agree with you. I think we want to
13 make the point that this is a one-time deal, that we're
14 not going to perpetually fund this.

15 MR. COBB: Right.

16 MS. LYNN: This is to launch this program, and
17 if they want to come back with a better description of
18 how the money is going to be expended, who it's going to
19 be expended on.

20 I still think it is a legitimate expense --

21 MR. COBB: Oh, yes.

22 MS. LYNN: -- that possibly government should
23 fund. But it was a gap that government wasn't funding.
24 It directly benefits TMWA's drinking water customers.

25 MR. COBB: Right.

1 MS. LYNN: And so, I think, ultimately, it is a
2 legitimate proposal. But, I agree, there are lots of
3 questions about it.

4 MR. COBB: They have some gaps to fill. And, I
5 think, if they do that, I would have no heartache in
6 sending it to the board.

7 MR. SWAN: Motion?

8 MR. GODBOUT: Do we have a motion?

9 MR. SWAN: A motion to reject the program.

10 MS. LYNN: With conditions.

11 MR. CAMERON: But wasn't it more complicated
12 than that?

13 MR. COBB: Did you catch all our comments that,
14 when they were discussing --

15 MR. ASKIN: Yeah. I caught that you suggested
16 that they -- that we not fund the proposal at this time,
17 but that we invite them to reapply, asking that they
18 provide better information on the public education
19 activities; that they provide better and more detailed
20 budget information; regarding the expenses, whether they
21 are, each of the expenses are outsourced or going to be
22 performed in-house per se by a staff person; and that
23 you would consider making them a grant, after that
24 resubmission, but it would be a one-time grant to help
25 launch the program, not for ongoing funding.

1 MR. CAMERON: And if I could add just to the
2 last point, is to -- and this may be overstepping our
3 boundaries here, but to encourage them to approach TMWA
4 directly for formal participation in the storm water
5 programs and as a possible source of long-term funding.
6 MR. PURDY: I'll second it.
7 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion?
8 Call for the question. All those in favor of
9 the motion, say "aye." (Five members said "aye.") All
10 those opposed?
11 MS. CARSON: No.
12 MS. LYNN: No.
13 MR. CAMERON: So that would be one, two,
14 three -- five to two, in favor of the motion.
15 MS. CARSON: Which was to decline.
16 MR. GODBOUT: To reject it.
17 MR. ASKIN: Okay. One to vote on and one,
18 another to discuss; is that correct?
19 MS. LYNN: Correct.
20 MR. COBB: Yes.
21 MR. GODBOUT: Okay. This last one is submitted
22 by the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental
23 Science, College of Agricultural, Biotechnology, and
24 Natural Resources at the University of Nevada, Reno.
25 And --

1 MS. LYNN: It's to study fish.

2 MR. GODBOUT: Oh, this is the fish monitoring --

3 MS. LYNN: Yes.

4 MR. GODBOUT: -- on the Truckee River; is that
5 correct?

6 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

7 MR. CAMERON: I'd like to support. I'm in
8 support of this. I had no prior awareness that this was
9 coming in.

10 TMWA has done a terrific job of responding to
11 community concerns about fish passage at their -- at the
12 upcoming rehabilitation of the Glendale Diversion. A
13 significant amount of effort has gone in by TMWA. And a
14 lot of expense will go into the construction.

15 Some of the, you know, changes of late have been
16 for the purpose of fish passage. And, I think,
17 documenting whether or not and how successful the
18 structure is going to be is the natural complement to
19 the work that's already ongoing.

20 And I also think, to the extent structures in
21 the river are an ongoing -- you know, we'll be taking
22 them out, we'll be putting them in, we'll be rebuilding
23 them. The lessons learned from the Glendale design will
24 be very relevant to future diversion modifications over
25 time.

1 And the only question I have about this
2 proposal, in my mind, is that this makes no sense to pay
3 for the baseline monitoring if we don't follow up and do
4 the postinstruction monitoring. I suppose, we could
5 leave that to chance, that they'll come back, and if we
6 funded the first part, we would also fund the second.
7 But, again, it makes no sense to fund the baseline if
8 you're not going to do the second part.

9 So that's my thought on this proposal.

10 MR. PURDY: Who's going to pay for the
11 construction and the maintenance? We don't have any
12 money. Everybody's broke. It cost 6,000 bucks per
13 acre-foot for screening. That's big-time bucks, there
14 on page three, if I understand it.

15 And I don't always want to approve things unless
16 you've got the money from the people in place to --

17 MR. CAMERON: TMWA is rebuilding the Glendale
18 Diversion irrespective of this proposal.

19 MR. PURDY: Sure.

20 MR. CAMERON: So this is, basically, a proposal
21 that would monitor --

22 MR. COBB: That side.

23 MR. CAMERON: -- the effect of that new design
24 on fish passage. So they're going to build the
25 structure independent of this research.

1 MR. PURDY: Efforts are underway to reconstruct
2 or retrofit a number of these, using public funds:
3 Derby Dam, Prosser, Pine, Proctor, Peterson diversions.
4 So we're talking millions and millions.

5 MR. COBB: Right. But they're looking
6 specifically at the Glendale Diversion and how this
7 is --

8 MR. PURDY: This would be limited to that, then?

9 MR. COBB: Right, this is limited to that and
10 whether or not, did this really work? There's been a
11 lot of studies done all over the nation for design on
12 this. But this'll give us at least a local idea, did it
13 really work what -- the time and effort that went into
14 it. And that when they go to these other sites, is
15 there a better way to do it, or did that way work?

16 And that's what we want to base our design on
17 when we start doing other, new structures or moving the
18 placement structures.

19 MR. PURDY: You're doing baselines. You're
20 going to build the diversion and then do the studies. I
21 understand.

22 MS. LYNN: I also appreciated the fact that they
23 said the fund would only be accepted if additional funds
24 are obtained to support the completion of phase one.

25 So it tells me, if we approve this, and they

1 don't find the other funding, the money will come back,
2 it won't be wasted.

3 MR. ASKIN: We might not even cut the check.

4 MS. LYNN: Exactly.

5 MR. ASKIN: We make the grant contingent upon
6 verification of them having secured those funds.

7 MS. LYNN: Yes.

8 MR. PURDY: Oh, yeah, that's good.

9 MS. LYNN: I think, this will be a very valuable
10 project for the future.

11 MR. COBB: I really like it. But I'm -- when
12 you look at their breakout, the majority of it's for the
13 student salary with fringe and tuition.

14 MR. GODBOUT: Well, grants are very commonly
15 used for the students.

16 MS. LYNN: Yes.

17 MR. COBB: Okay. That's what I just wanted.

18 MR. CAMERON: I think, it's also a pretty
19 labor-intensive exercise.

20 MR. COBB: Oh, yeah, most definitely.

21 So I mean, to me, I see a way if they find grant
22 is whether or not they involve some of the other
23 community groups, and part of the tagging, or whatever,
24 labor is a match.

25 MS. LYNN: Well, I think, they'll be working

1 with NDOW and TMWA and other folks all up and down along
2 the river. And, I think, if we should grant this, we
3 should also ask them to make a public presentation about
4 their finding.

5 MR. COBB: Oh, to the board, most definitely.
6 Because the board needs to approve this project being
7 built.

8 MS. LYNN: Exactly.

9 MS. CARSON: I guess, I had trouble linking this
10 proposal to our main mission, which is to protect and
11 enhance water quality or water resources.

12 MR. COBB: Isn't this part of the water
13 resources?

14 MR. CAMERON: Glendale Diversion, obviously, is
15 central to the water resources.

16 MS. CARSON: Well, whether or not fish pass has
17 nothing to do with the resources.

18 MR. CAMERON: Well, except the fact that TMWA
19 has, basically, for the last couple of years, spent few
20 hundred thousand dollars to make sure their design is,
21 at the front end, intended to be fish-friendly.

22 MR. COBB: I guess, what do you call a water
23 resource?

24 MR. GODBOUT: Well, do you have clean water with
25 no fish in it? What's the point of having clean water?

1 I don't mean to argue with you, but I mean.

2 MS. CARSON: But the clean water is their
3 mission for meeting drinking water standards.

4 MR. GODBOUT: That's the same --

5 MS. CARSON: And the fish liking clean water, to
6 me, is an ancillary.

7 MR. COBB: Then the Living River is part of --

8 MS. CARSON: And, but that's all about water
9 quality.

10 MR. COBB: Is the Living River all --

11 MR. GODBOUT: No.

12 MS. CARSON: And the physical configuration of
13 the diversion isn't going to change water quality.

14 MS. LYNN: No, but it's going to change the
15 livability for fish in the river. I mean they're
16 surviving now; but my sense is if we can forward some
17 scientific knowledge about what, for the future, about
18 how to build these diversion structures.

19 MR. SWAN: I would work out the Rainshadow thing
20 for your water quality, then.

21 MR. GODBOUT: Oh, no. Don't go there.

22 MR. CAMERON: I think, actually -- Yeah. What I
23 enjoy about this latest point, like a lot of the ones
24 earlier today, is that it is a highly relevant question
25 that we haven't yet engaged about what is meant by water

1 resources. And there is a narrow definition of that,
2 and there is an expansive definition.

