



Glendale Water Supply Improvement Project
Tuesday, December 14th, 2004 at 2:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Tahoe Room, 115 Corporate Blvd., Reno

Attendees:

Elisa Maser
Mike Wilkin
Ron Penrose
Jay Kidder
Andy Hummel
David Potter
Dean Deiderich
Debbie Shosteck
Holly Wilson
Margie Caisley
Michael Cameron
Marlene Olsen
Erik Ringelberg
John Enloe
Rose Strickland
Dennis Ghiglieri
Chad Gourley

Welcome

Elisa Maser welcomed the group and the meeting commenced at 2:30 p.m.

New Business, Ron Penrose, Project Management

Ron Penrose stated that he would be presenting the project before the RWPC. He stated that his presentation would essentially be a scaled down version of the first public meeting. He reported that he is still attempting to coordinate a meeting with Senators Reid and Ensign regarding funding for the project. He also reported that December 10th was the first meeting of the Truckee River Fund, which TMWA has set up under the Community Foundation of Western Nevada. The intent is to help fund projects that will enhance water quality, watershed, and water resources along the river corridor.

Project Manager: Ron Penrose
775-834-8017
rpenrose@tmwa.net
www.glendalewatersupply.com





Estimated Cost and Funding Options, Mike Wilkin, ECO:LOGIC

Please see the correlating power point presentation.

Mike Wilkin reported that with the presented velocity plot the control point moves with each of the slope alternatives, although a definite location has not been determined, the highest velocity point for each slope was plotted. He reported that the worse-case scenario was plotted for with the most adverse and highest velocities. He reiterated to the group that they were viewing rough models and that nothing was set in stone, it is a presentation of worst-case scenario alternatives. The same method is applied to each slope, and what were being presented were not design nuances.

Ron Penrose questioned if the higher velocity at the slope of 4 is because the channel width has been narrowed. Mike replied yes, it is a narrower channel, and with the horse shoe effect that has generated the numbers, the cascade off the edges creates a higher velocity and a narrower band. Mike also stated that the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout passage velocities had been plotted for.

Michael Cameron stated that he was curious about the seasonal needs of different species. He questioned if high flows were presenting the largest problem for passage in terms of velocity, and which season is most important. **Jay Kidder** responded that it selects for a part of the population, and has to do with windows of opportunity for spawning and migration.

Erik Ringelberg stated that they were showing fall and spring velocities with their spawners, and there will be selection under these modeling conditions with the Cui ui. Margie Caisley stated that there are no studies for non-endangered species. Ron questioned whether the concept of the roughened channel mitigates the migration passage issues. Jay responded yes, when a fishway is designed one has to understand and estimate averages of fish passage. With the roughened channel, it has to be widened enough for population and condition.

Mike Wilkin stated that when we look at these velocities, the bandwidth of opportunities at these average flows is the relationship between the slopes, and the next step would be to refine the model and then build a physical model. After a physical model is made, the boulders will be tuned and certain the pathways and interstitial species will be created. Dean Deiderich questioned whether existing conditions at the current facility have been evaluated for passage. Mike Wilkin stated no, it was modeled for the effects of flooding. Dean suggested such an evaluation would be worthwhile.

Project Manager: Ron Penrose
775-834-8017
rpenrose@tmwa.net
www.glendalewatersupply.com





Ron Penrose stated that they are trying to make the most of those opportunities, and much hydraulic evaluation has been completed by ECO:LOGIC. It could be done, but there are certain issues that need to be mitigated such as the priority of water rights. He continued that the purpose of the meeting today was to present cost information, but what needs to be accomplished is a collective decision on the evaluation material.

Dennis Ghiglieri reported that he had gone to Washoe County in order to verify where flooding occurred in 1997. He stated that he was told water did get onto Glendale, run down it and flood properties to the east. He stated that this information seemed different from the modeling information. **Mike Wilkin** stated that the flood went back underneath the bridge, as shown by the Corps of Engineers. He continued that at the slope there is a storm drain, and the water levels ran out of the storm drain and into the street, rather than coming across the bridge.

Dean Deiderich questioned if there is a location that has been designated as a consideration, because reconstruction and revegetation will certainly affect costs, and to what point it will affect cost depends on the selected location. Dennis stated that it would seem that the higher elevation and the smaller structure, the cheaper the cost would be.

Michael Cameron stated that with regards to the selection criteria, there is a need to sell the benefits of the different alternatives in terms of funding. If there is a better chance for the Cui ui to pass, etc., such information would be helpful when looking for funding. He stated he would like to better understand the benefits of moving up the cost ladder and marketing the project for funding.

Ron Penrose stated that he would like a matrix developed of construction cost, looking at various locations and slopes, which would be pure dollars for construction and in each location include the cost of incorporating the Pioneer Ditch. He continued that in terms of selection criteria, he would like to see the group develop a list of environmental and recreational criteria, and discuss what its worth and what weight it has relative to the other criteria. Ideally the field will be narrowed to the top two alternatives, and then the construction cost matrix can be used as sanity checks as to what is realistic. **Michael Cameron** pointed out that there is a relative difference between benefits, some will be qualitative. Ron suggested establishing qualitative ways of measurement, and defining the cost or benefit for next meeting. Ron hopes to attend the next meeting with information regarding TMWA's fiduciary commitment in terms of an actual dollar amount.

