

# TRUCKEE RIVER FUND

Enhancing and protecting our water resources

## TRUCKEE RIVER FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### AGENDA

Friday May 16, 2025, 8:30 a.m.  
Community Foundation of Northern Nevada  
50 Washington Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89503

### Meeting Via Teleconference and In-Person

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND VIA THE WEB LINK, OR  
TELEPHONICALLY BY CALLING THE NUMBER, LISTED BELOW.  
NO PHYSICAL LOCATION IS BEING PROVIDED FOR THIS MEETING  
**(Be sure to keep your phones on mute, and do not place the call on hold)**

Please click the link below to join the meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8785686516?pwd=K29WZlNla0Q2Wm1YbnpIR1l1SzJUUT09>

Zoom Meeting ID: 878 568 6516

Password: CFNN

#### NOTES:

1. The announcement of this meeting has been posted in compliance with NRS 241.020(3) at: Truckee Meadows Water Authority (1355 Capital Blvd., Reno), at <https://truckeeriverfund.org/meetings/>, and NRS 232.2175 at State of Nevada Public Notice Website, <https://notice.nv.gov/>.
2. In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda closes three working days prior to the meeting. We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for persons who are disabled and wish to attend meetings. If you require special arrangements for the meeting, please call (775) 834-8002 at least 24 hours before the meeting date.
3. Staff reports and supporting material for the meeting are available on the Truckee River Fund website at <https://truckeeriverfund.org/meetings/> or you can contact Sonia Folsom at (775) 834-8002 or [sfolsom@tmwa.com](mailto:sfolsom@tmwa.com). Supporting material is made available to the general public in accordance with NRS 241.020(6).
4. The Committee may elect to combine agenda items, consider agenda items out of order, remove agenda items, or delay discussion on agenda items. Arrive at the meeting at the posted time to hear item(s) of interest.
5. Asterisks (\*) denote non-action items.
6. Public comment is limited to three minutes and is allowed during the public comment periods. **To request to speak, please use the "raise hand" feature or press \*9 to "raise your hand" and \*6 to unmute/mute your microphone.** Pursuant to Directive 006, public comment, whether on action items or general public comment, may be provided without being physically present at the meeting by submitting written comments online by email sent to [lrenda@nevadafund.org](mailto:lrenda@nevadafund.org) prior to the Committee opening the public comment period during the meeting. In addition, public comments may be provided by leaving a voicemail at (775)834-0255 prior to 4:00 p.m. on August 19th. Voicemail messages received will either be broadcast on the telephone call during the meeting or transcribed for entry into the record. Public comment is limited to three minutes and is allowed during the public comment periods. The Committee may elect to receive public comment only during the two public comment periods rather than each action item. Due to constraints of the videoconference system, public comment must be provided by voicemail, email, or online comment as indicated above.

1. Roll Call\*
2. Public comment (limited to no more than three minutes per speaker)\*
3. Approval of the agenda (**for possible action**)
4. Approve the March 7, 2025 summary meeting minutes (**for possible action**)
5. Fund balance report\*
6. Presentation by City of Reno – Bryan McArdle, Revitalization Manager\*
7. Presentation of 2025 Strategic Assessment – McKenzie Mendoza & Rachel Tatro, The Blueprint Collaborative (**for possible action**)
8. Discuss possible scope for Fall 2025 grant cycle (**for possible action**)

9. Review completed projects\*

- a. **#246 TRWC:** Bear Creek Lower Meadow Restoration Project- Phase 2 Construction, \$51,250 (Terri)
- b. **#263 TNC of Nevada:** Developing Forest Resilience to Fire – Independence Lake, \$100,450 (Bill)
- c. **#282 KTMB:** 2024 Great Community Clean-Up, Truckee River Clean-Up, Truckee River Clean-Up, Adopt-A-River Program, and Community Education Program, \$91,360.32 (Jim)
- d. **#283 One Truckee River:** Watershed Coalition Building, \$135,138 (Terri)
- e. **#288 Great Basin Outdoor School:** Youth Watershed Education and Protection Projects, \$9,279.60 (Dave)
- f. **#293 Sierra Nevada Journeys:** Watershed Education Initiative, \$31,699 (Jim)

10. Committee and staff comments\*

11. Upcoming Meetings (**for possible action**)

- a. Friday August 15, 2025 at 8:30am

12. Public comment (limited to no more than three minutes per speaker)\*

13. Adjournment\*

## MEETING MINUTES (TRANSCRIPT SUMMARY)

### TRUCKEE RIVER FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 7, 2025

(Meeting via Zoom and teleconference)

The following meeting minutes is a summary of the certified transcript for the Truckee River Fund Advisory Committee meeting held at 8:30 a.m., Friday, March 7, 2025, via Zoom teleconference and in-person at.

#### **Those Present:**

*Committee Members:* Jim Smitherman, Chair; Terri Svetich, Vice Chair; Brian Bonnenfant, Mike Brisbin, Peter Gower, Neoma Jardon, Don Mahin, Dave Stanley.

*Also:* Lauren Renda, Community Foundation of Northern Nevada; Sonia Folsom, Kara Steeland, TMWA; Sarah Ferguson, Council for TRF; Susan Merideth, TRF Minutes Recorder.

*Members of the Public:* Heidi Anderson (Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation), Audrey Bergmann (Sierra Nevada Journeys), Benjamin Castro (RISE), Chris Cutshaw (Friends of Nevada Wilderness), Autumn Harry (River Justice), Beverly Harry (River Justice), Chris Holman (City of Reno), Iris Jehle-Peppard (One Truckee River), Daniel Moss (City of Reno Partnership), Michele Prestowitz (TRWC), Jon Simpson (City of Reno), Nate Ullyol (City of Reno), Derek Unak (Great Basin Outdoor School), Olivia Wolff (Friends of Nevada Wilderness).

+ Committee member arrived after roll call

+ + Committee member left meeting before adjournment

\* Asterisks (\*) denote non-action items

**Agenda Item #1: Roll Call\*:** Roll call was taken. A quorum was noted.

**Agenda Item #2: Public comment\*:** There was no public comment at this time.

**Agenda Item #3: Approval of the agenda:** Terri Svetich motioned to approve the agenda for the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The agenda was unanimously approved.

**Agenda Item #4: Approve the November 15, 2024 summary meeting minutes:** Peter Gower motioned to approve the Meeting Minutes (Transcript Summary) for November 15, 2024 as written and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The summary meeting minutes were unanimously approved. Jim Smitherman abstained because he was not present at the

**Agenda Item #5: Fund balance report\*:**

The amount of the fund balance on March 7, 2025 is \$1,087,771.28, with an available amount to spend of \$307,647.73.

