

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

-oOo-

TRANSCRIPT OF A MEETING
OF THE
TRUCKEE RIVER FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Monday, January 11, 2016
8:30 a.m.

Location:
Community Foundation of Western Nevada
50 Washington Street, Suite 300
Reno, Nevada 89509

-oOo-

REPORTED BY: SHANNON L. TAYLOR, CCR, CSR, RMR
Certified Court, Shorthand and Registered Merit Reporter
Nevada CCR #322, California CSR #8753, Idaho CSR #485

A P P E A R A N C E S

Present at the Truckee River Fund Advisory Committee Meeting on Monday, January 11, 2016:

Committee Members:

Janet Phillips, Chairman
Tom Swan, Vice Chairman*
Michael Cameron
Jerry Purdy
Mike Brisbin
Sue Donaldson***
Candice Elder**
Susan Lynn

* Committee member arrived after roll call
** Committee member left before adjournment
*** Committee member was on the phone and did not vote

Also: Tracy Peterson Turner, CAP, Ph.D.
Chief Philanthropy Officer
Community Foundation of Western Nevada

John Enloe, P.E.
Truckee Meadows Water Authority

Sonia Folsom, Executive Assistant
Truckee Meadows Water Authority

Sylvia Harrison, Esq.
McDonald Carano Wilson, LLP

Members of the Public:

John L. Flansberg, P.E.
Director, Public Works
City of Reno

1 RENO, NEVADA, MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2016, 8:33 A.M.

2 -oOo-

3 MS. PHILLIPS: So we have a quorum. I think,
4 we could get started. And so let's start with roll
5 call.

6 You're ready, aren't you, Shannon?

7 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, I am. We are on the record.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: Janet Phillips.

9 MS. LYNN: Susan Lynn.

10 MR. PURDY: Jerry Purdy.

11 MR. CAMERON: Michael Cameron.

12 MR. BRISBIN: Mike Brisbin.

13 MS. TURNER: Tracy Turner.

14 MS. FOLSOM: Sonia Folsom.

15 \ MR. ENLOE: John Enloe.

16 MS. HARRISON: Sylvia Harrison.

17 MS. ELDER: Candice Elder.

18 MS. PHILLIPS: And we have a guest.

19 MR. FLANSBERG: John Flansberg, City of Reno,
20 Public Works.

21 MS. DONALDSON: And Sue Donaldson.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Thank you.

23 We have public comment.

24 And the only public person here is you, John.

25 Did you want to say anything?

1 MR. FLANSBERG: The only thing I'd like to say
2 on behalf of the City of Reno, and just appreciate
3 funding we received, the Virginia Lake project has been
4 completed, the first water quality project. And,
5 obviously, we have other work going on. Just to say
6 thank you, and I just wanted to come and meet the group
7 and just understand what you do here.

8 So thank you.

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Thanks for coming.
10 We need a motion to approve the agenda.

11 MR. PURDY: So moved.

12 MR. ENLOE: Second. Woop, I can't second. I
13 just wanted to move it along.

14 (Laughter from the group.)

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Any discussion?

16 All those in favor, "aye."

17 (Committee members said "aye.")

18 MS. PHILLIPS: Anybody opposed?

19 MR. ENLOE: I realized as soon as I said it.

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah, nice try.

21 MR. PURDY: When are we going to adjourn?

22 MS. PHILLIPS: So item four is the kind of the
23 meat of this meeting, which is to review the priorities
24 for funding including evaluation criteria, other funding
25 sources, location, drought, and cost effectiveness.

1 And this is -- item four sort of leads us into
2 five, which is if we should make changes to our spring
3 RFP.

4 (Tom Swan arrived at the meeting.)

5 MS. PHILLIPS: So. Anybody want to kick this
6 off?

7 My notes from past meetings really were just
8 tweaking the RFP. For instance -- well, let's stick
9 with priorities for funding first. Susan had commented
10 a few meetings ago about adding a drought mitigation
11 kind of concept. That's not in the RFP.