3 My opinion is this doesn't even require
4 expansive definition, since the Glendale, the revision
5 of the Glendale Diversion is so tightly tied to water
6 resources. And we're, basically, trying to evaluate its
7 effectiveness.

8 MR. COBB: Yeah. And it's just not -- all this,
9 did it really work? All this time and money, that
10 they've used ratepayers, is it really --

11 MR. CAMERON: And when they come to permitting
12 next time, I mean, I think, you can actually -- if you
13 want to really tie it down narrowly, is if there are
14 revisions to structures in the future, and we have a
15 good template to work with, the permitting process is
16 going to be a lot more straightforward if we can
17 demonstrate that we have a structure that actually
18 succeeded. And, you know, permitting agencies are going
19 to have more information to move forward.

20 This has been an interesting exercise.

21 MR. FOREE: The fish passage question has been a
22 huge part of that public process.

23 MR. ASKIN: Yes, this project is -- sounds like
24 it's one which is the most complementary of some other
25 work that TMWA is doing.

1 MR. SWAN: They aren't guaranteeing that there's
2 going to be fish passage with the change in the
3 diversion?

4 MR. COBB: No, they've designed around it.

5 MR. FOREE: It's designed for fish passage.

6 MR. COBB: It's based on what they say really
7 works.

8 MR. SWAN: But nothing like that has ever been
9 built here. Is it anywhere else?

10 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

11 MR. COBB: They've built things. But, I guess,
12 locally, does it?

13 MR. SAWN: That was my only problem, I couldn't
14 believe that they would spend a lot of money and not
15 know for sure if it was going to work.

16 MR. GODBOUT: Well, my questions is, is how come
17 it wasn't a condition of -- well, I'm thinking in terms
18 of entitlements, but a condition that, as part of the
19 program, if they're going to do it, they should monitor
20 how effective it is? I mean they're just going to build
21 it and just kind of ignore the consequences?

22 MR. COBB: Well, no. They're basing it on
23 studies and stuff that have been done in other places.
24 But, I guess, this gives it a local, really --

25 MS. LYNN: Confirmation.

1 MR. COBB: -- confirmation that stuff that's
2 been done in other parts really works, or not.

3 MR. SWAN: Another study.

4 MR. COBB: Yeah. Another study, yes.

5 MR. GODBOUT: I think, it should be part of
6 their responsibility, to see if it's effective.

7 MR. CAMERON: I think, TMWA is -- I mean if you
8 wanted to take the narrowest view of TMWA's
9 responsibilities, is they have to get permits. Right?

10 MR. GODBOUT: Right. That's true.

11 MR. CAMERON: I mean. And one can argue that as
12 soon as they get their permit, as long as they comply
13 with the permit, their formal responsibilities are
14 finished.

15 And I, for one, appreciate the fact that TMWA
16 backed up a few steps and took another run at the design
17 and came up with what many people think is a much better
18 design. And I, for one, think that this is a very
19 modest investment to confirm that all that effort was
20 worthwhile; or if not, we can understand why not.

21 MR. GODBOUT: To comment on what Janet's
22 question was, I think, fish are a part of water
23 resources.

24 MR. CAMERON: Right on.

25 MR. GODBOUT: There's a lot of other things that

1 go into water resource besides monitoring. Swimability,
2 fishability.

3 MS. CARSON: Does TMWA have a position on this,
4 Mark?

5 MR. FOREE: Well, like I said, the fish passage
6 issue has been a huge issue in the public process that
7 we've had. We've had the Nevada Department of Wildlife.
8 We've had Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe representation.
9 We've had --

10 MR. CAMERON: Fish and Wildlife.

11 MR. FOREE: Fish and Wildlife Service. And it's
12 really a big part of what the public process has done.
13 So.

14 MS. HARRISON: If the board has a position that
15 is contrary to this position, I mean if you send this up
16 to the board, you'll find out.

17 MS. LYNN: Yes.

18 MR. FOREE: The staff, right. We think, staff,
19 we think it's a good idea. We think it's beneficial.
20 But, hopefully. You know, I don't know what the board
21 will say. But, I think, there's pretty good ties to
22 what we've done over the past couple of years here.

23 MR. GODBOUT: One thing that puzzles me is why
24 didn't they propose phase one and then come back to us
25 for funding of phase two?

1 MS. CARSON: Because our rules are there's a
2 \$25,000 limit.

3 MR. FOREE: Are you talking about after
4 completion of the project?

5 MR. GODBOUT: After the basin monitoring.

6 MR. FOREE: The structure?

7 MR. GODBOUT: The ongoing. Okay. Thank you.

8 MS. CARSON: And this is done by these, by guys
9 getting out in the river and catching fish; is that how
10 this is done, basically?

11 MS. LYNN: It's like through electroshocking and
12 other things, yes.

13 MR. CAMERON: Dick Cheney's trying to run the
14 program.

15 MR. GODBOUT: What's that?

16 MR. CAMERON: Dick Cheney's trying to run the
17 program.

18 MR. GODBOUT: Dick. All right.

19 MS. CARSON: Are you going to torture the fish?

20 MR. GODBOUT: Come on, folks. I'm not exposing
21 my political views here. I think we got to stay on
22 focus.

23 MS. LYNN: I'm going to move that we approve
24 this application for the full amount, because I think it
25 benefits the publicness of or verification of the

1 publicness of the process, that TMWA's already
2 undertaken, and will give this information that we will
3 probably need for all future diversion changes.

4 MR. PURDY: I'll second that.

5 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion?

6 MS. CARSON: I just have one other question, is
7 do we know from past experience whether this is going to
8 be good data? I mean is it --

9 MR. SWAN: I think, Sudeep Chandra is a highly
10 reputable fisheries biology and researcher. And, you
11 know, I have, you know, in general, reason believe that
12 she does good work and that the outcome of this will be,
13 you know, statistically valid.

14 MS. LYNN: Yeah. She's very highly regarded
15 worldwide.

16 MR. PURDY: I'm wondering if we could offer a
17 suggestion that they consider another project in the
18 future?

19 Researchers of Colorado made a startling
20 discovery. Fish apparently male are developing female
21 sex organs. Scientists believe the result's too much
22 estrogen in the water. They are finding estrogen in
23 rivers across the country. They found them in three
24 rivers in Colorado. And there's about 30 rivers across
25 the United States.

1 And there's a lot of chemicals that are found in
2 paints, rubber, cosmetics, plastics, that have the same
3 effect as estrogen. And the thing, the fish grow
4 abnormalities is a pretty common thing. And it sounds
5 like this lady and her team has got a lot of horsepower.

6 And if we approve this, maybe we could suggest
7 that they consider looking into it and send them a copy
8 of that thing. It's just an article.

9 MR. ASKIN: Okay.

10 MR. PURDY: It's nationwide.

11 MS. LYNN: It's, I think, already under study by
12 the university.

13 MR. SWAN: I just move for the removal of all
14 birth control products. Whatever it takes to make those
15 fish --

16 MR. PURDY: One of the scariest things was that
17 most of these products that are in chemicals have been
18 banned in Europe and Canada for years. It's only in
19 America that we're allowing the use of these things.
20 And maybe we ought to take a looky-poo.

21 MR. CAMERON: Yes, I second it.

22 MS. CARSON: I'd like to suggest that we put
23 that into the group of things we may want to solicit
24 proposals on.

25 MS. LYNN: Yes.

1 MS. CARSON: I think, it's a little far afield
2 from this particular proposal.

3 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

4 MR. ASKIN: Okay.

5 MR. GODBOUT: We had a first. We had a second.
6 And we've had discussion. Any further discussion? All
7 those in favor? (All said "aye.") Those opposed?
8 Motion carries.

9 (Motion carries.)

10 MR. ASKIN: And you end with a unanimous vote.
11 That's nice.

12 MS. CARSON: Yes.

13 MR. ASKIN: Okay. So if we revisit these in our
14 latest stuff --

15 MR. COBB: Let's discuss -- There was one that
16 was sort of pulled, but there wasn't any discussion on
17 it.

18 MR. CAMERON: My point of view would almost --
19 you know, going to item number seven and trying to
20 cultivate and better understand, I am still struggling
21 with how do we better understand the universe of need
22 out there and prioritize?

23 I mean, I think, we're very fortunate around the
24 table. We do have enough -- We're not blind. We're not
25 coming out of -- We're not way out of our professional,

1 our group experience.

2 But I still am under the impression -- And the
3 spirit of this proposal really was that there needs to
4 be -- that there are gaps, and that coordination and
5 communication is necessary for long-term watershed
6 protection. It's not quite ready for prime time, I
7 think. We don't have a physical sponsor.

8 MS. LYNN: We don't have a person to be in
9 charge yet.

10 MR. SWAN: I have a couple of comments about
11 your proposal.

12 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

13 MR. SWAN: And I was going to reject this only
14 because, supposedly, Brisbin is -- and, I think, I
15 brought this up before, that Brisbin was hired to do
16 this, that he --

17 MR. CAMERON: What part?

18 MR. SWAN: The archiving part of it, where you
19 guys go and collect all the data and put it into one
20 site.

21 MS. LYNN: Who is Brisbin?

22 MR. SWAN: Mike Brisbin. He's the water quality
23 coordinator for the City of Sparks, the Truckee Meadows
24 Water Recreation Facility.