**Agenda Item #6: Review grant proposals to Truckee River Fund and select projects to be recommended for funding:**

The following grant proposals were considered and voted on by the group and approved, rejected/declined or action taken as follows:

**#299, Sierra Nevada Journeys:** Watershed Education Initiative, amount requested \$31,699

Audrey Bergmann, Advancement Manager with SNJ, was present to review their proposal and answer questions about the Watershed Education Initiative. This is an on-going project with a focus on getting kids outside and engaged in science and learning about their environment in a hands-on way, and this year's request would fund 700 students in the Spring of 2025 at field sites along the Truckee River watershed.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$20,000, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#300, RISE:** River Stewards, amount requested \$180,404.40

Benjamin Castro from the Reno Initiative for Shelter & Equality (RISE) was present to review the River Stewards proposal to recruit people living on the river to help in cleanup efforts and stewardship. The project is currently funding 5 stewards and 2,500 pounds of trash have been removed through the program thus far, and the proposed funding would be used to hire one program manager and 4 part-time independent contractors to decrease pollution in areas within 100 feet on either side of the Truckee River.

Since providing employment opportunities is more of a social service, the Committee chose to consider funding for the portion of the initiative focused on water quality via trash removal. Benjamin set a minimum request to accomplish this goal as \$99,000.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$85,000, and Terri Svetich seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#301, Great Basin Outdoor School:** Youth Watershed Education and Protection Projects, amount requested \$11,750.90

Derik Unak, the Development Coordinator from GBOS, was present to discuss their proposal for funding to support Tahoe Truckee Snapshot Day water sampling event to be held the campus of Mountain View Montessori School. This project provides critical

watershed education for elementary and middle school-aged students at Spring and Summer Adventure Day Camps, with full-funding covering 8 weeks of day camp programs. With reduced funding they could still accomplish their goals with fewer weeks for site days.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$7,500, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#302, Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism:** Restoring Truckee River's Ecological Health through Solid Waste Removal and Cottonwood Recruitment, amount requested \$106,931

Autumn Harry and Beverly Harry from the Healing Waters Institute were present to discuss their proposal to restore ecological health to the Truckee River with cottonwood recruitment initiated with active planting, solid waste removal, and work with partners to develop a draft ordinance to ban single-use plastic bags in Washoe County. While previous efforts have been focused on solid waste removal, they are now also working on restoring ecological health through cottonwood establishment. They have a significant volunteer base, but trash cleanup efforts are not sustainable in perpetuity, and changing the habitat structure along the river would have long-term effects once in place. Given the absence of a cash match required for downstream projects, the Committee chose to consider the upstream trash clean-up and coordination seminar components only, and Autumn proposed a reduced request of \$50,000 to accomplish these tasks.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$40,000, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#303, Friends of NV Wilderness:** Mount Rose Noxious Weed Monitoring, Treatment, and Re-seeding 2025, amount requested \$27,000

Chris Cutshaw and Olivia Wolff from the Friends of Nevada Wilderness were present to review their proposal and answer questions from the Committee.

The goal of the 2025 Mount Rose Wilderness Noxious Weed Monitoring, Treatment, and Re-Seeding project is to continue efforts to remove noxious weeds (tall white top and musk thistle) from the Hunter Creek watershed and reseed treated areas with native seeds to protect the water quality of the Truckee River and its watershed. They plan to host 6 removal projects, 2 reseeding projects and monitoring of known weed sites. With reduced funding they would remove native seed costs from the current budget.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$24,700, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#304, City of Reno:** Invasive Weed Control and Vegetation Management in a Truckee Meadows Urban Tributary, amount requested \$15,120

Daniel Moss from the City of Reno was present to discuss a proposal for weed control and vegetation management along an urban tributary to Chalk Creek. The project provides public education opportunities and a model to facilitate discussions on routine vegetation management alternatives. The funds would be used to hire professional landscaper managers, herbicide applicators, land managers, and environmental educators to implement the project, and partially pay for materials and equipment related to herbicide application, mechanical brush removal, a temporary irrigation system, seed mixes and potted shrubs, erosion control, and educational signage.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$13,000, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#305, City of Reno:** Strengthening Stewardship for the Truckee River, amount requested \$311,212.49

Nathan Ullyol and Chris Holman from the City of Reno were present to answer questions about the City of Reno's stewardship proposal. This program fills a critical gap in Truckee River protection by combining on-the-ground enforcement with long-term strategy and coordination by providing salaries and benefits for one full-time River Ranger and one full-time River Coordinator position.

Neoma was in favor of supporting the River Ranger component, which is valuable for preventing trash build up along the river, as opposed to the River Coordinator position, and with limiting funding available, Nathan proposed a reduced request of 60% of a Ranger position.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$50,000, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#306, Truckee River Watershed Council:** Independence Watershed Aquatic Organism Passage Project, amount requested \$175,341.04.

Michele Prestowitz from TRWC was present to discuss TRWC's proposal to complete phase 2 of designs and update the technical surveys to advance the Independence Watershed Aquatic Organism Passage Project (Independence AOP). With limited funds available from TRF, Michele reduced TMWC's request to \$150,000, and Brian proposed the Committee consider \$75,000.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$55,000, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

**#307, Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation:** Rosewood Nature Study Area: Unique and Interactive Interpretive Signage Fabrication, amount requested \$28,460

Heidi Anderson from Truckee Meadows Park Foundation was present to discuss TMPF's proposal to Fabricate 10 interpretive signs at the Rosewood Nature Study Area that will educate the public about the connectedness of nature, local flora and fauna, and watershed and wetland health and quality.

Brian Bonnenfant motioned to award a reduced amount of \$12,500, and Neoma Jardon seconded the motion. The motion for funding was unanimously approved.

Project advisors for the approved proposals were assigned as follows:

|                      |                        |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| #299, Jim Smitherman | #302, Dave Stanley     | #305, Neoma Jardon     |
| #300, Neoma Jardon   | #303, Brain Bonnenfant | #306, Peter Gower      |
| #301, Jim Smitherman | #304, Neoma Jardon     | #307, Brain Bonnenfant |

Closing remarks

A total of \$307,700 was allocated in grants for spring 2025.

**Agenda Item #7: Review completed projects\*:**

*Agenda item moved to next Committee Meeting: May 16, 2025.*

**Agenda Item #8: Committee and staff comments \***

None.

**Agenda Item #9: Upcoming Meetings:**

- a. Spring 2025 – fieldtrip (TBD)
- b. Friday May 16, 2025 at 8:30am.

**Agenda Item #11: Public comment:** There was no public comment.

**Agenda Item #11: Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 10:52am.



# **TRUCKEE RIVER FUND STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT**

---

**Presented by  
The Blueprint Collaborative**



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This assessment and any accompanying documents contain information belonging to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority and are confidential and legally privileged. This information is only for the use of the entity for the intention of educating and empowering the staff and Advisory Committee to make effective decisions related to the Truckee River Fund. How and when to share, and with whom, is a decision reserved for the Advisory Committee and Truckee Meadows Water Authority.

---

## Introduction

The Truckee River Fund (TRF) was established in 2004 by the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) to protect and enhance the water quality and resources of the Truckee River watershed. The Fund provides grants to local agencies and organizations for projects that restore and improve the river's health, ensuring a resilient water supply for communities in the region. TRF is managed by the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada (CFNN). To evaluate and strengthen the Fund's grantmaking process, TMWA engaged The Blueprint Collaborative to conduct a strategic assessment.