12 Anybody else recall any other things we wanted
13 to add for our priorities?

14 Yeah, Jerry.

15 MR. PURDY: Well, you know, us clunky
16 engineers, I just think that we should start looking at
17 the water treatment. We have got an awful lot of
18 problems with milfoil that's coming down from Lake
19 Tahoe. We all know about that. And it grows all along
20 the area and down through Sparks. And one of these
21 days, it's going to plug up our sewer treatment plant
22 when it gets into these ditches and starts to grow.

23 We're getting some more water now, with a
24 wetter winter, and that gets a little more water in the
25 ditch that's going to start making it flow around. And

1 there's nothing positive about that when it goes into
2 the subdivision areas that take taps off of the Truckee
3 River.

4 And anybody that's been down to the sewer
5 treatment plant can take a look at that ugly milfoil
6 that's growing down there. And then it's okay for us,
7 because once it goes past that, then it's out of our
8 hands. But, man, what a mess we're making for down
9 there, Fernley, Fallon and the people that rely on the
10 Truckee River water.

11 The Truckee River just doesn't go into a hole.
12 It goes downstream. And, I think, we've got a duty and
13 an obligation to try and be respectful of the needs and
14 situation and the other folks downstream.

15 That's the end of my sermon.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Susan, you still there?
17 I mean Sue Donaldson?

18 MS. LYNN: Sue Donaldson.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Hello, Sue?

20 MS. DONALDSON: Yeah, I'm here. Sorry. I had
21 it muted.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. I remember that you
23 looked into the vegetation down there by East McCarran,
24 I think, and --

25 MS. DONALDSON: Yeah, the vegetation under the

1 bridge at East McCarran. And that was not Eurasian
2 watermilfoil. Which is not to say it couldn't catch
3 some in the future, because the water level has been
4 going down and down, and it is a fairly nutrient-rich
5 area. We have some other, other water plants there.

6 I do think that the fund has sponsored projects
7 to work on the aquatic invasive species, actually quite
8 a lot of funding for that. And the project that's
9 ongoing from the dam at Tahoe downstream is going to be
10 really helpful to show what you can accomplish in a
11 river setting. Because it's not easy, when you have
12 moving water that changes the situation and what you can
13 do.

14 So, I think, personally, I think, continuing
15 the strategy that the fund has pursued makes a lot of
16 sense and will help. And, I think, you know, there's
17 no -- if it were an instant solution, I'd say go ahead
18 and do X, Y, Z. But there isn't. And we got to keep
19 chipping away at it. And there's a lot of things
20 underway. And, I think, we should continue to support
21 those.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Along this line -- and
23 then I'll get over to John, because I know you had your
24 hand up -- I don't know if everybody recalls this little
25 pie chart that I did three years ago. And it was very

1 approximate, but it tried to sort out where our money
2 has gone in accordance to categories. And so the
3 invasive species one is -- well, unhelpfully, this
4 doesn't have percentages on it.

5 MR. CAMERON: Make an eyeball guess. I'm
6 curious. If you can read them off.

7 MS. PHILLIPS: I don't know. It's like a
8 quarter.

9 MR. ENLOE: About a quarter, yeah.

10 MR. CAMERON: And what about the rest of them,
11 since you've got it in your hand?

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Bank erosion is 1.1 million,
13 which looks like maybe 15 percent. Structures and LIDs
14 is 1.4 million, which looks like maybe 20 percent.
15 Removing pollution is 1.3 million.

16 MR. ENLOE: Another 20.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Another 20. Invasive species is
18 2.3 million. That looks like about a quarter. And then
19 there's a big category called Other at 2.8 million.
20 And that was primarily -- when I did this distribution,
21 I tried to go back in the inception of this program.
22 And we had different categories in the early days. And
23 so there was some things I couldn't categorize very
24 well, and then there were others. Like this includes
25 cloud seeding, which we used to fund, forest thinning,

1 education, the sheriff work crews. There's a whole
2 bunch of stuff in that Other category.

3 If somebody wants to take on the project of
4 trying to better define Other, go for it.

5 Anyway, so the point I was trying to make is we
6 have spent quite a bit of money on invasive species over
7 the years. And I don't think, I don't think we'll --

8 MS. DONALDSON: Janet, what was the total on
9 the aquatic invasive species?

10 MS. PHILLIPS: Invasive species was
11 2.2 million.

12 MS. DONALDSON: Yeah, that would have been what
13 I guessed. It's been quite a lot.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah, it was, it's been a lot.
15 This goes back to 2006. So it's 10 years of the
16 projects.

