

Central Nevada Regional Water Authority

Churchill County
Lander County

Elko County
Nye County

Esmeralda County
Pershing County

Eureka County
White Pine County

Meeting Minutes

The Central Nevada Regional Water Authority (Authority) held a public meeting at 10:00 a.m., September 26, 2017 in the Winnemucca Convention Center, Silver State Meeting Room, 50 W. Winnemucca Blvd., Winnemucca, Nevada. In attendance were:

Directors:

Churchill County: Norman Frey

Elko County: Commissioner Demar Dahl

Esmeralda County: Commissioner Nancy Boland

Eureka County: Jake Tibbitts, Eureka County Natural Resources Manager, Alternate

Lander County: Commissioner Judie Allan and Frank Whitman

Nye County: Joni Eastley, CNRWA Chairwoman, Midge Carver and Commissioner John Koenig

Pershing County: Commissioner Rob McDougal

White Pine County: Gary Perea, Vice Chairman and Bill Butts, White Pine County Water Advisory Board

Others:

Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, CNRWA

Wilma Mansfield, Executive Assistant, CNRWA

Pete Goicoechea, Nevada State Senator

Ron Cerri, Humboldt County

Marlene Brissenden, Humboldt County Commissioner

Susan Frey, Fallon Resident

Jim French, Humboldt County Commission

Tori Sundheim, NACO Public Lands and Natural Resource Coordinator

Dan Schinhofen, Chairman, Nye County Board of Commissioners

Lorinda Wichman, Nye County Board of County Commissioners,

Marlene Rebori, UNCE Community Development

Rob Stokes, Elko County Manager

Omar Saviento, Southern Nevada Water Authority

Call to Order. Chair Joni Eastley called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. A quorum of the Board was determined to be present. Chair Eastley thanked Marlene Brissenden and Humboldt County for hosting this meeting and introduced Jeff Fontaine as the Authority's new Executive Director. The Authority and those present cited the pledge of allegiance.

Public Comment. There was no general public comment.

Approval of Agenda. There were no changes to the agenda. Norman Frey made a motion to approve the agenda. Commissioner Demar Dahl seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes. Motion was made by Commissioner Rob McDougal to approve the minutes for the June 9, 2017 and July 28, 2017 Authority meetings respectively. Midge Carver seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Financial Report and Quarterly Expenditures – Recommendation to approve the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority financial report and quarterly expenditures. Jeff Fontaine presented the Revenue Report, Detail Budget Report by Category, Account Activity Listing and the Budget Detail for the month of August. Jeff Fontaine's quarterly invoice was submitted. Wilma Mansfield's quarterly invoice was not included with the attachments however; Jeff located her invoice and read it into the minutes. Wilma Mansfield's labor costs, reimbursement for direct and travel expenses totaled \$836.50. Jeff Fontaine's labor and expenses totaled \$2,026.69. Motion was made by Commissioner John Koenig and seconded by Commissioner Rob McDougal to approve the financial report and quarterly expenditures. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

Discussion and Possible Action on an Amendment to the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Budget – Recommendation to discuss and approve an amendment to the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority FY 2017-2018 budget for the purpose of prorating the budgeted Executive Director's contract expenditure to September 18, 2017. Jeff Fontaine reported that the CNRWA's 2017-2018 budget includes a professional services expenditure of \$40,000 for the Executive Director. His contract as Executive Director began on September 18, 2017. He said the budget should be amended to reflect a prorated expenditure for the remainder of the year. This will reduce professional services for the Executive Director by \$8,658 (from \$40,000 to \$31,342) and increase the end of year fund balance by \$8,658 (from \$19,000 to \$27,658). Motion was made by Commissioner John Koenig to approve the amended FY 2017-2018 fiscal year budget by reducing the professional services expenditure for the Executive Director by \$8,658 (from (\$40,000 to \$31,342) and increasing the end of the year fund balance by \$8,658 (from \$19,000 to \$27,658). Vice Chair Gary Perea seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Chair Joni Eastley said there are two member counties that have not yet paid their annual dues. They are Elko and Eureka Counties.