For nearly two decades, the Fund was chaired by Janet Phillips, whose strong leadership and decisive approach set the tone for committee meetings and applicant evaluations. She provided clarity in decision-making, ensuring that funding was allocated effectively. Since 2022, the Fund has transitioned to a rotating chair model, coinciding with a rise in the Fund's reputation as a valuable funding source. However, as TRF's popularity has grown, its available funding has declined due to TMWA's increasing focus on large-scale, multi-year projects. These shifts, combined with evolving leadership dynamics, highlight the need for greater clarity in grant evaluation and decision-making processes.

In March 2025, The Blueprint Collaborative conducted interviews with nineteen stakeholders to assess their experiences with the Truckee River Fund. Interviewees included Advisory Committee members, Fund holder staff, TMWA staff, and both applicants and awardees. The discussions focused on the Fund's challenges, effectiveness, and future direction, with the goal of identifying insights to enhance its long-term impact.

Key Insights include:

1. The Fund Makes a Difference
2. Advisory Committee's Effectiveness is Challenged by External Oversight
3. Long Term Evaluation of the Fund Impact is not a Priority
4. Declining Funding is a Concern for Most
5. Clear and Consistent Priorities and Guidelines Are Essential
6. The Fund's Application Process Is Accessible
7. Consistent Evaluation Criteria Are Needed for Fair Deliberation
8. Better Communication with Applicants will Streamline the Grant Process
9. Efficiency and Fairness of Committee Meetings Needs Improvement
10. Clarify the Role of the CFNN Grants Cycle Administrator

This assessment highlights the Fund's commitment to transparency and continuous improvement. The challenges identified are not unique to the Truckee River Fund, as many foundations face similar difficulties in defining clear grant priorities, parameters, funding amounts, and evaluation processes. By addressing these key insights, the Truckee River Fund has an opportunity to refine its practices, enhance its impact, and continue serving the watershed and its communities effectively. We are pleased to present our findings and hope they will support the Fund's continued growth and success.

---

## Key Insights

### THE FUND MAKES A DIFFERENCE

Many applicants shared positive feedback about the Fund's effectiveness, highlighting its significant impact on their organizations and projects. One applicant described the funding as a "game changer." The Fund plays a crucial role in promoting sustainability for nonprofits by providing anchor support that fosters long-term success and stability.

Eighty percent of interview respondents provided positive feedback, while the remaining 20% expressed mixed opinions. Some noted challenges in determining whether the Fund had made a substantial difference in drinking water quality. Nevertheless, several projects demonstrate the Fund's lasting influence, including efforts to manage invasive species in Lake Tahoe, environmental clean-up initiatives, waste reduction (such as sanitation facility improvements), and sediment reduction in Donner Lake.

A standout feature of the Fund is its support for the design phase of large-scale projects. While government agencies are often reluctant to finance these critical preliminary stages, the Fund steps in to provide essential pre-work funding, laying the groundwork for impactful projects.

### ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S EFFECTIVENESS IS CHALLENGED BY EXTERNAL OVERSIGHT

The Advisory Committee is seen as effective and valuable within the community, with members who are enthusiastic and well-suited to their roles. The meetings are productive, with thoughtful questions asked and good opportunities identified.

Field trips that occurred in the past were highly valued and continuing education in this way was brought up multiple times.

However, there's a perception that the Advisory Committee's agency is limited by oversight from the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) Board. This oversight by a Board of politicians, who have been lobbied before by past applicants, causes hesitation among members, impacting decision making, and undermining the intended separation between the Fund and TMWA.

Some interviewees expressed concern over the internal power dynamics within the Advisory Committee, with some members using their tenure to influence newer members, potentially diverting the committee from TMWA's objectives and driving their own objectives.

### LONG TERM EVALUATION OF THE FUND IMPACT IS NOT A PRIORITY

While most interviewees believe the Fund's contributions are effective, the magnitude of its impact is challenging to measure. Although there is interest in conducting long-term evaluations, this effort

is hindered by the high costs associated with environmental monitoring, difficulty in tracking long-term educational impact, and the difficulty of consistent tracking.

The absence of long-term data makes it challenging to conclusively demonstrate the Fund's effectiveness over time. However, there is a strong consensus among interviewees that the Fund is making a meaningful difference in the community and positively impacting the river.

As a practical alternative, implementing a dashboard to track long-term impacts reported by applicants could be valuable. Metrics such as pounds of trash collected and number of students taught could offer insight into the Fund's ongoing impact without requiring costly evaluation and monitoring efforts.

## **DECLINING FUNDING IS A CONCERN FOR MOST**

The Truckee River Fund faces significant challenges as its funding has steadily declined. This decline is largely due to TMWA allocating resources to important side projects. While this shift was not criticized by interviewees, it is a reality that limits the Fund's ability to fully support its priorities along the Truckee River.

At the same time, the challenges facing the river—particularly in urban areas—are growing more complex, and the demand for funding to address these issues is only increasing. The Fund's effectiveness is well-recognized, but declining resources will likely necessitate declining more applicants or reconsidering and refining its funding priorities.

When asked, "How do you envision the role of the Truckee River Fund evolving over the next decade?" the most common response (58%) emphasized the need for additional and expanded funding. Further intentional discussions should be had between all stakeholders, the Advisory Committee, TMWA staff, and Community Foundation of Northern Nevada (CFNN) staff to identify if funding is a priority.

To address these resource constraints and sustain its impact, the Fund may need to explore new funding sources and develop strategic partnerships, but keep in mind that additional funding may be challenging with final decision-making power being determined by the TMWA Board. If new funding is secured, the ultimate decision authority might be reconsidered, including possible transfer to another entity, such as Western Regional Water Commission.

## **CLEAR AND CONSISTENT PRIORITIES AND GUIDELINES ARE ESSENTIAL**

**Clear Funding Priorities:** The Fund has established clear funding priorities, which have become increasingly well-defined since its inception. However, there is inconsistency among Advisory Committee members in their understanding of what is outlined in the application, on the website, and in communications with applicants.

**Project Location:** One area where clarity remains a challenge is project location. While the RFP states it “gives preference” to projects that benefit TMWA customers, particularly projects that protect against threats upstream or near water treatment and hydroelectric plant intakes, the language is not direct. Broader guidance and history allows for funding anywhere within the Truckee River watershed.

Perspectives on location is mixed among Committee members. Discussions around project location were frequent, with valid points on both sides regarding the funding of downstream projects. Based on the mixed opinions, further discussion among the Committee members, TMWA staff, and legal counsel about the topic of funding for downstream projects is warranted.

**Grant Request Amounts:** Applicants lack clear guidance on appropriate funding request amounts, as no documentation or official communication provides specific direction. Unless an applicant has received funding in previous years and has a sense of typical award sizes, they often submit requests without a clear benchmark.

While CFNN staff offers some guidance when directly asked, determining an appropriate request amount remains challenging since the Committee has no established minimum or maximum funding thresholds. All project sizes are considered, contingent on available funding.