25 MS. LYNN: Okay. Good.

1 MR. GODBOUT: Okay.

2 MR. SWAN: He's the one working with Svetich on
3 Chalk Creek. Anyways, that was one of his things to do.
4 And I'm -- for whatever reason, he hadn't accomplished
5 it. But they have, "they" being, I think, Moody Vasad,
6 through Reno, and --

7 MS. CARSON: He's got some data collection
8 stuff, too.

9 MR. SWAN: And Brisbin had hired -- I can't
10 remember the guy's name. It turns out that it's
11 Dr. Goldman's group, with California, Davis. They've
12 hired somebody who's going to do that, supposedly gather
13 up everything you wanted to know about the Truckee River
14 and have it in one spot.

15 So I don't know if you want to take that off of
16 the table and do something else in coordination with
17 that, or coordinate with Brisbin after they collect the
18 stuff.

19 MS. LYNN: That's what we need to find out.
20 That's what we need to find out.

21 MR. SWAN: But the important thing and the other
22 part, supposedly we are -- and they hired him at an
23 extraordinary amount of money. So. That part should be
24 getting done.

25 MS. LYNN: That's fine. That's good.

1 MR. CAMERON: And, to me, that was kind of at
2 the bottom of the list, in terms of what needed to be
3 done.

4 MR. SWAN: Sure. It seemed to be the expensive
5 part.

6 MR. CAMERON: Uh-huh.

7 MR. GODBOUT: That's my question, was 75 hours
8 for data collection? I collect this stuff, just because
9 some day I think I'm going to read it.

10 MS. LYNN: Well, it's --

11 MR. GODBOUT: There's a mountain. I don't think
12 75 hours is enough.

13 MS. LYNN: It probably isn't.

14 MR. GODBOUT: Ten hours for cataloging of data,
15 reports, and materials. And, again, I'd up that by a
16 factor of 10.

17 MS. LYNN: Ten, yeah.

18 MR. CAMERON: Well, and maybe that's not, to my
19 way of thinking, and this is a -- You go ahead. Excuse
20 me.

21 MS. LYNN: Well, I was going to say, if this is
22 already being done, let's not even talk about it.
23 Because I believe that there are probably people out
24 there very qualified to do that sort of work. And why
25 reduplicate?

1 Our thought was to create a virtual archive of
2 material where you could go to the Web site.

3 MR. SWAN: That's what this guy's supposed to
4 do.

5 MS. LYNN: Good. Perfect.

6 MS. CARSON: Okay. What he's supposed to do is
7 different from is doing.

8 MR. SWAN: Yeah, but he's paid to do it. And
9 that's why I said lots of money to do it. And I didn't
10 know that that was -- it didn't seem like there was as
11 much money in there to do what this guy's going to do.
12 And, like Mike says, this is a minor part of their
13 proposal.

14 MS. CARSON: Well, maybe this an appropriate
15 amount of money to nag the guy who's supposed to be
16 doing it.

17 MR. CAMERON: This is a nag grant.

18 MR. SWAN: That's Brisbin's job, to nag the guy.

19 MS. CARSON: I mean is it going to be done, is
20 my uncertainty?

21 MR. PURDY: I know the county will be coming in
22 with a proposal to put all of the Truckee River test
23 reports on one common database.

24 MR. SWAN: That's what he's hired for. The
25 county was supposed to -- I think, we are. And that's

1 why we hired Brisbin.

2 MR. PURDY: I talked to him a little bit a while
3 back, before I ever even got on this committee --

4 MS. LYNN: Okay.

5 MR. PURDY: -- to put that together.

6 MS. LYNN: Then let's cut that part out
7 completely.

8 MR. PURDY: Can I offer another one, then?

9 MS. LYNN: Sure.

10 MR. PURDY: You folks are good at it.

11 When you go out there and look at the Truckee
12 River, you've got lots of trees that are falling in the
13 river, because the channel is expanding and moving, and
14 there's a lot of soft soils out there around Sparks.
15 And it's undercutting roots, and the trees lean when the
16 wind comes up. And we're losing all of our big trees.

17 It might be worth it to go catalog the ones you
18 want to save and then put 10 yards of rock around them
19 and figure out what you want to do with them.

20 MR. COBB: The problem there, Jerry --

21 MR. GODBOUT: You have to have a permit.

22 MR. COBB: Yeah. The permitting's through NDOW
23 and all the other, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and
24 everything else. The reason I know this is areas that
25 were undercut due to the flood, soon after the flood,

1 the cities, different jurisdictions, whatever, get in
2 and take some gravel bars out, put in rock in certain
3 areas and do things. And in some areas, we just missed,
4 in the lower Sparks along the path, that we came back at
5 a later date to try to do, to accomplish.

6 At that point, permitting with these agencies
7 and what they would allow greatly changed. It did a 180
8 of what they would allow. And trying to put root balls
9 of willows within five-foot diameter rocks and how it --
10 it just -- I understand what you're trying to do with
11 saving the trees.

12 But what they're physically going to allow us to
13 do anymore is they say that it's a living river. And
14 even digging out sand bars, the city manager doesn't
15 want to do. When you work with the Natural Resource
16 Conservation Agency and stuff, they're saying this is
17 the part of the river and how it ages itself, and we
18 have to let it go its natural course.

19 So they're going to tell you -- I understand
20 where you're going with it. And if somebody wants to
21 approach them, that's fine. But they're going to tell
22 you that's part of the river and how it's moving and
23 aging itself.

24 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, this isn't really central to
25 what --

1 MS. CARSON: I was going to say, we're way off
2 the track.

3 MR. COBB: Right.

4 MR. CAMERON: Just come back to this, and maybe
5 to help shorten this subject, I'm almost inclined to,
6 you know, come back with a proposal, calling -- it's a
7 pretty modest one. But I can't get off the notion of
8 getting people together for a day or even two. And I'm
9 talking about getting the Lahontan Water Quality Control
10 Board, NDEP, Pyramid Lake Tribe, cities, TMWA, counties,
11 get them into a room, hire a facilitator.

12 I want to do this right. I mean the Truckee
13 River Symposium was too much catch-as-catch-can and
14 thrown together kind of randomly. And to try to develop
15 a need statement for both this coordination question
16 that, to me, was the most -- for me, it was the most
17 critical part of this, was trying to get people to find
18 out where the gaps were; but also to try to find out
19 where the water quality monitoring and regulatory
20 programs may need reinforcement or gaps.

21 And I just don't know how else to come up with a
22 robust, well-informed proposal without trying to pull
23 people together with a very -- you know, with a
24 professionally put together program, so that we can
25 really elicit the information that we need.

1 And, you know, I'm thinking of -- I'm just
2 guessing, off the top of my head, that it would cost
3 \$10,000 or something to put on a symposium like that,
4 and that that, would then, in turn, lead to another
5 proposal that would look like this, that calls for an
6 ongoing set of dialogues, with a set of topics and
7 parameters.

8 But I just feel like we're flying a little bit
9 too blind and that maybe we start with baby steps and
10 pull everybody together with a very focused mission and
11 agenda.

12 MR. COBB: To help them with the proposal, do
13 you know if the person that's been hired is actually --
14 are they just collecting the data and putting it
15 somewhere, or is somebody actually going to review this
16 and the differences within the data?

17 MR. SWAN: They're supposed to review that.

18 MR. COBB: Okay.

19 MS. LYNN: They provide for the analysis.

20 MR. SWAN: Right.

21 MR. COBB: It provides, so, like you said, that
22 coordination, I could really see that the policy's
23 different. There's going to be that lack of
24 coordination. So if it is being done, that's part of
25 it? Okay.

1 MR. SWAN: Can you guys coordinate with Brisbin
2 and, you know, his group, to find out?

3 MR. COBB: Where it's missing.

4 MS. CARSON: Inviting him to make a
5 presentation --

6 MR. SWAN: Brisbin?

7 MS. CARSON: Brisbin -- would be nice.

8 MR. SWAN: I think it might be appropriate. I'd
9 like to know what he's doing, too.

10 MS. LYNN: Well, actually, the other question
11 that was raised at the most recent Truckee River
12 conference is how do you move the science, that we're
13 developing, into policy measures? Do we already have
14 policies and regulations in place to measure that, or do
15 we need to tweak the ones we have, or do we just need
16 enforcement of those policies and regulations to protect
17 water quality and to protect the health of the river?

18 So that was the primary focus of what instituted
19 the concept for this. And it's not ready to go, but we
20 wanted a place.

21 MS. HARRISON: Could I ask a question? Because
22 I understand that, last time, you brought up the
23 question whether this group, as fund advisors, could
24 collectively put on a conference. Well, I guess, there
25 were two questions really that are sort of different.

1 One is how do we accomplish the goal of reaching
2 out to potential groups that might be interested in
3 bringing forth quality proposals within the parameters
4 that have been established for this group.