17 MS. DONALDSON: Right. I'm not saying it's out
18 of proportion. I think, it's just really useful for us
19 to recognize sort of where the funding has been
20 funneled.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah. And, in fact, if TMWA has
22 like an intern this summer, that would be a nice little
23 project.

24 MR. ENLOE: Yes, it would be, if we had one.

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Trying to do a better job of

1 defining Other.

2 Anyway, but, John, you had your hand up.

3 MR. ENLOE: Right. I think, I brought this up
4 a meeting or two ago, because it's really when Sonia and
5 I presented the recommended projects from the last
6 funding go-round, we had several questions from our
7 Board members. And those questions revolved around --
8 there was one actually we funded, that thing, invasive
9 species, the weed control program at Incline. And they
10 were questioning spending this money in the Tahoe Basin
11 when there's so many other funding sources available in
12 the Tahoe Basin.

13 They questioned what is the prioritization of
14 our funding. And, I think, that's where -- I know The
15 Nature Conservancy is working on a project like that,
16 that will help us really define what's the best bang for
17 the dollar on some of this funding. So they were
18 questioning that.

19 And then, it was more some questions on the
20 effectiveness of the dollars spent and what are the
21 fund's priorities. And, I think, that's one of the
22 reasons why we're having the discussion today, so that
23 we could better define that. And when we do make the
24 recommendations to the Board, we could be much more
25 specific as far as how the recommended projects are

1 satisfying the goals of the fund.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Sylvia, you had your hand
3 up.

4 MS. HARRISON: Yeah, I really hope that
5 everyone has taken advantage of the distribution that
6 Tracy made of the Guidance Document that Ron Penrose was
7 primarily responsible for, that was completed a couple
8 years ago.

9 This topic gave us the opportunity to revisit
10 that, take a look at it again. And I don't really have
11 a vote on this body, but in my opinion, I think, it is
12 still extremely valuable and accurately reflects the
13 priorities and the justifications of the priorities that
14 I think that this Board has struggled with and developed
15 over the course of its existence.

16 So I really hope that we don't ignore this
17 document at the expense of spending a lot of time
18 re-creating what we did a couple years ago. I think,
19 it's still very valuable.

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah. Okay. Jerry. I'm sorry.
21 Susan, you had your hand up first.

22 MS. LYNN: Well, I went through this pretty
23 extensively, and it seems like the recommendations and
24 guidance for future projects is pretty darn good.
25 Although it does not specifically mention -- it does

1 later, in the last two pages of the document. It talks
2 about the anthropogenic impacts, the environmental
3 regulations, the connectivity, the health of the river
4 and its impact on economics and quality of life and then
5 stewardship. And then it says suggested preference is
6 aquatic invasive species, watershed improvements,
7 stormwater improvements, reforestation and revegetation,
8 rehabilitation of local creeks and drainages and
9 stewardship and environmental. And it seems like
10 everything we've done to this point has focused on those
11 kinds of things.

12 So, I think, this is a still a good list. When
13 I talked about drought, I think, all of these things are
14 related to drought. And now that TROA is in place,
15 maybe drought isn't as important as it was several
16 months ago, before the implementation of TROA.

17 So, you know, I still think this is a good
18 list.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Jerry, then, you had your
20 hand up next.

21 MR. PURDY: Oh, well, thank you.

22 When I was with federal highways, they made
23 use -- this is just a suggestion -- of putting together
24 little mini movies, hired somebody to do it, to show
25 some aspect of things that affected an area or a lot of

1 people.

2 And I would like to suggest we think about
3 getting somebody together to go hire some person to go
4 make a little, quick, simple film, go up to Tahoe and
5 take a look at Tahoe Keys, and then you can put in the
6 dates when they did the Tahoe Keys, and then you can put
7 in when they let the boats come up from Vegas. And they
8 got the milfoil out in the lake. In just a few years,
9 it covered everything. And then, in a few more years,
10 it jumped the dam and then went downstream to Reno.
11 Clear to the Pyramid Lake you can find bits of that.
12 And that was in the short period of time.