Approval to include the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority's Executive Director as an Additional Insured on the Authority's Insurance Policy with the Nevada Public Agency Insurance Pool. Chair Joni Eastley said past CNRWA Executive Directors carried their own insurance by adding a million dollar rider to their homeowner's insurance policy to cover themselves as executive director for the Authority. Joni Eastley said she disagreed with the way this was done in the past, the executive director adding the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority as additional insured on their individual homeowner's insurance policy. The POOL PACT will pick up Jeff Fontaine as additional insured on the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority's policy at no extra charge. Vice Chair Gary Perea made a motion to approve adding

Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director to the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority's POOL PACT insurance policy as additional insured. Norman Frey seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

Presentation on the U.S. District Court of Nevada's August 23, 2017 Order granting in part and denying in part the Parties' Motion for Summary Judgment – Case 2:14-cv00226-APG-VCF. Plaintiffs, Center for Biological Diversity, Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, White Pine County and the Ely Shoshone and Duckwater Shoshone Tribes challenge of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management's decision to approve the first phase of Southern Nevada Water Authority's application to construct a pipeline to convey water from Spring, Delamar, Dry Lake and Cave Valleys in eastern-central Nevada to Las Vegas.

Chair Joni Eastley stated that Gary Perea and Commissioner John Koenig attended this hearing. Jeff Fontaine said he spoke with the Simeon Herskovits, attorney representing the plaintiffs in this case. Simeon Herskovits is attending remand hearings in Carson City on the Southern Nevada Water Authority's water rights applications on remand. Mr. Herskovits will present a detailed update on this issue at the next CNRWA meeting. Vice Chair Gary Perea stated the Judge asked many questions on the impact of groundwater levels, impacts quantified in the study and EIS. He said it was a "win" for the plaintiffs. If the SNWA is required to do what is in the judge's decision it will show the detrimental effects to the environment and existing water right holders. Gary Perea said the attorneys for both sides gave testimony. He said the Native Americans presented a very strong case, particularly in Spring Valley (swamp seeders). Jeff Fontaine said the judge's ruling came rather quickly in a case like this. He referred to the U.S. District Court of Nevada Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part the Parties' Motion for Summary Judgment on this case (39 pages), reading portions from the link. The Judge said, "for the most part, he cannot say that BLM violated its duties in approving this portion of the pipeline project. The plaintiff's primary complaint is that BLM punted the specifics of some of its assessments until later phases of the project." He also acknowledges that the agencies have a fair amount of leeway and discretion in terms of what they can do and how they can do it. The factual background, general overview of the project and BLM's role is to decide whether to give the Southern Nevada Water Authority permission to build a pipeline and supporting facilities on federally-controlled land in Clark County. BLM's authority to allow SNWA to build a pipeline on federal land comes from three statutes, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) and the Lincoln County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act (LCCRDA). A lot of the deliberation had to do with whether or not the BLM has in fact, the discretion to consider this project on a tiered basis, adopt the alternative for allowing the right-of-way permits based on that they don't have the specific information about the location of certain facilities, etc. Judge Andrew P. Gordon seemed to give BLM a lot of leeway. Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) the Judge doesn't have the authority to overturn agency decision because it disagrees with the decision. Jeff Fontaine said the Judge favored with the plaintiffs on a very narrow set of circumstances. He said the plaintiffs argue BLMs discussion of mitigation was inadequate under NEPA because BLM failed to provide and analyze "thresholds and triggers" for when additional mitigation would be necessary. It is true that EPA sought more specificity from BLM about thresholds for additional mitigation and likely effectiveness. Besides taking EPA's comments seriously, however, BLM was not statutorily bound to comply. The plaintiffs contend that BLM violated NEPA by failing to prepare a supplemental EIS once it was informed of new

information about the project's impacts on the environment. The Judge rejected those arguments. The judge also rejected the argument related whether a Supplemental EIS should have been done based on the decision to remand the allocations back to the State Engineer. The Judge did agree with whether BLM violated NEPA by failing to evaluate compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b) guidelines and compensatory mitigation rule. Although BLM's analysis of the project is mostly sound under NEPA, the same cannot be said of the agency's consideration of whether the project will comply with the Clean Water Act. He said this seems to be a major argument that the plaintiffs made that Judge Gordon agreed with. It was arbitrary for BLM to approve major construction on this project without some consideration of how SNWA might comply with the Clean Water Act. BLM must address this issue on remand. Another argument the plaintiffs made that Judge Gordon agreed with has to do with FLPMA. The plaintiffs claim that BLM violated FLPMA because the pipeline project does not comply with a land use plan the agency created: the 2008 Ely Resource Management Plan (RMP). Judge Gordon ordered that the plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment (ECF Nos. 98, 93, 97, and 99) are granted in part and denied in part as set forth Motions for Summary Judgment. Jeff Fontaine said it's a remand on some very specific, important issues that will have to be addressed and potentially cannot be addressed. Gary Perea said it's a narrow victory and gets to the heart of the case. He said they can't withdraw that water without severe impacts and how are they going to mitigate that? Jeff Fontaine encouraged board members to read the Motion for Summary Judgment. He said Simeon Herskovits, attorney will hopefully make a presentation at the next meeting to give a more detailed analysis on the order. Gary Perea stated the EIS has been taken off the BLM website as it has been remanded and is no longer in effect. Chair Joni Eastley thanked those who attended the hearings on behalf of the Authority.