## **THE FUND’S APPLICATION PROCESS IS ACCESSIBLE**

The Fund’s application and reporting processes are widely viewed as straightforward and low maintenance. Applicants appreciate the ease of applying and the transition to an online portal, which has streamlined the process further.

While there are some barriers, such as the reimbursement model, they are generally flexible, with workarounds available when needed. Overall, these barriers do not discourage organizations from applying.

## **CONSISTENT EVALUATION CRITERIA ARE NEEDED FOR FAIR DELIBERATION**

The Advisory Committee’s deliberation process has been described as unpredictable. Each committee member applies their own criteria when evaluating applications, leading to inconsistencies in decision-making. This lack of structure poses challenges for both Advisory members and applicants.

A more consistent evaluation framework would also serve as clear justification for funding decisions and provide valuable “back-up” for the TMWA Board. Some applicants perceive that the Advisory Committee may not fully understand TMWA’s priorities, making it difficult to ensure alignment in funding decisions.

While some committee members appreciate the flexibility that comes with an unstructured evaluation process—believing it prevents rigid guidelines from stifling decision-making—others see

a need for more consistency to reduce perceived bias and improve transparency. When asked “how could the project selection process be improved?” 75% of interviewees mentioned improvements were warranted.

Potential Approaches to Balancing Structure and Flexibility:

- Implementing a weighted priority system (e.g., assigning higher value to education or implementation projects).
- Applying weighted criteria to project location to ensure funding is aligned with strategic priorities.
- Establishing funding allocation guidelines, such as dedicating a percentage of funds to education programs and the remainder to on-the-ground efforts like restoration or trash mitigation.
- Developing a streamlined rubric with fewer than ten yes-or-no questions, accompanied by a point system to guide decision-making.

## **BETTER COMMUNICATION WITH APPLICANTS WILL STREAMLINE THE GRANT PROCESS**

There is a need for more deliberate and structured communication with applicants to ensure clarity with the application and review process.

Currently, applicants receive an email stating: “As always, you are welcome to attend the TRF Advisory Committee meeting...to present your proposal and answer any questions the Committee may have.” However, there is an unspoken expectation among committee members that applicants should attend only to answer questions, not to formally present their proposals. Clearer guidelines on meeting decorum may be necessary, as misunderstandings continue to create challenges during meetings.

Improving Transparency Around Funding and Application Expectations:

- Clearly stating the total grant dollars available and setting a maximum request amount per cycle to help applicants tailor their proposals.
- Providing an online application template that applicants can download in advance, allowing them to draft proposals before submission.
- Implementing a pre-screening process where CFNN can return applications that do not meet minimum requirements before they reach the committee.
- After applicants apply, CFNN could communicate funding constraints if the ask is higher than a certain threshold (such as the total available funds and the average grant request amount) allowing applicants to adjust their proposals accordingly.
- Setting word limits for different sections of the application to streamline the review process and avoid excessively long submissions.

## **EFFICIENCY AND FAIRNESS OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS NEEDS IMPROVEMENT**

Following the March 7, 2025 Advisory Committee meeting, numerous critiques emerged, with many interviewees describing it as more challenging than usual. While Advisory meetings have often been described as unpredictable—one interviewee likened them to *The Hunger Games*—this particular meeting seemed to generate even more frustration than normal.

One major concern was the tension between expecting applicants to submit high-quality proposals and then pushing them to cut their budgets during deliberations, which some felt ultimately diluted the impact of their work. Additionally, some applicants perceived that those who submitted for higher dollars received greater funding—not necessarily based on merit, but simply because their requests were higher. This created a sense that funding decisions lacked consistency and transparency.

A recurring issue in the deliberation process is the committee’s difficulty in saying no to applicants who are physically present in the room. While opinions on this varied, most interviewees believed that attendance influences decision-making, making it harder for the committee to decline proposals outright. Some noted that proposals flagged as vague or ineligible still received considerable discussion and funding, seemingly because applicants were present.

Another point of concern was the dynamic of having applicants observe committee deliberations. Many found it uncomfortable to sit through discussions about their proposals, especially when budget cuts were suggested. However, all applicants interviewed mentioned that they do like to participate and answer questions about their proposals. When applications are denied, the committee typically provides constructive guidance, which is appreciated.

To address these concerns, some suggested restructuring the meetings so that applicants are available to answer any questions and then leave before the committee deliberates in a closed session. This approach could help maintain transparency while allowing for more candid discussions and reducing the pressure committee members feel when applicants are in the room. However, due to Open Meeting Laws, further research and consultation with legal counsel would be necessary to determine the feasibility of this change.

## **CLARIFY THE ROLE OF THE CFNN GRANTS CYCLE ADMINISTRATOR**

Applicants had overwhelmingly positive feedback about working with the CFNN Grants Cycle Administrator, praising their responsiveness and support throughout the process. The role of the CFNN Grants Cycle Administrator is sometimes misunderstood by Advisory Committee members, yet applicants overwhelmingly see the position as a valuable resource. The Administrator provides critical guidance on funding amounts, priorities, and project fit, offering applicants a direct point of contact for questions and support. Since the Administrator’s email is the only one publicly listed, grant applicants naturally direct their inquiries to them.



Some committee members have expressed surprise that applicants rarely reach out to them for guidance before submitting proposals. However, the application process explicitly states that *“Organizations or entities sponsoring proposals are prohibited from ex parte communications with members of the Committee regarding such proposals while those proposals are pending before the Committee, and such communications may be grounds for rejecting a proposal.”* This policy underscores a misunderstanding among some committee members about their role in the application process and the limits of their engagement with applicants.

To address this, implementing a formal onboarding or orientation for new (even current) Advisory Committee members could help clarify roles and responsibilities for all entities involved.

## Recommendations

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS (0-3 MONTHS)

#### 1. Clarify the Advisory Committee Member's Roles and Responsibilities

- a. Implement an onboarding and orientation program for new Advisory Committee members. Include learning for current Advisory Committee members to ensure clarity.
  - i. This should outline the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved, including clear distinctions between the Advisory Committee, TMWA Staff, and CFNN staff.
- b. Plan ongoing education and field trips for Advisory Committee members.

#### 2. Research and Consider Restructuring Advisory Committee Meetings

- a. Because of Open Meeting Laws, research and talk with legal counsel to see if a revised structure for the Advisory Committee meetings is possible.

#### 3. Improve Communication and Transparency with Applicants

- a. Set expectations regarding the total available funds and maximum request amounts per cycle.
  - i. For example: "We have \$320,000 available for this funding cycle. While we typically fund projects between \$10,000 and \$40,000 the Advisory Committee has the discretion to award higher amounts for projects deemed especially impactful."
- b. Provide an online application template in advance for applicants to prepare and draft their proposals.
- c. If Advisory Committee meetings must stay in their current format, provide more clarity and rules to applicants about attending in the email from the CFNN Grants Cycle Administrator.
- d. Empower the CFNN Grants Cycle Administrator to pre-screen applications enabling them to disqualify applications if minimum requirements aren't met.
- e. Consider adding a link to the CFNN TRF landing page to direct applicants there.
- f. Add typical deadlines or cycle seasons to the TRF website.