13 And we're just whistling in the dark about
14 recognizing what's happening to us when that gets into
15 our water systems and the sewer systems. When we get a
16 little more water, it's going to raise the level of the
17 Truckee River, and we're going to start getting that
18 into our systems.

19 And, I think, it would be good to do a little,
20 short movie that you can -- copies can be made, that
21 they could show at the city or at different places. Or
22 if you're going for funds, it sure helps to show the
23 movie that highlights these things. We did quite a bit
24 of that when they started with the interstate program.
25 Because you just couldn't sit in meetings like this and

1 discuss things like we're trying to do now. It helps to
2 visualize it and see it.

3 And I'd like to see us spend a few, I don't
4 know, a couple thousand, or whatever, and get a movie
5 made that highlights that and take it down to the sewer
6 and then mention it to --

7 MS. PHILLIPS: Jerry, I'm not saying that
8 wouldn't be a good idea. But I'm kind of curious about
9 who would be -- who would look at it.

10 MR. PURDY: Well, I think, people who are
11 interested, and truly interested, and not sitting around
12 a table like we're doing here and just talking about
13 bits and snippets of things. And then, once this
14 meeting's over, we all go home for another month.

15 But, I think, it could be shown down at city
16 hall. And it could be available that you could rent one
17 at some of the different places, for groups to show that
18 want to see change. There's an awful lot of civic
19 groups in our city.

20 MS. PHILLIPS: M-hm (affirmative).

21 MS. TURNER: And I just think that it would be
22 a great way to do the groundwork.

23 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

24 MR. PURDY: By just looking at it for 20
25 minutes, not a two-hour documentary or just a --

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. I've added that to my
2 list of notes.

3 MR. PURDY: You know, 20 minutes or something
4 would usually work good.

5 MS. PHILLIPS: And Susan and then Candice.

6 MS. LYNN: Okay. Since I've been liaison to
7 the League to Save Lake Tahoe's Eurasian milfoil
8 identification project, I've learned quite a bit about
9 it. And Eurasian -- there are lots of different kinds
10 of milfoil in the system. Not all of them are bad.
11 Some of them provide fish cover. It is the Eurasian
12 milfoil that is the troublesome one, and identifying it
13 is even more troublesome. But it can be done.

14 And League to Save Lake Tahoe has lots of
15 slides that they could put together in a presentation.

16 MR. PURDY: Oh.

17 MS. LYNN: If this is of interest. You could
18 go take their class that they offer five or six times
19 during the summer. Or bring one of them down to talk to
20 civic groups here.

21 But I really don't think we need to reinvent
22 the wheel, in terms of doing a presentation on it,
23 because there are people who do that.

24 MS. PHILLIPS: And I want to come back to the
25 pie chart in which the invasive species are the largest

1 single category of work we have funded. So it's not
2 like we're not doing anything.

3 Go ahead, Candice.

4 MS. ELDER: I guess, I was thinking that maybe
5 part of this discussion was to talk about the way in
6 which the RFP's written and maybe clarifying some things
7 in how it is written, so it better guides nonprofits and
8 agencies, or whoever, what the criteria we're looking
9 for are. For instance, if they are -- if they do have
10 their own rate source or funding source, then maybe
11 we're not as interested in funding those ones.

12 Is that -- I don't know that that's true. But
13 that's sort of been --

14 MS. PHILLIPS: I think, that's definitely part
15 of discussion.

16 MS. ELDER: Okay.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: For sure. Because in agenda
18 item four -- let's just go back and reread that.
19 Priorities for funding. Evaluation criteria. Other
20 funding sources, which would get to your point about
21 ratepayers. Location, which gets to the Tahoe Basin
22 question.

23 MS. ELDER: M-hm (affirmative).

24 MS. PHILLIPS: Drought, which Susan had brought
25 up. And cost-effectiveness was one of the other things

1 that came out of your Board meeting.

2 MR. ENLOE: Right.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: So all of those are in the scope
4 of this discussion. And I know that we did add, a few
5 years ago, a thing about something that you're required
6 to report on your -- help me with this, Tracy. There's
7 something in here about reporting --

8 MS. TURNER: M-hm (affirmative).

9 MS. PHILLIPS: -- on the effectiveness of your
10 project.

11 MS. TURNER: Yes. That is on the measurables.
12 It says "Specific project goals of measurable outcomes
13 and how you will measure and report them." It's
14 number 1 of the Narrative Requirements.