5 But I thought that there was a second question,
6 whether there was a -- well, there was a role for this
7 organization and hosting the sort of conference that
8 you've just been describing, which may be a little bit
9 different from the proposal or the goals of this
10 specific proposal, which were a little bit more
11 long-term, as I understood them.

12 I don't know the answer to either of those
13 questions, but it was -- and number seven is kind of
14 requesting do you want to, in conjunction with your
15 recommendations, take a question to the TMWA Board.
16 Specifically, is it appropriate for you to take however
17 many dollars from the fund you think will be necessary
18 to host a conference or a symposium to accomplish one or
19 both of these goals?

20 MR. CAMERON: Well, I'm just going to try to
21 flip that into an active, maybe an active statement,
22 which is, you know, would this group entertain creating
23 a subcommittee to work with TMWA's staff. I mean I'm
24 not sure how else to phrase it, but with a budget to
25 develop a forum?

1 I mean is it -- We don't have a proposal in
2 front of us, so I don't quite understand whether or not
3 we can make, take that kind of action, but to just
4 authorize the development of a program for this purpose
5 and give it some budget, so that we don't have to, you
6 know, basically lose time.

7 I think, the other purpose of it, if I could
8 just add onto Sylvia's comment, I do think cultivation
9 of projects would be to our advantage.

10 The original purpose of the symposium, in my
11 mind, was to try to get the experts together to identify
12 the gaps and needs. But I can easily imagine a second
13 day where you would then flip it around and have people
14 start making suggestions as to -- you know, a
15 brainstorming session on how one might address those
16 needs, and in very rough terms, start developing
17 projects that could then be turned into proposals, and
18 really, as an incubator, jump-start it, so that we
19 really have a rich body of proposals to work with in the
20 future.

21 I think, we'll be a lot better off if we can
22 instill that kind of -- or generate that kind of
23 informed proposals.

24 MR. PURDY: I think, you need to come up with
25 projects and not any philosophical studies of studies

1 and concepts, goals. You're talking about development,
2 expanded codes, handbooks, education materials that may
3 provide land use decisions.

4 You take a look at what was in the paper. It's
5 too late. You got to come up with projects to address
6 what's going on here. These are all the proposals for
7 the growth in Reno and Carson City.

8 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to use one of your
9 favorite examples, Jerry. You think we should be
10 pulling this wood debris out of the river. That's
11 already a jurisdictional responsibility. Frankly, I'm
12 glad they don't implement it.

13 But those are the kinds of failures of
14 enforcement, now, that -- I mean you may call that a
15 project that requires a body and track hoe to go in and
16 pull it out. And somebody else might describe that as a
17 failure of an agency to implement its existing
18 authorities.

19 MR. PURDY: Yeah, that's part of the rub, why it
20 hasn't been done, you're right, fair and square.

21 MR. CAMERON: The project -- And so, anyway,
22 that's direct response. But, to me, the narrow question
23 still is can we authorize ourselves to generate -- could
24 we make a motion to even --

25 MS. CARSON: Well, can't we do that within our

1 existing framework, by saying, "Look, we want to fund
2 the portion of this that has to do with a forum"?

3 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

4 MS. CARSON: I mean that falls within kind of
5 the manner of doing business that we have. And we don't
6 have to raise a bunch of procedural questions. And we
7 get done the part of this that, I think, would be very
8 helpful.

9 MR. ASKIN: Well, your timing is good here.
10 We're going to be -- Following today's meeting, there's
11 going to be a report that goes to the TMWA Board. And
12 they're meeting in a week?

13 MR. CAMERON: Two weeks.

14 MS. HARRISON: The 30th.

15 MR. ASKIN: The 30th. So to have this down as a
16 question to them would seem to be appropriate. You
17 know, we're not going to have time today to discuss
18 exactly what you're looking for in terms of a format of
19 that type of an event.

20 So if we asked them in a fairly brief manner,
21 you know, may we conduct this activity, which is
22 typically done by funding entities, especially as they
23 start out, but also from time to time as they change
24 their funding emphasis to work with funders, I mean with
25 grantees and, also, potential applicants, we should have

1 the word back from them on the 30th. And then we need
2 to meet again anyway.

3 So then we could put together the format for
4 that event. My guess would be that they would support
5 that.

6 MS. CARSON: But do we need to go to them?

7 MS. HARRISON: Yeah, I think you'll want to.

8 MR. COBB: Before you fund this, I think, you
9 need to touch base with where they're at with cataloging
10 this, and all that. So are you funding it appropriately
11 in this fiscal. Or find out, do you need to fund a nag
12 fund? I mean we don't know where that's at. And it's
13 being done.

14 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

15 MR. COBB: So, I think, before you fund a forum,
16 you need to find out really where that process is at, so
17 that you have a beneficial forum for bringing them in.

18 MS. HARRISON: My suggestion is that because
19 your authority, as fund advisors, is gray as to whether
20 this, using fund money for this purpose, is appropriate,
21 I think, getting just ongoing authority from the board
22 that from time to time we may wish to conduct these
23 conferences or symposia or these incubator sessions, to
24 get authority to spend an up-to amount of money, in your
25 discretion, subject to, you know, reporting back to the

1 board about what you've done, and so on, is probably a
2 good idea and gives you some flexibility that you need.

3 We're not talking about can we have \$50,000 to
4 have a one-time conference. I think that what you want
5 to do is something that's more flexible, but so that you
6 don't have to go back to them every time you get a
7 bright idea about community outreach.

8 MR. PURDY: Good thought.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So would you be willing to
10 frame that question? I like the formulation. How does
11 that get drafted as a decision item?

12 MS. HARRISON: I would -- If you want to,
13 because we do have an action item that relates to this,
14 if you want to just, you know, approve that effort
15 generally, probably what Craig and I will do between now
16 and the time that we have to actually put this on the
17 agenda with the board, is quickly but together the final
18 board report, ship it all around to each of you for
19 comments, and just incorporate it without further
20 action, if that works.

21 MR. CAMERON: So you guys will take it from here
22 and basically put that into a --

23 MS. HARRISON: Yeah, if that's what you instruct
24 us to do.

25 MR. GODBOUT: It's great.

1 MR. CAMERON: In terms of dollar amount, I mean
2 do we want to propose something?

3 MR. GODBOUT: What's our budget now for
4 administrative, 25,000?

5 MS. HARRISON: I wouldn't take it out of your
6 administrative budget. I'd make it an add-on.

7 MR. CAMERON: Separate.

8 MS. HARRISON: And maybe Mike and Susan have a
9 sense of an up-to amount.

10 MR. CAMERON: Well, you know, you get what you
11 pay for. And, at some level, I think, the technical
12 nature of this, I think, if you can do some front-end
13 work, so that you can really present, you can start off
14 with a good healthy body of information ahead of the
15 conference, you're going to get more out of it.

16 Similarly, on the follow-up, if somebody can,
17 basically, condense the conclusions and discussion into
18 some intelligible document on the back end, it's a much
19 more valuable exercise.

20 So from that point of view, I don't want to be
21 penny-wise and pound-foolish. Ten thousand, to me, I'm
22 trying to -- you know, real good facilitators are
23 expensive. And given the technical nature, 10 is
24 probably -- you could do it. But I'm really picking
25 numbers out of the air. I would say 15 at least, for

1 the first one, might be a safer bet.

2 MS. HARRISON: I wouldn't cut yourself short. I
3 mean you may want to do this twice a year. Just, I'm
4 thinking, especially given the amount of money that you
5 have in the fund, if you went back and asked for --
6 What's a good number, Chris? You've done this a lot.

7 MR. ASKIN: Well, I don't know. That seems on
8 the high end to me.

9 MS. HARRISON: Does it?

10 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

11 MR. CAMERON: Fifteen does?

12 MR. ASKIN: I don't know that you'd need to go
13 higher than that.

14 MR. CAMERON: Well, maybe we did 20 for the
15 whole year, for possibly up to two conferences. The
16 second one, I would assume, would be potentially less
17 expensive.

18 MR. ASKIN: Yeah. And you've got to keep in
19 mind the Community Foundation, we're a nonprofit
20 ourselves, and we're very used to leveraging things at
21 very low cost.

22 MS. LYNN: Yes.

23 MR. ASKIN: Typically, the one thing you can't
24 get around is the facilitator fees. But in terms of
25 food, the conference facilities, communication efforts,

1 and so on, the cost may not be that high.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

3 MS. CARSON: I guess, I'm still a little stuck
4 on the routing of this effort. I think, it's a critical
5 thing we should do. But we all, as the committee,
6 aren't going to do it. We talked a couple meetings ago
7 about not putting more tasks on the TMWA staff. So why
8 are we not handling this as a proposal from somebody to
9 do it? That's --

10 MR. SWAN: I think, you ought to make sure you
11 don't introduce any bias into it. If it comes like out
12 of TMWA, I think, it's better than having it come -- no
13 offense to you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

15 MR. SWAN: You don't want to have it come out of
16 the burden money people or the sewer plant people or I
17 mean out of the -- Even like him, if he could put it on,
18 it would have a lot more ubiquitous --

19 MR. ASKIN: Or the Community Foundation can just
20 contract with somebody to take care of setting this up.

21 MR. CAMERON: I think, it would reflect well on
22 TMWA.

23 MR. ASKIN: That's the easiest and most direct,
24 is if we just contract.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

1 MR. ASKIN: You know, we talk about what you
2 want to do, and then we just hire somebody to take care
3 of that for us.