### SHORT-TERM ACTIONS (3-6 MONTHS)

#### 1. Establish Clear and Consistent Evaluation Criteria

- a. Develop a standardized evaluation framework for the Advisory Committee to use when reviewing proposals.
  - i. This framework could include the following options:
    - 1. A weighted priority system
    - 2. Applying weighted criteria to project location
    - 3. Establishing funding allocation guidelines
    - 4. Developing a streamlined rubric with fewer than ten yes-or-no questions, accompanied by a point system

## **2. Enhance Long-Term Evaluation Practices**

- a. Implement a dashboard to track long-term impacts of funded projects.
  - i. This could include metrics directly from awarded project to tally totals of waste collected, acres of habitat restoration, number of volunteers engaged, number of students supported, etc.

## **3. Address Committee Dynamics and External Oversight Challenges**

- a. Initiate discussion between TMWA, CFNN, and the Advisory Committee to address the concerns around external oversight and internal committee dynamics.
  - i. The aim would be to clarify expectations regarding decision-making and clarify the separation between the committee's role and TMWA's influence.

# **MEDIUM-TERM ACTIONS (6-12 MONTHS)**

## **1. Revisit Funding Priorities and Clarify Project Location Guidelines**

- a. Engage in a discussion with TMWA staff and Advisory Committee members to review and clarify the Fund's funding priorities, particularly regarding project location. If funding is to prioritize areas upstream or near water treatment and hydroelectric plants, this should be clearly communicated in all materials.

## **2. Increase Funding and Diversify Funding Sources**

- a. Engage in discussions around exploring additional funding sources with all stakeholders (TMWA, CFNN, and the Advisory Committee)
- b. Develop a strategy to diversify revenue streams.
  - i. Explore partnerships with other organizations or government agencies, private donors, or environmental grants to increase available resources.
- c. Engage in discussion around reconsidering the ultimate decision authority changing from TMWA.

# **LONG-TERM ACTIONS (18+ MONTHS)**

## **1. Implement Long-Term Strategic Planning for the Fund**

- a. Engage stakeholders in developing a long-term strategy for the Truckee River Fund.
- b. This could include establishing goals for the next 5-10 years, exploring new funding models, and assessing long-term environmental impact goals.
  - i. With the Fund's funding model being under pressure, it is crucial to have a long-term plan that focuses on sustainability, resource allocation, and the broader impacts of the Fund's work.

## **2. Monitor and Adjust to Emerging Needs**

- a. Continuously assess the Fund's performance and adjust priorities as needed based on emerging environmental or community needs.
- b. This could involve periodic evaluations of funded projects and stakeholder feedback to ensure the Fund remains responsive to current challenges.

# Truckee River Fund- Fall 2025

## *Community Foundation of Northern Nevada*

### *Truckee River Fund Grant Priorities*

Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) recommends that the Truckee River Fund (TRF) Advisory Committee (the “Committee”) give preference to well-supported, clearly drafted grant requests that consider substantial benefits to TMWA customers for projects and programs that mitigate substantial threats to water quality and the watershed, particularly those threats upstream or nearby water treatment and hydroelectric plant intakes.

- **Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS):** Projects/Programs that support the prevention or control of aquatic invasive species in the mainstem Truckee River, Lake Tahoe, other tributaries and water bodies in the Truckee River system.
- **Watershed Improvements:** Projects that reduce erosion or sediment, suspended solids, or total dissolve solids (TDS) discharges, nutrients, industrial contaminants, or bacterial pollutants to the River. Projects or programs that are located within 303d (impaired waters) and total maximum daily load (TMDL) sections of the River should be considered, both in California and Nevada. Innovative techniques should be encouraged. The following link identifies impaired sections of the river and its tributaries: <https://mywaterway.epa.gov/>.
- **Local Stormwater Improvements:** Projects that demonstrably mitigate storm water run-off due to urbanization of the local watershed. Priority should be given to those improvement projects in close proximity to TMWA’s water supply intakes and canals and which will improve the reliability and protect the quality of the community’s municipal water supply.
- **Re-Forestation and Re-Vegetation Projects:** Projects to restore forest and upland areas damaged by fire and historical logging operations, and to improve watershed resiliency in drought situations. Projects/programs in this category should be given a high priority due to urbanization of the watershed and increased susceptibility of the urban and suburban watershed to wildfire.
- **Support to Rehabilitation of Local Tributary Creeks and Drainage Courses:** Projects to support water quality improvement in creeks and tributaries to the Truckee River.
- **Stewardship and Environmental Awareness:** Support to clean-up programs and the development and implementation of educational programs relative to water, water quality and watershed protection that do not fall clearly into the one of the above-mentioned categories.

#### Notes:

- For proposals related to weed control/eradication, contact Lauren Sgandurra at the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada for additional criteria at [laurens@nevadafund.org](mailto:laurens@nevadafund.org).
- For proposals in the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Truckee River Fund (TRF) typically only funds proposals related to Priority I and VI.

## *Grantee Requirements*

### **GRANTEE REQUIREMENTS**

To be eligible for funding, grantees must adhere to the following requirements:

- Funds are to be used and/or disbursed exclusively for the charitable uses and purposes.
- The Fund shall be used exclusively for projects that protect and enhance water quality or water resources of the Truckee River, or its watershed.
- Grantees may include 501(c)(3) organizations and governmental entities. Any grants to governmental entities must be made exclusively for public benefit purposes.
- All grantees will be required to sign a grant agreement stipulating their agreement to all applicable terms, conditions, and reporting requirements.
- Organizations or entities sponsoring proposals are prohibited from ex parte communications with members of the Committee regarding such proposals while those proposals are pending before the Committee, and such communications may be grounds for rejecting a proposal.
- All applicants must provide **a match of at least 25 percent** for dollars requested. The match may be with funding and/or in-kind services.

### **TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTOR'S DISCRETION**

For each proposal submitted and recommended by the Committee the TMWA Board of Directors has absolute discretion to:

- Accept or reject any proposal;
- Accept a proposal on the condition that certain modifications be made;
- Assess proposals as they see fit, without in any way being obligated to select any proposal;
- Determine whether proposals satisfactorily meet the evaluation criteria set out in this RFP;
- Reject proposals with or without cause, whether based on the evaluation criteria set out above or otherwise.

## PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES

To maintain eligibility to receive grant funds, each Charitable Beneficiary must comply at all times with the following requirements:

- Must be exempt from federal income taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Code;
- Shall use all Fund distributions toward projects that are appropriate and legal public expenditures;
- Must provide financial details and/or reports of their organizations upon request;
- Must submit quarterly reports.
- Must not use any Fund distributions for political contributions or political advocacy;
- Must either implement the projects, activities, and/or programs for which they received Fund distributions within six months of the date in which such distributions are received or by date(s) as agreed upon in the grant acceptance agreement, or must return all such distributions to the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada forthwith;
- Must provide the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada a report detailing the completion of their projects, activities, and/or programs; and
- Must sign an agreement regarding their compliance with the qualifications hereof.