15 MS. PHILLIPS: M-hm (affirmative). Yeah,
16 measurable outcomes. And one of the things that we
17 touched on briefly in our last meeting was it's very
18 hard to say, "Well, you get so many tons of sediment
19 removal with this project, but you may get so many cubic
20 yards of trash with this project." And I don't think we
21 have a way of comparing those things. But at least we
22 have something in here about effectiveness.

23 MS. TURNER: And that is on the very last page
24 of the RFP. It's got Project Evaluation Criteria. And
25 measurable outcomes is the first in the criteria.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. And then back to
2 Candice's specific point, I don't think it says anywhere
3 in here, either implicitly or explicitly, that we will
4 not fund projects that have their own ratepayers. And
5 is that something we want to say? Do we want to make
6 that a rule?

7 Yeah, Sylvia.

8 MS. HARRISON: Just I thought about this a lot.
9 And, I think, it's a little dangerous to try to set
10 hard-and-fast rules regarding excluding projects.
11 Because we don't know what's going to come along, what
12 opportunities there are. And I think that in the past
13 we have, at least implicitly, looked at or given
14 priority to projects that may not go forward but for the
15 infusion of some, if you will, seed money from this
16 fund. So there's sort of a sense that the fund plays an
17 important part in kick-starting a project.

18 And you might think -- again, I'm not
19 recommending a hard-and-fast rule. But if we know that
20 a project's going to go forward, regardless of the
21 contribution of the fund, and that the contribution of
22 the fund is less important in making sure that a worthy
23 project takes place, then it may be a lower priority
24 than a project where we understand that the funding from
25 this body is critical to making it go forward.

1 Again, it's hard to express that as a
2 hard-and-fast rule. But, I think, implicitly, we've
3 kind of done that through the years anyway.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. What -- the other, I'm
5 thinking about, rather than trying to like rewrite the
6 whole RFP and start from scratch, I see a couple of
7 pretty narrow solutions. Like in our discussion --
8 okay. Back to trying to get some closure on at least
9 one point, back on Candice's point about other funding
10 sources, is it's not a very hard application to submit.
11 I mean I submit lots of grant applications. This is a
12 pretty easy one.

13 So I don't see a huge amount of effort lost by
14 submitting. But if, if somebody calls up Tracy and
15 says, "I have this idea; I'd like to know if you think
16 it would be worth submitting," are you like likely to
17 give them any kind of feedback?

18 MS. TURNER: Yes. I go back to the criteria,
19 to the projects that are described in here, where they
20 can choose A, B, C or D, and I do direct them toward
21 the -- whether the permitting requirement or the
22 question about permitting. I do talk to them about
23 their 25 percent match. And I do talk about the
24 requirement that it affect the Truckee River or its
25 tributaries. And if they feel that it meets those

1 requirements, then I tell them they should go ahead and
2 submit.

3 But I, basically, reiterate what's in the RFP
4 and on the website for them. I don't make any
5 recommendation that might suggest that I think they will
6 or won't get funded. I just direct them back to
7 reviewing other projects and the criteria.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

9 MS. LYNN: Do they get to read a copy of this
10 (indicating)?

11 MS. TURNER: Well, we have not distributed
12 that. Sylvia, I don't know -- or excuse me. Sonia, I
13 don't know whether that document is posted on the
14 current TRF website. But it is something that we could
15 post on the new one.

16 MS. FOLSOM: Yes. Yeah.

17 MS. LYNN: To me, that would be useful,
18 especially the last two pages.

19 MR. ENLOE: Yes, exactly. You don't need the
20 whole thing.

21 MS. FOLSOM: Okay.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

23 MS. LYNN: But the recommendations and guidance
24 for future projects --

25 MR. ENLOE: Right.

1 MS. LYNN: -- I think, is very helpful.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. So, Jerry, is your
3 comment on this subject about other funding sources, or
4 are you on a different topic?