4 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

5 MS. HARRISON: I would suggest that in
6 conjunction with that, probably, especially for this
7 first one, have another meeting or two, not necessarily
8 an all-morning meeting, but, you know, and then direct
9 Chris with a lot of specificity.

10 MR. CAMERON: So the next step would be to get
11 some financial authorization, so we have some money to
12 spend on such an event. And then, once we get that, we
13 can come in, and then we actually can put something
14 together and not just be speaking hypothetically.

15 MS. CARSON: I really agree with what Michael
16 said about doing the front-end work and the back-end
17 work. Because, otherwise, there's a bunch of people
18 getting together in a room, having a good discussion,
19 and that's that. We've had enough of those.

20 MR. GODBOUT: You have a good idea, Mike.

21 MS. LYNN: Results.

22 MS. CARSON: Can we specifically invite Brisbin
23 or whoever to inform us about what's going on with that?

24 MS. HARRISON: That's a good idea. It might
25 make him find out.

1 MS. CARSON: That's a nicer way to do it.

2 Another thing I'm thinking is what would be
3 helpful is there were a couple of studies done, but this
4 was handed out in our first edition of the group. This
5 is Nonpoint Source Pollution Trading and Analysis
6 Report. Here's one that's Watershed Management
7 Protection Plan for Tributaries to the Truckee River.

8 I'd be interested in hearing from somebody.

9 MR. CAMERON: We were going to do that.

10 MS. CARSON: Whatever happened to this?

11 MR. CAMERON: We were going to do that.

12 MS. LYNN: Mike Widmer. It hasn't gone
13 anywhere. Mike Widmer with C. Donaldson.

14 MS. CARSON: Somebody at the front end say,
15 "What's out there, and who do we need to hear from?"

16 MR. CAMERON: Well, in my way of thinking, given
17 the massive amount of information, as Craig referred to
18 it, what I think is going to -- and this is what I
19 think, it does cost a little bit of money.

20 And, actually, Janet, you actually come to mind.
21 I'm trying to -- you know, who can we find to do this?

22 But here's what I think. I think, what you got
23 to do, because there's so much of that out there, is
24 that you find somebody who's technically competent in
25 the science, who basically, ahead of this conference,

1 has the conversation with Widmer, looks at his report,
2 has the conversation with Brisbin, you know, reads his
3 material, gets up there, and for an hour, one person
4 presents a summary of the pile, with a respondents'
5 table -- Well, okay, so maybe you got to narrow it.

6 MR. GODBOUT: Two hours.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Two hours. But I'm trying
8 to synthesize, is my point. I don't want Mike Widmer --
9 no personal offense intended at all. I don't want to
10 sit and listen to Widmer for half an hour. I want
11 somebody to get up there and say, "The body of knowledge
12 reduces to this." We have a panel of respondents,
13 including Widmer, including Brisbin.

14 MS. CARSON: Yeah, that's a great idea.

15 MR. CAMERON: But that's what I think the
16 expense is, to pay for somebody on the front end, to
17 both take the time to read and have the conversation and
18 draw the one-paragraph conclusion and do that. That's
19 where I think the expense is.

20 MS. CARSON: I love that.

21 MR. GODBOUT: Well, if you could use -- Who's
22 the fellow that was supposed to collect this
23 information? I missed that part.

24 MS. CARSON: Brisbin?

25 MR. SWAN: No. Actually, it was a contract with

1 the University of California, Davis. I don't know the
2 guy, the first name, I don't know who it is, but Goldman
3 is assigned.

4 MR. GODBOUT: Could we depend upon them to
5 collect that data, and you would have access to the
6 data, or they would produce a compendium? I mean our
7 person could -- instead of paying our person, or whoever
8 it is, to collect it all, but to review what's been
9 collected, 10 grand?

10 MR. CAMERON: Let's not do anything that's
11 already been done or that somebody is supposed to do.
12 But, also, I think that part of the chicken or egg
13 problem is if we wait for all of these people to do
14 their jobs, we won't get the guidance we need in order
15 to make good decisions in here.

16 So, I think, we need to almost force the issue.
17 And if someone's almost halfway done, we're going to get
18 up in this room and say, "They're supposed to do this.
19 They're halfway done. This is what we know right now."

20 MR. SWAN: Just call it, instead of waiting for
21 everybody.

22 MR. PURDY: It might be good to take a look at
23 one of the reports that's already out there. This was
24 done by Brock, J.T. Brock of Rapid Creek Research. It
25 was done in the year 2000. And it was done with all of

1 the agencies that do water quality testing, channel
2 characteristics, aerial photographs, gas retention,
3 travel time, point sources.

4 MR. CAMERON: Brock.

5 MS. LYNN: I know. Exactly.

6 MR. CAMERON: All these people can be in the
7 room with a muzzle.

8 MS. LYNN: Yes.

9 MR. PURDY: But the bottom line is there's your
10 chart of who all's doing testing on what basises. It's
11 the most complete document around.

12 MR. CAMERON: Complete, but it's unintelligible.
13 I think, that's the problem, is that -- that --

14 MS. LYNN: We need a translation for the
15 layperson.

16 MR. PURDY: There's a guy who can make a
17 contribution toward cleaning up the water quality
18 testing.

19 MS. LYNN: He's already made his contribution.

20 MR. PURDY: Do you know him?

21 MS. LYNN: Oh, yeah.

22 MR. CAMERON: He's very bright, but he's another
23 one of the scientists that can't keep it in front of him.

24 MR. PURDY: He's not the one, then.

25 MS. LYNN: Well.

1 MR. GODBOUT: Well, it's incomplete.

2 MS. LYNN: So are we not to implement any part
3 of this? Let's leave this, then, for -- you know, if
4 what we're talking about goes into effect, this is not
5 needed.

6 MS. CARSON: Okay. But the thing that this is
7 driving at is very much needed, I think.

8 MR. CAMERON: The form, I mean the coordination.

9 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

10 MR. COBB: It's been submitted as a proposal. I
11 think, we can make a motion that we could reject it,
12 with a -- strongly urge to resubmit with, you know, a
13 different basis.

14 MS. CARSON: Well, I would rather have them
15 withdraw than have us reject.

16 MR. ASKIN: That's what I had down from our
17 first -- from the beginning of the meeting, that it had
18 been retracted.

19 MS. CARSON: But the problem I have with them
20 withdrawing is some of these things, I think, are
21 crucial to do.

22 MS. HARRISON: But, I think, the point that --
23 what I'm hearing is that we're not quite sure what some
24 of them give and that once we can -- if we can
25 collectively put on this forum that, you know, as you

1 point out, doesn't have any baggage associated with
2 it --

3 MR. CAMERON: Right.

4 MS. HARRISON: -- because it's sponsored by a
5 particular group, then I think that that, out of that
6 forum will come more particular needs that may drive
7 other, more pointed, focused proposals that we don't
8 necessarily, from that point --

9 MR. CAMERON: One of the things that we
10 struggled with as a fiscal. You know, we both jumped in
11 and wrote it. But neither one of us assumed that our
12 organization was the best one to do the ongoing
13 coordination.

14 That's one of the questions, is we want a
15 certain amount of neutrality and independence. Who is
16 best suited to do that? It's something that we weren't
17 trying -- we didn't want to prejudge that.

18 And right now, Janet, we're not even sure who
19 would be most appropriate to be a fiscal sponsor.

20 And so, from that point, having this group begin
21 this, get everybody to the table, have a structured
22 conversation, generate some needs and incubate some
23 proposals.

24 MS. LYNN: And maybe use some of these concepts
25 towards developing discussion.

1 MR. PURDY: Good idea.

2 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

3 MS. LYNN: We didn't have any pride of ownership
4 in this. We just wanted to see something happen. So.

5 MR. CAMERON: So can I make a motion? With
6 respect to agenda item seven, that --

7 MR. GODBOUT: I think, we're still on --

8 MR. CAMERON: Oh.

9 MR. GODBOUT: Five.

10 MR. CAMERON: Five. Okay.

11 MR. GODBOUT: Sorry.

12 MS. CARSON: But you could still make it. Or
13 can you?

14 MS. HARRISON: Are we done with five?

15 MR. GODBOUT: So this one's been withdrawn?

16 MS. LYNN: Yes.

17 MS. HARRISON: Yes.

18 MR. ASKIN: So we are, then, officially done
19 with five?

20 MS. HARRISON: Yes. And we're skipping over
21 six, and we're going to seven.

22 MR. ASKIN: Going to seven?

23 MS. HARRISON: Yeah. So, Mike, make your
24 motion.

25 MR. CAMERON: I would move -- And I'm not going

1 to try to paraphrase Sylvia. But, basically, I would
2 move that Sylvia and Craig, as I heard it, will draft a
3 recommendation for the TMWA Board to authorize the
4 Truckee River Fund Advisory Committee to sponsor up to
5 two forums a year and to provide facilitation and
6 scientific support, authorize \$20,000 for this, for the
7 first year's events, up to \$20,000.