## *Project Evaluation Criteria*

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

Applications are evaluated according to the following criteria and in order of priority. If the grant applicant does not meet the “Grantee Requirements”, the application will not be considered.

#### 1. RELEVANCE OF PROPOSAL TO THE TRF PROGRAM

- Address TRF grant priorities – Does the project address at least one of the TRF grant priorities, as described at the beginning of the RFP?
- Meet multiple objectives – Does the project meet multiple grant priorities?
- Public benefit of the project – Does the project help TMWA protect its sources of drinking water?
- Benefit to TMWA customers – Is there a direct benefit to TMWA customers?
- Project location – Is the project located upstream of one of TMWA’s water treatment plants?

#### 2. QUALITY OF PROJECT DESIGN

- Appropriateness of selected project methods – Do the proposed project strategies make sense to address the watershed and/or water quality concern(s) outlined by the applicant?
- Thoroughness of project design – Is the project design adequately detailed to ensure the desired outcome(s)?
- Sustainability of project – Will the benefits of the project continue after the grant funds are expended?
- Project longevity – If ongoing operation & maintenance (O&M) is required to maintain benefits, is it funded?
- Consideration of existing research – Does the project consider existing research, planning efforts, or assessments related to the Truckee River watershed?

### 3. MEASURABILITY OF PROJECT SUCCESS

- Identification of project benchmarks or milestones – Has the applicant described the steps necessary to complete the project?
- Demonstrated ability to measure the results of the project – Does the project have adequate measurable outcomes to evaluate project success?
- Benefits expected from a successful project – Are there clear goals that will be obtained on project completion?
- Readiness to begin project – Is the grant applicant ready to undertake and complete the project?

### 4. EFFECTIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION

- Qualifications of applicant for the proposed project – Does the applicant have adequate experience and credentials to perform the work described in the application?
- Collaborative efforts – Are there partner organizations supporting or benefiting from the project?
- Demonstrated ability of applicant to manage and complete the project – Has the applicant successfully completed projects similar to the one proposed? If previously funded by TRF, has the applicant met performance requirements and completed projects successfully?

### 5. ADEQUACY OF PROPOSED BUDGET

- Availability and status of matching funds – Does the project provide a minimum of 25 percent match in cash and/or in-kind services? If the project is downstream of the USGS Vista gage, is the 25 percent match requirement met using cash match?
- Total project cost relative to benefits – Is the project cost reasonable given the expected project outcome(s)?



- Appropriateness of budget – Are the costs presented in the budget adequately detailed and do they seem reasonable? Is the project under the 25 percent indirect/overhead expense limit?

## *Project Information*

---

### **Project Title\***

Name of Project.

*Character Limit: 250*

### **Amount Requested\***

*Character Limit: 20*

### **Project Start Date\***

*Character Limit: 10*

### **Project End Date\***

*Character Limit: 10*

### **This funding will be used to:\***

Complete this sentence with a max of 2 sentences.

*Character Limit: 5000*

### **This project is on:\***

Check all that apply

#### **Choices**

Public land

Private land

### **Are government permits or decision documents needed for the project?\***

#### **Choices**

Yes

No

### **If so, are those permits and decision documents already secured?**

*If permits and decision documents are needed but not yet secured, in #4 of the Narrative Requirements provide a list of permits and documents needed and a schedule for securing them.*

#### **Choices**

Yes

No

## Organization Information

---

### Organization Name\*

Character Limit: 250

### Organization Type\*

#### Choices

501(c)(3) Nonprofit

Governmental Entity

### EIN

If the organization is a 501c3, please include the EIN#.

Character Limit: 250

### Director of Organization\*

Character Limit: 250

### Project Contact Name\*

Character Limit: 250

### Project Contact Postion/Title\*

Character Limit: 250

### Project Contact Email\*

Character Limit: 254

### Project Contact Phone Number\*

Character Limit: 25

### Organization Mission\*

Character Limit: 10000

## Previous Funding from Truckee River Fund

---

### Has your organization received other grants from the Truckee River Fund?\*

#### Choices

Yes

No

If yes, please include the following information for all previously funded projects:

- *Date awarded*
- *Project # and Title*
- *Amount of award*

*Please attach additional pages as needed to list ALL previously funded projects.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

## Previous Funding continued

*File Size Limit: 2 MB*

## Narrative Requirements

---

### 1.) Specific project goals and measurable outcomes and how you will measure and report them.\*

*All projects are required to have measurable outcomes.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

### 2.) Describe the project location.\*

*Include site map and aerial photos if applicable/possible as an attachment.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

## Map/Photo attachments

*File Size Limit: 5 MB*

### 3.) Project Description\*

*Character Limit: 10000 | File Size Limit: 5 MB*

### 4.) Grant priorities\*

*Explain how the proposed project advances the TRF's specific grant priorities.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

### 5.) Permitting\*

*Provide a permitting schedule for your project along with your plan for getting the required permits and decision documents. Be sure to include the cost of permitting/decision documents as a line item in your budget.*

*Character Limit: 10000 | File Size Limit: 5 MB*

### 6.) Future Land Use\*

*List any known or foreseeable zoning, land use, or development plans that may affect your proposed project.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

### 7.) If future phases of the project will be needed, identify anticipated sources of funding.\*

*Character Limit: 10000*

**8.) Identify the principals involved in leading or coordinating the project or activity.\***

*Character Limit: 10000*

**9.) Number of staff positions involved in project.\***

*Identify how many staff will be full-time and how many will be part-time.*

*“Fulltime” means 100% of their staff position will be dedicated to this project; “part-time” means only a portion of their staff position will be dedicated to this project.*

*Character Limit: 250*

**10.) Number of volunteers involved in project and an estimated number of volunteer hours.\***

*Character Limit: 250*

**11.) Timeline of Project\***

*List key dates and include project milestones. Note: Be realistic in your estimate of dates and milestones. List any factors that may cause a delay in implementing and/or completing the project.*

*\*\*Note: Funding will not be provided for work performed prior to grant approval.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

**12.) What factors will indicate a successful project?\***

*Character Limit: 10000*

**13.) Collaboration\***

*List partnerships or collaborations with other entities in relation to your proposal, if any. Grantees are encouraged to seek other funds prior to requesting money from the Truckee River Fund. Please explain what other funding opportunities were sought and if any other funds have been awarded.*

*Character Limit: 10000*

## Grant Match

All applicants must provide **a match of at least 25 percent** for dollars requested. The match may be with funding and/or in-kind services.

For larger grant requests, priority will be given to projects that significantly leverage the grant with funding from other sources.

For grant requests for projects downstream of the Vista USGS gage, the 25 percent match requirement must be met using **cash match**.