5 MR. PURDY: I just wanted to wrap up the
6 thought we talked about for a project like doing that
7 movie, something, spending money to get the word out on
8 this Tahoe thing. Because the last thing that I wanted
9 to mention, there is a solution. The Incline Research
10 Center has been working on that for years, and they find
11 that if you put a black plastic over that milfoil --

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Jerry, I'm sorry. I'm going to
13 interrupt you. I want to try to reach some conclusion
14 about the --

15 MR. PURDY: Well, I wish you wouldn't interrupt
16 me. Can you just give me a minute?

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Jerry, I'd like us to try to
18 stay on this topic right now, until we get somewhere
19 with it. Because, otherwise, we're just going to keep
20 going around and around. So can you hold that thought
21 for a minute?

22 MR. PURDY: No, I'll just forget it. To hell
23 with it. It's not that important to me what happens at
24 Tahoe. I don't have any interest up there.

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. That's your option.

1 MR. PURDY: Yeah.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: Back to the thing we were on
3 about funding sources. So we could add something to the
4 RFP to sort of clarify that, we could leave it, at our
5 discretion, which is sort of Sylvia's input.

6 Anybody have any direction they want to take
7 this thing?

8 MS. ELDER: Are you allowed to say like
9 priority will be given to these, you know, criteria or --
10 or these, you know -- so maybe priority would be given
11 to projects that don't have a direct funding source, you
12 know. So just saying it's going to get priority, it's
13 not meaning that your project wouldn't be funded, but it
14 may, you know, give somebody who's applying a better
15 lead on whether or not their project is really worth the
16 money.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

18 MS. ELDER: Or even priority may be given to
19 projects occurring within TMWA ratepayers or TMWA
20 customer service rates or, you know, something to that
21 effect?

22 MS. LYNN: I think, that's kind of always been
23 understood, but it's never been clarified.

24 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

25 MS. LYNN: In black and white.

1 MS. ELDER: I believe, it's understood in here.
2 But I don't think it's understood out there.

3 MS. LYNN: Right.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: I think, I think, Candice makes
5 a good point.

6 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

7 MS. PHILLIPS: We all know that. But is there
8 any way for somebody out there to know that?

9 MR. CAMERON: And this is -- so, Candice, I
10 think, you've raised a couple things -- and, I guess,
11 I'm the last one -- about ratepayer, sort of the -- I
12 mean you just mentioned kind of the geography of the
13 TMWA rate base.

14 But related to that, I guess, since it's now on
15 the table, I have thought that it might -- and not to --
16 I guess, part of our thing is we don't want to overreact
17 to some of the questions that have been raised by the
18 Board and maybe read too much into it or whatever. But
19 if it would be helpful, I guess, a couple thoughts I had
20 on the RFP would be to that point, that maybe something
21 about the -- I don't know if it's the evaluation
22 criteria or where it says -- it's the second paragraph
23 on the mission of the Truckee River fund. But
24 somewhere, elevating and making it obvious that the
25 benefits to the TMWA ratepayers, the linkage between the

1 benefits of the project to sort of the TMWA service.

2 MS. LYNN: Water treatment service or
3 something.

4 MR. CAMERON: I mean I do think that that's,
5 obviously, something we think about, if it's not
6 transparent to the applicants. And I don't know if that
7 may in any way be responsive to some of the questions
8 that have been raised, or is that not really going to be
9 meaningful?

10 MR. ENLOE: No, I think, I think, it would
11 help. I think, it's -- I think, it's just a little bit
12 more of a challenge for maybe Sonia and myself, where we
13 write up these things for the agenda items, to be more
14 specific on how it benefits TMWA, and maybe linking it
15 back to this document, it satisfies, if we had policy A,
16 B, C, D, E, or whatever, this project satisfies policy A
17 and D, or something like that.

18 And, I think, there's a little bit of education
19 that we need to do with a couple of the Board members,
20 too, on that. So.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: I guess, let me ask you a
22 question, because I've fallen behind on this. But when
23 Ron used to do the report to the TMWA Board about the
24 projects, it always had a line about benefit to TMWA.

25 MR. ENLOE: And it still does.

1 MS. FOLSOM: M-hm (affirmative).

2 MS. PHILLIPS: It still does?

3 MR. ENLOE: Yeah.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: And is that not sufficient?

5 MR. ENLOE: It wasn't the last time.

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Hm. Okay.

