

# CARSON TRUCKEE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

## Public Hearing on the Tentative Budget and Regular Meeting

May 20, 2025

---

### **DIRECTORS:**

Todd Westergard  
Karen Baggett  
Ernie Schank  
Ed James  
Eddy Quaglieri  
Mike Nevin  
Ty Minor (Zoom)  
Pete Olsen (Zoom)

### **ABSENT:**

Tyler Henderson  
John Capurro

### **OTHER:**

Kayla Dowty, Engineer  
Lucas Foletta, Attorney  
Chad Blanchard, FWM

### **Staff**

Mary Pat Eymann

### **GUESTS:**

Tim Bardsley, National Weather Svc

---

## **1. CALL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE TENTATIVE BUDGET TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 10:05 a.m.

## **2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

## **3. PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF THE 2025/2026 TENTATIVE BUDGET AS FINAL - Staff**

*A copy of the budget was provided to the Directors and is available online or at District offices.*

The accountants prepared the budget and were asked about combining the two emergency funds into one which was fine to combine as a capital maintenance expense, which is broad enough to use for any needs the District may have. If used this should be reflected in the minutes. The Board could also place internal restrictions via board action. The money given to the sub-District was reworked and incorporated into the numbers reflected in the budget as well.

- ❖ Director James made a motion to approve the Tentative 2025/2026 budget as Final; seconded by Director Schank; motion carried.

## **4. ADJOURN PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER –Quorum present**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT – limited to no more than three minutes per speaker \***  
**None**

**3. APPROVE AGENDA**

- ❖ Director Schank made a motion to approve the agenda; seconded by Director Nevin; motion carried.

**4. APPROVE MINUTES FOR APRIL 2025, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND CHECKS WRITTEN AS SUBMITTED –**

- ❖ Director James made a motion to approve the financial statements as presented; seconded by Director Baggett; motion carried.

Changes to the April Minutes – Item 7, Director James motion to move money out of contingency should be for \$100,000 not one million dollars.

- ❖ Director Schank made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected; seconded by Director Nevin; motion carried.

**5. WATER MASTERS REPORT AND DISCUSSION – Chad Blanchard.**

*A complete copy of the Water Report is available at District Offices or on the internet at [troa.net](http://troa.net) and the SNOTEL report at [wcc.sc.egov.usda.gov/reports/SelectUpdateReport.html](http://wcc.sc.egov.usda.gov/reports/SelectUpdateReport.html)*

No one was present from the Water Master's office.

**6. FOLLOWUP AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE GRANT TO BE PROVIDED TO THE CARSON WATER SUBCONSERVANCY DISTRICT (CWSD) PURSUANT TO THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO BY AND BETWEEN THE DISTRICT AND CWSD.**

The amount was passed at the last meeting based on the updated calculation adopted. There had been discussion as to notices and letters.

Director James stated that he would be providing a letter on where the money is going to be spent. There is \$57,000 going to the Dayton Valley Conservation District. A follow up report will also be sent. Once the funds are actually spent CWSD will send a report and request for the funds to CTWCD.

Director Schank thought that next year we should send out a letter advising the Carson agencies of the new policy.

**7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE DISTRICT'S LEGAL COUNSEL – Lucas Foletta**

Nothing on this subject can be removed from future agendas.

**8. ENGINEERING/SUPERINTENDENT REPORT – Kayla Dowty**

*See engineering report.*

*A complete report with photos was also provided to the Board and available at District offices.*

**A. Riverside Drive Inundation and possible involvement of the District.**

Lucas has been very helpful in getting the funding agreements cleaned up. Last time we talked, we just updated the board that TRFMA had started out by only providing a funding agreement for the berm and then said that they'd do another one for the flood wall later, and we said they really need to be tied together, because one part of the project without the other is essentially worthless. The whole thing is needed to contain the 14,000 so they drafted a separate funding agreement for the floodwall, and then they basically are, contingent on each other. I think we're almost done, revisions will be sent back to TRFMA.

On the design side, we should have the 60% design set for the berm from JB on Wednesday. That's so tomorrow is the due date for that. We're planning to do a field walk once we have the 60% design in hand, because City of Reno is very sensitive to the trees out there at Riverside. They don't want the berm construction to have too much of an impact on the trees. So, they're talking about some tree wells and some other stuff. So we'll field walk it once we get that 60% design set, and then move to a 90% design, which will be enough for Reno to go to bid. And they still are planning to have the berm construction done this fall, right on the heels of Arlington. So that would be great. On the flood wall side, I included a scope of work from JUB in my email this weekend. In order to get that one moving, we really need to get the biological and cultural studies done for that portion, because it's going to require a full 408 permit. It also requires a full NEPA permit, and in order to do the NEPA, you have to have the biological and cultural baseline studies completed, so that \$26,000 proposal is to do the studies and the associated reports. The biological report and the cultural report are typically very lengthy documents in order to get Shippo and the US Fish and Wildlife Service to sign off on them.

- ❖ Director James made a motion to approve proceeding with the scope of work; seconded by Director Nevin; motion carried.

USACE has been advised that they should expect a full permit application from us on the flood wall, probably by the end of the year or early next year, by the time we have full design.

**B. Maintenance debris removal work, emergency debris/deposit removal work and authorization for expenditures for such work.**

Debris removal report was completed and dispersed. I do have our we have a right of entry documents with State Lands, City of Reno Washoe County. City of Reno is expiring, and so I have a new one for Todd signature today that will take us through 2030 it's another five years. It looks exactly the same as the last ones.