### Total grant match to be provided.\*

*Total Match = Cash + In-Kind*

*Character Limit: 20*

### Cash

*Character Limit: 20*

**For the cash portion, is the funding already being held by the applicant for this project?**

#### Choices

Yes

No

### In-Kind

**\*\*Note:** Provide an itemized breakdown of volunteer match in your budget with rationale.

*Character Limit: 20*

### Description of matching funds/in-kind donations.\*

*Character Limit: 10000*

## Attachments

### Project Budget\*

*Provide detail on each line-item expenditures and show which funds are committed and which have been requested to be paid for by the Truckee River Fund grant, and which will be paid for with in-kind services. Other sources of funding should be provided. Explain status of other funding if not in hand. If project is to be implemented in phases, please separate budget into each phase. **Please contact Lauren Sgandurra at [laurens@nevadafund.org](mailto:laurens@nevadafund.org) for a sample budget template, or download one here.***

#### **\*\*Notes:**

- *Indirect/overhead expenses cannot exceed 25 percent; TRF may fund indirect/overhead up to 25% based on availability of funds.*
- *Applicants should be prepared to provide reduced budgets during the review of applications by the TRF Advisory Committee when funds are limited.*
- *Grants from the Truckee River Fund are paid on a reimbursable basis for actual expenditures only. Craft your budget in such a way that requests for reimbursement correspond to the original budget.*

*File Size Limit: 5 MB*

### **Supplemental Attachments**

*Please attach any additional attachments here.*

*File Size Limit: 3 MB*



**COMMUNITY  
FOUNDATION**  
*of Northern Nevada*

### TRUCKEE RIVER FUND GRANTEE EVALUATION

|                       |  |                  |
|-----------------------|--|------------------|
| <b>Prepared by:</b>   | <b>Terri Svetich</b>   | <b>2/15/2025</b> |
| <b>Project Title:</b> | <b>TRF #246 Bear Creek Lower Meadow Restoration Project – Phase 2 Construction</b> |                  |
| <b>Grantee:</b>       | <b>Truckee River Watershed Council</b>   |                  |

**1. Grantee used the funding for activities specified in the grant proposal.**

- ☐ Completed and exceeded activities specified in proposal  
☐ Completed activities specified in proposal  
☒ Partially completed activities specified in proposal

**NOTES: While the anticipated Phase 2 construction was not completed, the post monitoring of the Phase 1 was completed demonstrating overall goals of the project were realized. Consequently, \$27,618.24 of the allocated funds were unused.**

**2. Grantee deemed their project a success.**

- ☒ Exceeded expectations  
☐ Met expectations  
☐ Met some but not all expectations

**NOTES:**

**PHASE 1 CONSTRUCTION AUGMENTED RIFFLES AND INSTALLED BANK LOG STRUCTURES AND REVEGETATION. IT WAS ANTICIPATED PHASE 2 CONSTRUCTION WOULD BE NEEDED. HOWEVER, THE POST PHASE 1 RESTORATION CONSTRUCTION MONITORING, DETERMINED PHASE 2 CONSTRUCTION WAS NOT NEEDED, AND COULD BE DETRIMENTAL. THEREFORE, THE PLANNED PHASE 2 CONSTRUCTION WAS CANCELLED.**

**3. Grantee met their stated goals.**

- ☒ Met and exceeded stated goals  
☐ Met stated goals  
☐ Met some but not all stated goals

**NOTES: The measurable goals as stated in the original proposal were met and exceeded. The goal was to reduce 20 tons of sediment per year. The pre and post monitoring reduction calculated to be 55 tons/year in sediment to Bear Creek and the Truckee River.**



**Lauren Sgandurra**

---

**From:** Bill Bradley <billobradleyjr@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 7, 2025 5:12 AM  
**To:** Lauren Sgandurra  
**Subject:** Evaluation of TRF #263

Good morning Lauren.

This is my project evaluation for # 263, forest thinning at outflow channel of Independence Lake and additional ongoing thinning of fire-prone stands around Independence Lake.

This is an ongoing project to protect and enhance water quality at one of the headwaters of TMWA's water supply. The work continues to be carried out by The Nature Conservancy with grants from many sources, including the State of California and TRF.

Other than delays caused by weather, this project was successfully completed in the fall of 2025.

The grantee, TNC, used the funding for activities specified in their grant proposal.

The grantee deemed this project a success.

The grantee met their stated goals.

Bill Bradley



**COMMUNITY  
FOUNDATION**  
*of Northern Nevada*

### TRUCKEE RIVER FUND GRANTEE EVALUATION

|                       |  |                               |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Prepared by:</b>   | <b>Jim Smitherman</b>  | <b>Date: January 28, 2025</b> |
| <b>Project Title:</b> | <b>2024 Great Community Clean-up, Truckee River Clean-up, Adopt-A-River Program, and Community Education Program</b> |                               |
| <b>Grantee:</b>       | <b>KTMB</b>  |                               |

#### 1. Grantee used the funding for activities specified in the grant proposal.

- ☒ Completed and exceeded activities specified in proposal  
☐ Completed activities specified in proposal  
☐ Partially completed activities specified in proposal

NOTES:

#### 2. Grantee deemed their project a success.

- ☒ Exceeded expectations  
☐ Met expectations  
☐ Met some but not all expectations

NOTES: **Most expectations met or exceeded.**

#### 3. Grantee met their stated goals.

- ☒ Met and exceeded stated goals  
☐ Met stated goals  
☒ Met some but not all stated goals

NOTES: **Most goals met or exceeded, very few not met, detail.**

#### Great Community Clean-Up Spring 2024

- Work with partners like One Truckee River (OTR) to identify and target a minimum of six invasive weed "hotspots" along Truckee River tributaries for weed removal and native plant restoration ( 7 sites, goal exceed);
- Support accurate mapping of invasive weed zones as tracked by the Washoe Storey Conservation District (WSCD);
- Engage a minimum of 700 volunteers to participate in litter clean-up and weed removal at the event (1040 volunteers, goal exceeded);
- Of those 700 volunteers, recruit and coordinate a minimum of 125 volunteers to pull invasive weeds at hotspots (196 at 7 sites, goal exceed);
- Involve a minimum of 100 youth volunteers (100 youth, goal met) through new and existing youth program partnerships;

## Grantee Evaluation

## Page 2

- Enhance event marketing and outreach efforts with Adopt-A-River groups to increase their participation in the 2024 Great Community Clean-Up;
- Remove 15-20 tons of trash, invasive weeds, and green waste from the Truckee River Watershed; (58.7 tons total, goal exceed)
- Educate volunteers on waste reduction and weed mitigation at Great Community Clean-Up sites and subsequent volunteer picnic; (goal met)
- Survey volunteers participating in weed-related projects and analyze results to determine the success and impact of the event.(goal met)

## Adopt-A-River 2024

- In response to the changing conditions of the Truckee River as a result of our growing community, KTMB will work with municipal partners to update KTMB's annual Litter Index Survey and dedicate a section completely to the Truckee River corridor. Survey results will help KTMB staff identify areas that need adoption; (goal met)
- The Adopt-A-River program will also include a litter survey before each clean-up. Areas are rated based on a scale of 1-4, 1 meaning "virtually no litter" and 4 indicating "major illegal dump site". These surveys will show the impact of the Adopt-A-River program; (goal met)
- Recruit and retain adopters and volunteers to be stewards of our watershed;
- Conduct a minimum of 15 river-specific clean-ups through the Adopt-A-Spot Program (16, goal exceed);
- Engage 150 volunteers in river-specific clean-up efforts (1612, goal exceed);
- Remove 5 tons of litter and invasive weeds from the Truckee River corridor.(42.2 tons, goal exceed)