Presentation on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Ruling in the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians v. Coachella Valley Water District – The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court's partial summary judgment in favor of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians and the United States, which declared that the United States impliedly reserved appurtenant water sources, including groundwater, when it created the Tribe's reservation in California's arid Coachella Valley in the 1870s.

Tori Sundheim, NACO Public Lands and Natural Resource Coordinator presented a report on the status of the case and how the ruling may impact water resources in Nevada. She began by stating this lawsuit is part one of a three-part lawsuit, the beginning stages. The Agua Caliente Tribe sued the Coachella Valley Water District and the Desert Water Agency over federal reserved rights to the groundwater beneath the reservation. The Agua Caliente Tribe's main source of water is purchased groundwater from the Coachella Valley Water District and the Desert Water Agency. The Tribe also receives 360 acre-feet of surface water for irrigation from the Whitewater River System, per a State-based adjudication. She said, the question is if they're receiving the water that they need already, then what is the purpose of asking for federal reserve right to groundwater and what does that mean for the water agencies and the water right holders in that basin? She said Part one has just been decided in the Ninth Circuit Court. Part 1: Whether the Tribe has a federal reserved right to groundwater? Yes. Part 2: Whether the Tribe beneficially owns the "pore space" out of the groundwater basin underlying the Reservation; Whether the Tribal Right to groundwater includes the right to receive water of a certain quality. TBD. Part 3: The Court will quantify the amount of water, according to the "purpose for which the reservation was established." TBD. Part 2 and 3 have not yet been litigated. The main issue,

according to the tribe is the quality of Colorado River water used to replenish the underlying groundwater aquifer, as well as potential Agency over-pumping practices. The Agua Caliente Tribe's positions include: The Tribe can at any time assert federal reserved and aboriginal rights to the Coachella Valley Aquifer. The Tribe should have a say in the quality of Colorado River water used to replenish the underlying groundwater aquifer and over-pumping. The Water Districts say that the Tribe already receives all of the water it needs under State Law. More than 33 million people rely on Colorado River water for drinking water, which meets federal and state standards. We believe that the facilities are unnecessary, would be extremely challenging logistically and would impact rates unless the Agua Caliente Tribe was willing to offset all of those costs. The tribe has said that they would be willing to offset costs which would be part of settlement terms between them. The Ninth Circuit Holding: The Judgment declares that the United States impliedly reserved appurtenant water sources, including groundwater, when it created the Tribe's reservation in California's arid Coachella Valley. The Court reasoned there is no controlling federal appellate authority addressing whether the reserved rights doctrine applies to groundwater. Water rights obtained under State law are irrelevant to a federal reserved rights analysis, as it asks, "whether water was envisioned as necessary for the reservation's purpose at the time the reservation was created." What are the implications? This applies to federal reserved rights, generally (i.e. Forest Reserves). New claims for groundwater by federal agencies on hydrographic basins where the water has already been appropriated. Historically, case law has only addressed surface water. Groundwater has been assumed to fall under State control. No accounting of all federal reservations in Nevada. Still, this is a case-by-case analysis. The Court reviews the purpose of this particular reservation. The Water Agencies requested that the United States Supreme Court review this decision. The State of Nevada, along with nine other states filed an *Amicus Brief* requesting that the Supreme Court settle the matter. Part II, on "pore space" and water quality, and Part III, quantifying the rights, has not yet been decided. Regarding Part II and III she said the Authority might want to consider and look into speaking with their council about Part II, water quality issue. Commissioner Demar Dahl addressed the issue of ocean water desalination. She said water quality issues are federally-controlled. She explained "pore space" as water trickling down into the basin creating a groundwater basin. Jake Tibbitts said it means "percolating waters" in their groundwater law. Norman Frey referenced the Fallon Tribe drilling a well which required a permit from the State Engineer as the State owns the water in the state of Nevada. She said the concept of federal reserved rights is separate from State law, referring to treaties with the tribes. She said federal reserve rights mean that the water was never a part of the transfer of land to the State. Discussion was held on federal water reserves. Chair Joni Eastley thanked Tori Sundheim for her presentation.