**C. Encroachment permits and requests.**

Arlington Bridge - Chad (FWM) called me last week and said, because we had just talked about the Arlington permit and their variance request to get into the river sooner, he called and said, he just found out that there's going to be a lot of stored water coming down the river in June, and the flows will be like 1100 to 1200 CFS at Reno, which makes diversion a real bummer, because they need to divert the north half to the south so they can work on the south bridge and vice versa. So, I called RTC and let them know. So, in June, he's expecting these flows to be high for the entire month, not just for a week or a few days. So that can be really impactful to the construction schedule. So, I called RTC right away and said, "Get in there sooner and start doing your diversion sooner, and make sure that your diversion is prepped for this high flow. Because they probably were planning for around 400. And he was like, This is not good for us, because actually, they were planning to divert to the little south channel first, and the South channel, I guess, is only capable of containing about 1400 to 1600 and so if there is, like a rain event, or if anything happens, right, that's going to put that's going to be sketchy. So, we actually have a meeting on site. Chad and I are both going to go tomorrow morning and meet with RTC and the contractor both to see if they want to switch up their plans. I told them to try to get in to do the diversion early, but they have fish and wildlife restrictions till June 4, so we're just all going to get together and talk and see if there's any flexibility with construction or flexibility with the flow requests. Because Chad thought that there'd be a little bit of flexibility, but not a whole week, probably.

Sierra Street – We are expecting a 60% design here in the next couple weeks so that we can start reviewing the model for the first time. They say that they're still on schedule for an October permit request for the bridge replacement. And so, they know the rules are that they have 100% design, they don't get to submit based on a 60% again. So, they're planning for that.

Keystone - We have submitted the permit request for Geotech borings. The Corp came back in March with an incomplete submittal. They wanted some additional information. We provided that, and then I just heard from them this morning that they want a little bit more on the biological report. And so I told RTC and their consultant. We just submitted the permit in February. Apparently, they were planning to drill this summer. And I said, I have no idea why you would be planning to drill this summer. We've done this so many times. Permits require nine to 12 months for a Geotech boring. If you don't have the permit in November, please call me. Otherwise, I'll call you. And they said, Okay, so we'll keep that one pushing along, just so you guys know, the Corp has had quite a few changes with the current administration. Everybody's required to was required to report back to the office. They haven't been in the office since COVID. So, they had quite a number of people giving their notice. So, there's quite they've lost three so far from the 408 department specifically. So, they're definitely kind of scrambling a little bit.

NV Energy - Last meeting that that one was going to be processed on a fast track because of the emergency energy order, and that did get processed. I have it here with NV Energy signature for Todd to sign after the meeting.

White Fir - That one is taking a really long time, and the private owner is starting to get pretty frustrated. I think we're on month 19 now. So yes, it's very frustrating. The Core has said that we should expect full permission this month. We're getting pretty close to the end of the month, so what I did you guys, to try to keep them kind of happy, was I gave them a draft permit. I told them that this should include most of the conditions you'll see in the permit, but they could change pending final permission from the Core, but I wanted them to just kind of see what they would be signing so we can move it along quickly. I let them know that all work right has to be done outside of flood season, unless they ask for a variance. And they asked for a variance, they'd like to start construction on June 15, assuming that we get Core's permission in May. So, I know this one is a little bit funky because we don't have permission and we haven't issued a permit, but I'm wondering, since we don't have a June meeting, if you guys are willing to approve a variance request to start construction on June 15, if contingent on the Army Corps, permission.

- ❖ Director James made a motion to approve the variance to start construction June 15, 2025 upon USACE final approval per the discussion above; seconded by Director Schank; motion carried.

#### **D. Miscellaneous items**

Back in September, I got a kind of consultation request from JUB, actually, on behalf of TMWA, they were looking at doing some structural repairs to their wall at the Idlewild pump station. In Idlewild, right by that big pond, TMWA has a pump station that has been there, I think, since the 50s. So that obviously predates the Martis Creek agreement. But the wall is failing because trees grow out of it, and so they need to do a fairly substantial structural effort. They don't know exactly what that effort looks like, but at the time, they said it, so we talked through it in September. Kayla advised TMWA that all work like that, like significant maintenance effort where you're doing a lot of digging in the river and basically replacing this old rock wall with some sort of something more structural, should have an encroachment permit. TMWA said, "Well, how long does one encroachment permit take? I told him it's currently 12 to 18 months. Unless you deem it emergency, if it's an emergency, we don't really have a path with the Army Corps, and that's something. And I was very clear. I said, You guys need to make these decisions informed like you can't just call everything you do an emergency and never get a 408 permit. And I said, TMWA has a board member that sits on our board. So, of all the people that do work on the river, TMWA was should be like the model citizen. They said, "Understood, this one is an emergency. That's what they said. I have it in writing in September, this one is an emergency and needs to be handled immediately. I just heard last week from TMWA that it did not get done, and the tree that was growing out of it fell into the river and caused substantial damage to the wall. I called the TMWA engineer handling this and I said, so I'm not very happy about how this all went, because I have an email in September that says this is an emergency, and obviously you didn't take care of it, so now you're now it's a real emergency, and now I have all of this documentation that basically says TMWA skirted

I think the right process is for them to go ahead and submit a 408 permit, and again, if they don't want to wait for permission, fine, but I think it sends a bad message to other agencies.

### 13. BOARD COMMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

### New Future Agenda Item Requests –

1. Martis Creek update, and follow up

**Board Comments – None**

**14. ADJOURNMENT -**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

**Next meeting**  
**No June meeting**  
**July 8, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.**

Todd Westergard,  
President

Mary Pat Eymann,  
Secretary/Treasurer

Minutes transcribed via otter.ai