## Truckee River Clean-Up Fall 2024

- Engage a minimum of 600 volunteers to participate in a river clean-up, storm drain stenciling, and invasive weed removal; (562 volunteers)
- Remove 15-20 tons of litter, invasive weeds, and green waste in the Truckee River corridor at clean-up locations from Verdi to Lockwood; (29.4 tons, goal exceed)
- Involve a minimum of 100 youth volunteers through new and existing youth program partnerships; (61 youth)
- Host 20 "on the river" volunteers including kayakers, fly-fishers, and WET team Emergency Response personnel to remove debris from the river; (43 volunteers, goal exceed)
- Stencil a minimum of 100 storm drains (125, goal exceed) in partnership with the City of Reno to raise community awareness that all drains lead to the river;
- Spread mulch generated by KTMB's Christmas Tree Recycling program for soil erosion projects and to inhibit weed growth; (goal met)
- Work with park and natural area staff to identify and wrap trees as needed along the river corridor (goal met);
- Remove graffiti as needed;
- Educate volunteers on waste reduction and weed mitigation at Truckee River Clean-Up sites and the subsequent volunteer picnic. The "zero waste" event will aim to create as little waste as possible, aligning efforts with current state guidelines on public health and safety at the time of the event; (goal met)
- Survey event participants and compile analyzed results to determine the success and impact of the event. (goal met)

## Community Education 2024

- Conduct a minimum of 20 Community and Adult education presentations (5 presentations) and service learning events about our watershed, invasive weeds, and litter topics to reach a

Grantee Evaluation

Page 3

minimum of 500 community members (102 individuals reached) from local businesses, organizations, community groups, etc.;

- Promote ecological literacy and environmental stewardship messaging using digital outreach.



**COMMUNITY  
FOUNDATION**  
*of Northern Nevada*

### TRUCKEE RIVER FUND GRANTEE EVALUATION

|                       |  |                  |
|-----------------------|--|------------------|
| <b>Prepared by:</b>   | <b>Terri Svetich</b>                         | <b>2/15/2025</b> |
| <b>Project Title:</b> | <b>TRF #283 Watershed Coalition Building</b> |                  |
| <b>Grantee:</b>       | <b>One Truckee River</b>                     |                  |

**1. Grantee used the funding for activities specified in the grant proposal.**

- ☒ Completed and exceeded activities specified in proposal  
☐ Completed activities specified in proposal  
☐ Partially completed activities specified in proposal

**NOTES:**      **The efforts by the One Truckee River have exceeded the proposal expectations and increased collaboration among the Truckee Meadows Agencies**

**2. Grantee deemed their project a success.**

- ☒ Exceeded expectations  
☐ Met expectations  
☐ Met some but not all expectations

**NOTES:**      **In addition to increased collaboration and participation, OTR has identified and developed sources of revenue to partially support the OTR efforts.**

**3. Grantee met their stated goals.**

- ☒ Met and exceeded stated goals  
☐ Met stated goals  
☐ Met some but not all stated goals

**NOTES:**      **OTR has maintained and built upon community support. The OTR website, social media posts and events have kept the value of the Truckee River recognition and importance to the community for drinking water, recreation, environment, and economy.**



**COMMUNITY  
FOUNDATION**  
*of Northern Nevada*

### TRUCKEE RIVER FUND GRANTEE EVALUATION

|                       |   |                      |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <b>Prepared by:</b>   | <b>Dave Stanley</b>   | <b>Date:</b> 2/15/25 |
| <b>Project Title:</b> | <b>TRF #288 – Youth Watershed Education and Protection Projects</b> |                      |
| <b>Grantee:</b>       | <b>Great Basin Outdoor School</b>                                   |                      |

**1. Grantee used the funding for activities specified in the grant proposal.**

- ☐ Completed and exceeded activities specified in proposal  
**X** Completed activities specified in proposal  
☐ Partially completed activities specified in proposal

NOTES:

**2. Grantee deemed their project a success.**

- ☐ Exceeded expectations  
**X** Met expectations  
☐ Met some but not all expectations

NOTES:

**3. Grantee met their stated goals.**

- X** Met and exceeded stated goals  
☐ Met stated goals  
☐ Met some but not all stated goals

NOTES:

**GBOS has received funds from the Truckee River Fund for years and with those funds continually exposes school aged children to the concepts of watersheds, their working parts and their relevance to life in the Truckee Meadows. They accomplish this both by partnering with a school for Snapshot Day where school kids participate in gathering baseline data for a watershed and through Spring, Summer and Fall Camps that allow for more in depth and “hands on” education. As long as the Truckee River Fund continues to support educational efforts about the Truckee River, this is certainly an effective use of our funds.**



**COMMUNITY  
FOUNDATION**  
*of Northern Nevada*

### TRUCKEE RIVER FUND GRANTEE EVALUATION

|                       |   |                                |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>Prepared by:</b>   | <b>Jim Smitherman</b>                             | <b>Date: February 12, 2025</b> |
| <b>Project Title:</b> | <b>#293 Watershed Education Initiative (2024)</b> |                                |
| <b>Grantee:</b>       | <b>Sierra Nevada Journeys</b>                     |                                |

**1. Grantee used the funding for activities specified in the grant proposal.**

- ☒ Completed and exceeded activities specified in proposal
- ☐ Completed activities specified in proposal
- ☐ Partially completed activities specified in proposal

NOTES: **No deviations**

**2. Grantee deemed their project a success.**

- ☒ Exceeded expectations
- ☐ Met expectations
- ☐ Met some but not all expectations

NOTES:

**3. Grantee met their stated goals.**

- ☒ Met and exceeded stated goals
- ☐ Met stated goals
- ☐ Met some but not all stated goals

NOTES: **See Below**

Goal 1: Deliver WEI to 700 K-8th grade students within the Truckee River Watershed. All students receive first-hand experience with the local watershed through a field-study on the Truckee River or one of its tributaries.

Outcome 1: In Nevada during the fall of 2024, 1417 students attended WEI programs through Classrooms Unleashed. Funding from TRF directly supported 700 students and allowed them to access our WEI units.

- 100% of students who participated in "Hands in the River" draw, describe and discuss the Truckee River Watershed (100% anticipated)
- 100% of students who participated in "Hands in the River" completed water quality testing at/on the Truckee River to assess the health of their local watershed (100% anticipated)



Grantee Evaluation

Page 2

- 100% of students who participated in "Hands in the River" use knowledge of storm drains to describe how individuals and communities can protect watersheds and reduce human impact on them (90% anticipated).
- 72% of students felt comfortable in nature following their field study (80% anticipated)
- 92% of responding teachers reported that the program helps build critical thinking skills (95% anticipated).

Goal 2: Provide 26 teachers with WEI extension lessons.

Outcome 2: 61 teachers achieved goal. Funding from TRF allowed all 26 of those teachers to access WEI extension lessons.

- We provided teachers with the extension lessons, as well as information on how to access our Free Teacher Resources