8 MR. GODBOUT: That would be in addition to our
9 administrative?

10 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

11 MR. ASKIN: You may want to say on an annual
12 basis, just so that it doesn't have to be revisited.

13 MR. GODBOUT: Yes.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. On an annual basis.

15 MS. CARSON: I'll second that.

16 MR. GODBOUT: Discussion?

17 MS. CARSON: If I were a TMWA Board member, I
18 would ask, is this 20,000 coming out of your grant
19 money, or is this another 20,000?

20 MR. GODBOUT: Yes.

21 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

22 MR. GODBOUT: That's where I was trying to go
23 with the clarification.

24 MR. SWAN: It's coming out of the fund, right?

25 MR. ASKIN: Yes.

1 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I'm going to say the
3 purpose -- Can I add to this?

4 MS. HARRISON: Yes.

5 MR. CAMERON: The purpose of the forums will be
6 to cultivate the most beneficial, will be to -- excuse
7 me. The purpose of the fund will be to identify the
8 highest priority needs for watershed protection and to
9 help generate the best possible proposals for the
10 Truckee River Fund.

11 MS. HARRISON: Are you okay with that addition,
12 Janet?

13 MR. GODBOUT: Hm?

14 MS. CARSON: Yeah. The only discomfort I have
15 with that --

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

17 MS. CARSON: -- it sort of implies that these
18 decisions we made here were based on no knowledge.

19 MR. CAMERON: Would you rather we just leave
20 that second part off?

21 MS. CARSON: I'd rather just leave the second
22 part off.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

24 MS. HARRISON: We can say something again about
25 this.

1 MR. ASKIN: I mean you're going to have a
2 constantly growing base of knowledge. So, you know,
3 you've made decisions based upon what you know, which is
4 considerable, looking at the people in the room. And
5 future decisions will be based upon, really, expanding
6 the group of people who are more intimately aware of the
7 needs, so that you can glean better and more current
8 information on how grants can be made to meet those
9 needs, but, also, to encourage collaboration between
10 organizations and to encourage organizations to consider
11 taking on some of these on-the-ground or in-the-river
12 projects that you want to see happen.

13 MS. LYNN: That's good terminology to maybe add
14 to the motion or add to the proposal, is to encourage
15 good projects to come before this group and to
16 encourage --

17 MR. ASKIN: Yeah, an event like that always
18 accomplishes several purposes. I mean just bringing
19 everybody to discuss these does result in better
20 collaboration.

21 MR. GODBOUT: Did you make a motion?

22 MR. COBB: M-hm.

23 MS. CARSON: And I seconded it.

24 MR. GODBOUT: Janet seconded it. Any more
25 discussion?

1 All those in favor? (All said "aye.") Those
2 opposed? Motion carries.

3 (Motion carries.)

4 MR. GODBOUT: That concludes item -- a portion
5 of seven.

6 MR. CAMERON: A portion of seven.

7 MR. ASKIN: I would add that because you really
8 want to have this event, and you want to have it soon,
9 that we defer formalizing any next grant-making round
10 until we have better information on the timing of this
11 event and whether or not it will happen soon enough that
12 you can have the next RFP go out following that event.

13 But I have notes on what you spoke about in
14 terms of specific projects. And so we'll record those
15 notes, and I will get those to Sylvia, so that we have
16 those recorded. And that will change with this event.
17 But it gives -- you know, there's some documentation to
18 what you -- some of the things that you identified
19 today.

20 MS. CARSON: Would you mind reviewing that?
21 Because we have some really fresh thoughts right here
22 for next time that we don't want to forget.

23 MR. ASKIN: What I've got on that so far would
24 be the storm drain stenciling, the Glendale Bridge
25 debris problem, specifically the geographic areas for

1 many different types of projects, including Whites
2 Creek, Steamboat Creek and the North Truckee Drain and,
3 finally, the fish sex change hormone issue.

4 MS. LYNN: It's called the endocrine disrupters.

5 MR. ASKIN: Disrupters. Okay.

6 MS. CARSON: Could we add, for our own
7 collective memory, that -- I think, we wanted to say
8 something about one time versus perpetual funding.

9 MS. LYNN: Yes.

10 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

11 MS. CARSON: In our next round.

12 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

13 MS. CARSON: And, also, I had asked if we could
14 add a category for maintenance.

15 MR. GODBOUT: That's right.

16 MR. ASKIN: Yes.

17 MR. PURDY: Good idea.

18 MS. HARRISON: Let's -- Maybe what we should do,
19 because if you're going to go ahead and --

20 MR. ASKIN: Oh, I did. I'm sorry. I was
21 reading from a list that was below that.

22 Yes, the other item is your ongoing wish to
23 support capital projects and to encourage those
24 applications. The fourth category is maintenance.
25 Those items in addition. Sorry.

1 MS. HARRISON: What I was going to suggest is
2 that it might be appropriate to put an agenda item on
3 your next meeting, if you have the will to do it, is to
4 review the criteria that you've previously adopted, now
5 that you've had a chance to review these proposals, see
6 whether you want to refine those and modify and/or add
7 to them, develop some more tests, if you want to. And
8 that might be an appropriate agenda item for next time.

9 MR. PURDY: Good thought.

10 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

11 MS. HARRISON: Again, while this discussion is
12 fresh in your memories.

13 MR. CAMERON: Now, along those lines, one thing
14 that occurred to me, just based on our discussion today,
15 is that if we were to recast the criteria to say that
16 the project should, the projects should demonstrate that
17 they would enhance water quality and water resources
18 within or at -- you know, between state line. So that
19 projects that are upstream that really do -- are
20 relevant to TMWA rateholders, if you were to -- say, if
21 you were to take a project above state line that was
22 highly erosive, a Chalk Creek equivalent that was right
23 above state line, there's a way, I think, to craft our
24 criteria, so that it's eligible, if it can demonstrate
25 that it provides benefits within the narrower geographic

1 area.

2 It's not so much that it takes place within the
3 geographic area, but the --

4 MR. GODBOUT: The benefits.

5 MR. CAMERON: -- benefits need to flow downhill.

6 MS. HARRISON: I like that. That's a great
7 thought for next time.

8 MS. CARSON: Well, do we need to go to the board
9 with that?

10 MS. HARRISON: No.

11 MS. CARSON: Okay.

12 MS. HARRISON: I don't think so.

13 MS. CARSON: Because you said it's a sensitive
14 point with them.

15 MR. COBB: It is. But by crafting the question
16 that way in our criteria, I think, we demonstrate when
17 we send something to the board that we're following --

18 MS. HARRISON: Yeah. Let's see what it looks
19 like and see if we're comfortable without more guidance.

20 MS. CARSON: Okay.

21 MR. ASKIN: Okay. Also, Sylvia and Craig are
22 going to be working on the draft recommendations to the
23 board. So why don't I propose that I just -- regarding
24 our various notes and the recommendations for each of
25 the grants, but I go ahead, and on Monday, I can e-mail

1 that to you, too, so that everybody on the committee can
2 see the draft language that's going out to the
3 committee, including the notes regarding why you made
4 your recommendations. We'll try to take care of that
5 all at once.

6 MR. PURDY: Can you do that by then, or is that
7 punching you too hard?

8 MR. ASKIN: I need to do it while it's fresh.

9 MR. FOREE: We also might want to distribute
10 that packet on --

11 MR. ASKIN: It's got to be quick.

12 MR. GODBOUT: Because that brings up one of
13 questions that I had earlier and voiced, is that all of
14 these get forwarded to the TMWA Board, regardless.

15 MR. ASKIN: The complete proposals.

16 MR. GODBOUT: The complete proposals, all of
17 them, whether they're accepted by us or rejected?

18 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

19 MR. GODBOUT: With our recommendations,
20 comments.

21 MS. CARSON: Is that a statement or a question?

22 MR. GODBOUT: That's a question, was I --
23 because, at first, I was thinking that they only see the
24 ones that we accepted, that we're recommending.

25 MS. CARSON: I was thinking that all they saw

1 was a list.

2 MR. ASKIN: Yeah, I wouldn't burden them with an
3 additional 60, 70 pages of paper. You know, I think
4 that that's your job.

5 MR. GODBOUT: So they won't see, they won't
6 actually get these?

7 MS. HARRISON: Are you saying that you're not --
8 Okay. Two different, two different questions. One is
9 are you going to forward all of the proposals to the
10 board with your recommendations, regardless, or only the
11 ones that you recommend you forward? That's one
12 question.

13 The second question is, for those projects which
14 you forward to the board, are you going to provide all
15 the supporting documentation?