7 MS. HARRISON: It might be next time.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Well, what it seems to me
9 it would be pretty easy to do would be to add a sentence
10 or a paragraph in our RFP that says "Priority will be
11 given to projects that show a clear benefit to TMWA
12 ratepayers and for which there is not another funding
13 source."

14 MR. CAMERON: Where would you suggest that go,
15 Janet? Do you have a spot in mind?

16 MS. PHILLIPS: I'm thinking about right after
17 where we say "Proposals are encouraged for the
18 following" -- A, B, C, D, E. Then "Priority will be
19 given to projects that clearly" -- that -- "for which a
20 benefit is shown to the TMWA ratepayers and for which
21 there is no other funding source."

22 MR. ENLOE: Or where this is kind of a
23 critical -- this funding is critical to it rather
24 than --

25 MS. ELDER: Yeah.

1 MS. HARRISON: Right.

2 MS. ELDER: Because they do have other match,
3 other grants that they get sometimes.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, that's true, right. They
5 have to have it.

6 MS. HARRISON: Yeah. You can't, you can't
7 exclude projects.

8 MS. LYNN: Yeah.

9 MS. PHILLIPS: So if this is headed in the
10 direction people like, then we can wordsmith it. I mean
11 what do you guys think about that?

12 Sylvia.

13 MS. HARRISON: My only concern about being too
14 specific with these guidelines is that, I think, we all
15 have a fairly sophisticated understanding of the
16 connectivity of the watershed and the way in which it's
17 kind of the butterfly wing thing. And setting criteria
18 that require some sort of demonstration of a direct
19 benefit to TMWA ratepayers is going to probably raise a
20 lot of questions. Because we have to then explain why
21 milfoil is important to TMWA ratepayers, which is not --
22 it doesn't hit you in the face until you actually
23 understand the impacts on water quality and how it
24 affects the -- both the quality and the quantity of our
25 water supply. That invites a fairly complicated

1 explanation.

2 So I'm just, I'm just a little leery of being
3 too specific in that regard.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. I don't know who had
5 their hand up, John or Michael.

6 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, John.

7 MR. ENLOE: So, to Sylvia's point, this is just
8 a question. Because, okay, benefit to TMWA ratepayer or
9 benefit to the watershed, do we fund downstream
10 projects? Because if you look at benefit to TMWA, you'd
11 say, okay, everything from Glendale and above.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

13 MR. ENLOE: If it's the watershed, and because
14 the last one we funded with Virginia Lake, trying to
15 make a nexus that that benefits TMWA ratepayers is kind
16 of hard to do directly.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

18 MR. ENLOE: And Candice had the one a few
19 months ago for the downstream work for nitrogen
20 reduction. So there's a benefit regionally to that, but
21 it's not directly a benefit to TMWA ratepayers. So I
22 just think we need to decide.

23 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah. So. Okay. Well, let's
24 look, then, at the existing language in the RFP in
25 paragraph two: "The mission of the Truckee River Fund

1 is to protect and enhance water quality or water
2 resources of the Truckee River or its watershed. To be
3 considered for funding, project proposals must
4 demonstrate measurable impact in accordance with this
5 mission."

6 That pretty well says it's got to benefit the
7 watershed.

8 MS. ELDER: M-hm (affirmative).

9 MS. PHILLIPS: I'm okay with leaving that part
10 alone.

11 MR. ENLOE: Yeah.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: I am bothered a little bit,
13 though, by Candice's observation that what we all know
14 is in our deliberations in this room is not known to the
15 applicants.

16 MS. TURNER: May I offer -- and I don't know if
17 it'll make a difference in this forum. But we, the
18 Community Foundation does a number of scholarships. We
19 have 34 different scholarships that we administer on
20 behalf of donors. And one thing that we always ask our
21 donors who are establishing scholarship funds is, if it
22 comes down to a tie between three candidates, four-year
23 scholarship, that all have the identical GPA, the
24 identical ACT score, the identical work history, the
25 identical volunteer service, what's going to be the

1 tiebreaker? That's not published information. That is
2 for the selection committee to know.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Huh. So the applicants don't
4 know that?