16 MR. CAMERON: It's really a question for the
17 TMWA Board.

18 MR. GODBOUT: If they want to see it from us,
19 what do they want coming out of this committee?

20 MS. CARSON: If I were a board member, I'd say,
21 "Look, I've got a lot of stuff to read in my agenda
22 packet."

23 MR. GODBOUT: Exactly.

24 MS. CARSON: And I don't want all this
25 additional stuff. That's what you guys are here for.

1 MS. LYNN: Give us your recommendations and your
2 rationale.

3 MR. ASKIN: And you're going to get a stack when
4 you're looking at 40 to 50 proposals. Okay. So, you
5 know.

6 MR. CAMERON: One other way to do it --

7 MR. ASKIN: I mean, literally, probably in our
8 next round of funding, you're going to get a stack each
9 this big.

10 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

11 MR. ASKIN: I don't know that the TMWA Board
12 wants that.

13 MR. GODBOUT: Right.

14 MR. CAMERON: But maybe we could give them the
15 courtesy of allowing them to choose this time, at the
16 risk of sacrificing a third of a tree. I mean I would
17 just take Sylvia's suggestion. Do you want to put that
18 question to them or just make an assumption of what's in
19 their interest?

20 MS. CARSON: They can certainly request it, the
21 materials that they want.

22 MR. PURDY: Yeah, they can request what they
23 want.

24 MR. ASKIN: That is a good way to handle it.
25 And, you know, typically, that's done, you know: If

1 you'd like to see any original proposal, let us know.

2 MR. FOREE: Okay. Are they acting on this,
3 they're acting on the funding of these on November 30th?

4 MS. HARRISON: Yeah.

5 MR. PURDY: Are we going to have another meeting
6 one of these days, or what sounds right to you?

7 MR. GODBOUT: Well, are we at that point now in
8 the calendar?

9 MS. CARSON: Can I ask one more question about
10 thinking ahead to the next around? I noticed some of
11 the proposals submitted really only the form that we
12 provided. And some of them provided a bunch more stuff.

13 MR. ASKIN: M-hm.

14 MS. CARSON: Is that okay, or should we try to
15 seek more uniformity?

16 MR. ASKIN: You can shoot for uniformity, but
17 you'll never quite get it, especially as there are new
18 funding applicants. So I think that if you find that
19 the applicants have followed the spirit of the order and
20 the information that you're looking for, if they
21 included this or didn't include that, as long as it's
22 not something which is either required nor prohibited,
23 that I would have an understanding that everybody is
24 going to do their proposal a little bit different, just
25 because we all tend to do things differently.

1 MR. COBB: Do we want to try and limit the
2 number of pages, just so you're not reading a book?

3 MS. CARSON: Yeah, I like that idea.

4 MR. ASKIN: That's a good idea. And we didn't
5 in this one.

6 MS. LYNN: I thought we had already done that,
7 to 10 pages maximum.

8 MS. HARRISON: I thought we did.

9 MR. CAMERON: Isn't this something that we could
10 get into, into depth, at our next meeting?

11 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

12 MR. ASKIN: That's a good point, is we talk
13 about it at the next round.

14 MS. HARRISON: What I would do -- I hate to
15 disagree with Chris, because I think Chris knows more
16 about this than I. But having worked with our board, I
17 think, for this round, I would submit to our board the
18 entire proposal.

19 We have enough board members that would like to
20 see these and would like to be able to defend their
21 ultimate decision. And, I think, I would go ahead and
22 submit the whole package.

23 MR. CAMERON: And maybe could you include, then,
24 an explicit question of direction from them --

25 MS. HARRISON: Yes.

1 MR. CAMERON: -- as to whether they want these
2 in the future?

3 MS. HARRISON: Yes.

4 MR. COBB: Understanding that there might be 40
5 or 50.

6 MR. ASKIN: With a caution that there will
7 likely be many more.

8 MR. GODBOUT: They could choose if they want to.

9 MS. CARSON: Let me just respond to that as a
10 member of this panel. If the TMWA Board is going to
11 want to redo the deliberations that we have done, I will
12 not be interested in serving on this committee.

13 MR. PURDY: No, that's me, too.

14 MS. HARRISON: And that was another point that I
15 was going to make. And that is, again, this is contrary
16 to what Chris was going to suggest. I think, you take
17 the proposals, the recommendations for funding to the
18 board and ask for approval of those. I would not ask
19 them to second-guess your objections.

20 MS. LYNN: Okay.

21 MS. CARSON: Absolutely.

22 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

23 MS. HARRISON: I would only take to the board
24 requests for approval of your recommendations for
25 funding. I think, if they don't pass muster with this

1 group, there's no reason that the board should get a --
2 you know, should be bothered with the next stack. I
3 think, that's the way that I would approach it.

4 MR. CAMERON: So only forward the ones that were
5 approved?

6 MS. HARRISON: Only forward the ones that were
7 approved. If they want the detail on the ones that we
8 rejected and more explanation, then they're going to
9 look to you to maybe explain that.

10 MR. GODBOUT: They can always table them.

11 MR. FOREE: Will there be a summary in the
12 report?

13 MS. HARRISON: There will be a summary of the
14 reasons for the rejections.

15 MR. FOREE: Right.

16 MS. HARRISON: And a summary of the proposals:
17 The X one was rejected because it didn't fit the
18 geographic criteria, and so on and so forth.

19 But I think that that's going to be your better
20 course, and it's a straighter line. And, I think, the
21 board would actually prefer to work it that way. That
22 way, they don't get lobbied by additional projects. And
23 they don't, they don't like to make decisions that they
24 don't have to.

25 That would be my recommendation.

1 MS. CARSON: And let's help them to not get into
2 that situation.

3 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

4 MR. PURDY: Exactly.

5 MS. HARRISON: Is that okay, Chris?

6 MR. ASKIN: Well, you know the board. Which I
7 think, I think that's why it's critical that you be
8 working on drafting this report, because you understand
9 the format that they like to see things presented in.
10 So that's good.

11 MR. PURDY: What's next?

12 MR. GODBOUT: Where are we. Are we on six?

13 MS. HARRISON: Well, six, I think, we sort of
14 mooted six, because we'll be doing -- I think, we
15 discussed how we're going to do that.

16 MR. CAMERON: I think, it would be good if we
17 scheduled our next meeting.

18 MR. ASKIN: Yes.

19 MS. HARRISON: Yeah. And I also -- you know,
20 Chris was suggesting that you might want to table action
21 on the next funding cycle. But you may want to at least
22 have some discussion. You know you're going to have
23 another funding cycle.

24 I would suggest that you also talk a little bit
25 about when you might want to target this conference.

1 There's no reason that you can't figure out what your
2 funding cycle is going to be, also, in conjunction with
3 that. Even though you might not send out the RFPs until
4 after the conference, you may want to think about when
5 those RFPs go out and then work backwards, think about
6 when the conference has to happen.

7 MR. CAMERON: February or March. If you really
8 wanted to do this right, and you wanted good attendance,
9 we're looking at an event in February or March.

10 Which, then, I would say you want to give -- by
11 that point, people will have -- you know, if we set a
12 funding cycle for roughly three to four weeks after the
13 conference, I mean that would be April, and that would
14 be plenty of time, between now and then. We wouldn't
15 have this -- it's not as though we'd only have a month
16 after the conference, sort of compressed time frame.

17 But is April too long?

18 MR. ASKIN: I would get moving faster than that.

19 MS. HARRISON: I would, too. Once again, you
20 would probably want --

21 MR. COBB: We're pushing the cycle farther.

22 MS. CARSON: But the guy who's going to, guy or
23 gal who's going to read all of the material and
24 summarize it, you're looking at three months minimum,
25 I'd say, to do that. So.

1 MS. HARRISON: The point I'm going to make is
2 you have a whole bunch of money that is --

3 MS. CARSON: Yes.

4 MS. HARRISON: You've got \$900,000 to spend this
5 fiscal year, which ends the end of June.

6 MR. CAMERON: Let me ask it another way. Is
7 there only one funding cycle, finish the funding cycle
8 between now and then?

9 MR. PURDY: Let her finish her remarks.

10 MR. ASKIN: Not between now and then.

11 MR. CAMERON: Well, if we only get one, what's
12 the difference if we have it in April, January or May?

13 MS. HARRISON: The only thing is, once again, if
14 you want any projects that have any kind of demonstrated
15 success level, and you want to have a little bit more
16 hardware out there --

17 MR. CAMERON: I just think that -- that sounds
18 good. I just don't think the world moves nearly as
19 fast.

20 MS. HARRISON: That's a question.

21 MS. CARSON: Well, do we know, just among us
22 here, is there something out there that's ready to be
23 built that needs funding that would be good for the
24 river?

25 MR. PURDY: Quite a few things.

1 MR. GODBOUT: Well, the plant, I mean, well, the
2 construction documents --

3 MR. PURDY: Some of the stuff's off the shelf.
4 You don't have to invent the wheel on a lot of things.

5 MR. GODBOUT: No, but I'm saying that, you know,
6 you just can't go out on the river and do something.
7 You've got to, you know, do some analysis and do some
8 design work and get a set of plans ready.

9 MR. PURDY: Putting in detention basins to get
10 rid of stuff, that's off the shelf. And doing like Dave
11 said, let's go with the inject a lot of this polluted
12 water into the ground. That's an off-the-shelf thing.
13 Injection levels are off the shelf. And there's just a
14 lot of the things that --

15 MS. CARSON: But even something like that, you'd
16 have to figure out where to do it, how big would it be,
17 who would do it.

18 MR. ASKIN: I would suggest some baby steps
19 here. We know that a decision is going to be made in
20 two weeks from TMWA about us putting together this
21 event. So if we plan to meet after that date, but
22 before the end of the year, we'll know whether or not
23 we're going straight to another funding cycle or whether
24 or not we're going to this event.

25 And we can do some preplanning on that. Not a

1 long meeting. We're not receiving grants. We're not
2 making grant decisions. But an important meeting.

3 So my question would be could we meet in early
4 December?

5 MR. CAMERON: I think we should try.

6 MR. PURDY: Sure. Sounds fine to me.

7 MS. HARRISON: I'm sorry. What's the date of
8 the TMWA Board meeting?

9 MR. GODBOUT: November 30th.

10 MR. ASKIN: And if we meet after December 7th,
11 that's when the Community Foundation Board meets.

12 MS. CARSON: Then we should wait till after
13 that? Or --

14 MR. ASKIN: If we met December 1st or 2nd, we
15 could review the correspondence that's going to go out
16 to announce the grants. And that would be after the
17 TMWA Board has met. So.

18 MR. PURDY: I'd like that early. I'm going to
19 be out of town later.

20 MR. ASKIN: That's pretty quick from now, two
21 weeks. Two weeks from today is December 2nd.

22 MS. LYNN: The 1st and 2nd are out for me.

23 MR. CAMERON: The 1st and 2nd are out for me,
24 also, except for the late afternoon on the 1st.

25 MS. CARSON: Let's look at the next week, then.

1 MR. ASKIN: Okay. The week of the 5th. What
2 are good days?
3 MS. CARSON: Tuesday and Thursday are good for
4 me.
5 MR. CAMERON: Of those two, Tuesday works for
6 me.
7 MS. LYNN: Tuesday.
8 MR. ASKIN: Tuesday, I've got another meeting.
9 Well, I don't in the morning, though. Do you all want
10 to meet Tuesday morning?
11 MR. PURDY: Make it early and make it happen.
12 MR. ASKIN: 8:00? 9:00? 10:00?
13 MR. COBB: 8:00.
14 MR. GODBOUT: 8:00.
15 MS. CARSON: 8:00.
16 MS. LYNN: Yeah.
17 MS. HARRISON: What date is that?
18 MR. ASKIN: That's a Tuesday, December 6th.
19 MS. HARRISON: I will check to see if this
20 room's available, if you would like to keep meeting
21 here.
22 MR. COBB: Yeah, it's a great room.
23 MR. GODBOUT: Yeah.
24 MS. CARSON: It's a beautiful room.
25 MR. CAMERON: One of the decisions that will --

1 I'm going to -- If we are fortunate enough that the TMWA
2 Board approves this \$20,000 and the event, one of the
3 first questions we're going to have is who is -- or name
4 a couple of people who we think are appropriate and
5 competent to facilitate this event.

6 And maybe I just put it out there for all of you
7 to think about. I wouldn't mind, if we actually got a
8 favorable decision, I wouldn't mind having, if we could
9 move that fast -- if we knew somebody who was really
10 going to do the right job, have them actually join us.

11 MS. CARSON: That would be great.

12 MR. CAMERON: But it seems like we would want to
13 all -- maybe we would just think for a second how we
14 would go about selecting a -- Frankly, I see two
15 individuals being involved in this.

16 I think, you have a technical science person who
17 can do the Reader's Digest version of water quality.
18 And then you have somebody who's a professional
19 facilitator. I don't know if it's -- To me, asking a
20 single person to be both is probably asking too much.

21 MS. HARRISON: You might also think about TMWA
22 staff, if there's anybody on the TMWA staff that you
23 might want, too.

24 MR. PURDY: You want to go outside the home town
25 boys, this is kind of heavy-duty stuff. You know people

1 that do that sort of thing, don't you?

2 MR. ASKIN: Yes. But in this case, I think,
3 unless you're looking for a general facilitator, which
4 you may be, you may be looking for somebody that has
5 some expertise in your field. And you may know a person
6 better than I do. You would know a person better than I
7 do, in that area.

8 MS. CARSON: I think, it may be two different
9 school sets.

10 MR. SWAN: I don't know how you feel about --
11 I'm sure you probably all know him. Steve McDonnell. I
12 think, he would -- if you got him divorced from the --
13 with Crowell Engineers. I can tell you, he knows as
14 much as I do. I think, he's very sharp. I'm sure,
15 relatively expensive, but. If nothing else, maybe he
16 can -- he's really good.

17 Do you know Mr. Crowell?

18 MS. LYNN: Uh-huh, yeah.

19 MR. SWAN: Steve is really good.

20 MS. CARSON: He's still working, right?

21 MR. SWAN: Oh, yeah.

22 MR. CAMERON: I'm happy to pay a firm and pay --
23 I think we should -- for a million bucks a year, I
24 want -- I'm not at all adverse to paying for talent.

25 MR. PURDY: There you go.

1 MR. SWAN: I'm sure he's expensive.
2 MR. PURDY: Big issues.
3 MS. LYNN: Would you see him as the technical
4 person?
5 MR. SWAN: Well, he would --
6 MR. CAMERON: Well, he should be a one-stop
7 shop.
8 MR. GODBOUT: A facilitator man.
9 MS. CARSON: I haven't worked with him for many
10 years.
11 MR. SWAN: He's a busy guy.
12 MS. CARSON: But he seems like he's got kind of
13 a big picture.
14 MS. LYNN: He does have a big picture.
15 MS. HARRISON: Let's not -- even though we don't
16 have any members of the public, let's not wander too far
17 from our agenda.
18 MR. CAMERON: Maybe my question, then, to keep
19 it within the agenda item, is how would this group want
20 to make that decision?
21 MR. ASKIN: Well, I would suggest that just for
22 the sake of expediency, that at our next meeting in
23 December, if the TMWA Board approves this, that you
24 perhaps have a first, second, third choice.
25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So, then, I would ask if

1 everyone could give this some further thought. And we
2 have a couple -- we have one promising name.

3 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

4 MR. CAMERON: But it would be really helpful if
5 we could come up with that short list at the next
6 meeting and then figure out if we're just going to
7 probably delegate, I'm assuming, to some subcommittee or
8 something, to go out and make that decision.

9 MS. HARRISON: What I would suggest is that
10 maybe what you do is you all give it some thought. And,
11 then, regardless of doing any kind of group action, just
12 by e-mail, throw a bunch of names to Craig. And then
13 we'll just invite him.

14 MS. CARSON: Yeah.

15 MS. HARRISON: That way, you don't have to do
16 any deliberation between now and then.

17 MR. CAMERON: Do you think that budget would
18 be -- I'm going to --

19 MS. LYNN: Sufficient?

20 MR. CAMERON: 15,000, 10, 15,000, to do both
21 summary analysis and facilitate a meeting?

22 MS. HARRISON: Anybody who's worked with a firm
23 will probably -- they'll want some sort of payment. But
24 this would be a good opportunity for them. So, you
25 know.

1 MR. SWAN: I think, Dave --

2 MS. HARRISON: To say they'll donate some time.

3 MR. SWAN: He's really good, too. He knows

4 everything, all the data.

5 MR. ASKIN: You know, we'll ask. People do.

6 MR. SWAN: I said the guy from LimiTec, Dave. I

7 can't think of his last name. He's really -- He's as

8 good as Steve McDonnell.

9 MS. CARSON: I don't know him.

10 MR. SWAN: I'll find out. I'll get you his

11 name.

12 MR. GODBOUT: Okay.

13 MR. PURDY: Where we now?

14 MR. CAMERON: Adjourn. Public comment.

15 MR. GODBOUT: We tabled number six. We're done

16 with seven?

17 MS. LYNN: M-hm.

18 MR. GODBOUT: All right. Public comment? I see

19 no one from the public is here.

20 Do we have a motion for adjournment?

21 MR. SWAN: Move for adjournment.

22 MR. COBB: Second.

23 MR. GODBOUT: All those in favor? (All said

24 "aye.") So ruled.

25 MS. CARSON: Did you find out about the room

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

availability?

MS. HARRISON: Yeah, the room is available
December 6th, 8:00 o'clock.

* * * * *

(The meeting of the Truckee River Fund Advisory
Committee concluded at 12:30 p.m.)

-oOo-

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SHANNON L. TAYLOR, a Nevada Certified Court
Reporter, Nevada CCR #322, do hereby certify:

That I was present at McDonald Carano Wilson
LLP, 100 West Liberty, 10th Floor, Reno, Nevada, at
8:20 a.m. on Friday, November 18, 2005, and took
stenotype notes of the meeting of the Truckee River Fund
Advisory Committee;

That I thereafter transcribed the aforementioned
stenotype notes into typewriting as herein appears, and
that the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1
through 209, is a full, true, and correct transcription
of said stenotype notes of said meeting;

DATED 1st day of December, 2005.

Shannon L. Taylor
SHANNON L. TAYLOR
Nevada CCR #322, RMR