5 MS. TURNER: They don't know that.

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Michael. Thank you.

7 MR. CAMERON: So, yeah, that is helpful. And
8 so I'm still just, I'm still exploring this, trying to
9 get the TMWA and Truckee River Fund priorities a little
10 bit more obvious.

11 So we had a second ago talked about maybe some
12 new language that talked about the nexus with TMWA
13 ratepayers. And now we're maybe that's not such a great
14 idea. As an alternative to these last two pages, I'm
15 just -- it's kind of getting to the same thing, maybe in
16 a different way, is giving the -- giving -- I don't know
17 if it's a requirement or just at least having a place
18 where proponents can comment on whether their project
19 addresses these last two pages.

20 Because then at least there's -- and, again,
21 I'm just throwing out an idea. It's just to try to get
22 the tie between any proposal. And this is a better -- I
23 mean, to Sylvia's point about it's complicated. I mean
24 how do you demonstrate that a project is going to be
25 helpful to TMWA ratepayers? Well, some applicants, it

1 may be beyond what they're able to do.

2 But with the benefit of these last two pages,
3 and just giving people the opportunity to say, can you
4 connect your proposal to these, you know, these
5 guidelines, you know, these Guidelines for Evaluating
6 Requests, or whatever. I mean just throwing out another
7 idea, not necessarily recommending it.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Well, in that, in
9 response to that, and now this is some kind of talk of
10 really simple word processing solutions here.

11 MR. CAMERON: Uh-huh (affirmative).

12 MS. PHILLIPS: But on the last page of the
13 Guidance Document, there are six bullet items -- aquatic
14 invasive species, watershed improvements, stormwater
15 improvements, blah, blah -- six different categories
16 which is, in the lead-in sentence is: Based on the
17 aforementioned discussion, TMWA recommends the Advisors
18 give preference to well-thought-out grant requests,
19 blah, blah, blah, blah, particularly those threats
20 upstream or nearby, treatment and hydroelectric plant
21 intakes. And then it lists these things.

22 We could just list that whole guideline bullet
23 list and put it in here instead of our existing. And
24 then we'd say, look, we have a clear tie between this
25 TMWA document, which is the Guidance Document, and our

1 RFP.

2 I mean I'm not talking about a great
3 philosophical approach here. I'm just --

4 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

5 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

6 MS. HARRISON: I would add to that, go ahead
7 and add the last two, meeting the multiple objectives
8 and leveraging funds. I think, that's important.

9 MR. ENLOE: Yeah.

10 MS. LYNN: Yes.

11 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. My only concern with that
12 is -- I'm back to my pie chart.

13 MS. HARRISON: Yeah.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: These first six are like
15 categories of things to do. And the last two are more
16 like evaluation criteria.

17 MS. HARRISON: Right.

18 MS. PHILLIPS: So I don't disagree with putting
19 those in, but I'm thinking they don't quite provide a
20 list of categories. So I would say the six categories
21 could easily become our new categories, and these last
22 two could be in the evaluation --

23 MR. CAMERON: Well, the narrative -- I'm sorry.
24 Maybe this is out of turn. The narrative requirements
25 on page three of the RFP, there are twelve elements.

1 And, you know, maybe a thirteenth one or folding this
2 into one of the existing twelve is -- speak to this,
3 speak to these eight items. And just make it a little
4 more open-ended. And, you know, even if somebody didn't
5 say anything, that wouldn't necessarily disqualify them.
6 But if they can really make a strong connection between
7 a project and four of these bullets, I mean that would
8 help us, for one thing.

9 So I'm just, again -- a different, another
10 variation here would just be to ask the narrative, give
11 the proponents a chance to, you know, comment on how
12 your project relates to these eight evaluation criteria,
13 or which ones, or.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. But I'm back to my --

15 MR. ENLOE: Right.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: The way I read this is there are
17 six project areas and two evaluation criteria, in my
18 reading of this. So I'm kind of, again, stuck more on
19 the sort of the word processing approach.

20 If I'm writing a proposal, I can say, look, my
21 proposal best fits in local stormwater improvements.
22 And that's number three. But, boy, my project's really
23 great because it meets multiple objectives and it
24 leverages stakeholder assets.

25 To me, those are different things.