Approval of the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority to apply for a 2018 National Ground-water Monitoring Network – The Ground-Water and Stream flow Information Program of the USGS is offering a two-year cooperative agreement opportunity to state or local water-resources agencies that collect groundwater data to participate in the National Ground-Water Monitoring Network. The USGS is working with the Federal Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) and it's Subcommittee on Ground-Water (SOGW) to develop and administer a National Ground-Water Monitoring Network (NGWMN). This funding opportunity is to support data providers for the National Ground-Water Monitoring Network. Jeff Fontaine located this grant through the NACO

mailing list for federal and state grants. The grant is through the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for a Groundwater and Stream Flow Information Program which is a two-year cooperative agreement opportunity to state and local water-resources agencies that collect groundwater data to participate in the 2018 National Ground-Water Monitoring Network. Jeff Fontaine said this program has two million dollars set aside for this current fiscal year. There are no specific awards to be granted. This is for a two-year cycle and they anticipate each applicant will be restricted to a maximum funding level of \$150,000. The National Ground-Water Monitoring Network (NGWMN) information will be submitted to the USGS for the national program. Applicants can be state or local water resource agencies that collect groundwater data. The closing deadline for applications (online) is November 30, 2017. Several objectives have been identified and prioritized to meet the overall goal of building a Network that covers the Nation with data from well-defined sites and using accepted data collection and data-management techniques. The highest priority of the NGWMN is to support persistent data services from existing data providers to the NGWMN Portal. The next priority is to add new data providers to build a robust network. Existing data providers also may request funds for additional activities to enhance their NGWMN sites. These activities include: filling site information gaps, performing maintenance activities at existing sites in the Network, or drilling new wells for the NGWMN. The objectives will be supported for funding by the NGWMN: 1) Support to become a new data provider or expansion of services/sites by existing data providers, 2) Support persistent data service from existing data providers, 3) Filling gaps in information at NGWMN sites, 4) Well maintenance, and 5) Well drilling. He said in the application there is a match requirement for new data providers which would range from \$60,000 to \$120,000. Costs may vary depending on information technology costs. Jeff Fontaine stated at this time he doesn't know if the CNRWA would be eligible. The question is whether or not the Authority has the capacity to apply and administer a grant. He said the Authority needs to find out if they are already a member of the National Ground-Water Monitoring Network. He said if the Authority is not a member they would have to register with the Federal Grant System as an initial step, which is separate. He said he would be happy to work on it. Jeff Fontaine said you have to qualify to become a data provider through the network. After some discussion, Chair Eastley appointed a subcommittee to work with Jeff Fontaine to move forward and make a final determination of whether or not the Authority qualifies and what their chances are of eventually getting an award. Subcommittee members will include Jake Tibbitts, Chair Joni Eastley, Gary Perea and Norman Frey. In regards to grant assistance, Chair Eastley said they have assistance from various counties with certain administrative tasks involved in running this organization. She suggested contacting member counties to obtain staff to assist with the grant if the Authority decides to apply. Commissioner Rob McDougal made a motion to authorize Jeff Fontaine to move forward with the subcommittee, pending their approval, to go ahead and either apply or not apply for the National Ground-Water Monitoring Network grant. Commissioner John Koenig seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Gary Perea made a point to contact Elko County Finance who would eventually administer the grant.

Approval of Oral Public Comments on behalf of the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority on the Southern Nevada Water Authority water rights application hearing on remand Spring, Cave, Dry Lake and Delamar Valleys – By decision dated December 10, 2013 Judge Robert Estes, sitting for the Seventh Judicial Court for the State of Nevada in and for the County of White Pine, remanded the matter of applications 53987 through

53992, inclusive, and applications 54003 through 54021, inclusive, held in the name of the SNWA, to the State Engineer for further consideration. The State Engineer will hold a hearing to reconsider SNWA's protested applications 53987-53988 (Cave Valley Basin – 180), 53989, 53990 (Dry Lake Valley – Basin 181), 53991, 53992 (Delamar Valley – Basin 182), and 54003 through 54021 (Spring Valley – Basin 184). A time for oral public comment will be held on Friday, September 29, 2017. Jeff Fontaine reported that the State Engineer began the Remand Hearings on this case yesterday in Carson City. He attended the hearing. He said it was a quasi judicial proceeding. The hearing is scheduled for two weeks. There are lots of expert witnesses testifying providing lots of details about water rights, what's appropriated, what's not appropriated and presentations from experts about groundwater hydrogeology. Jeff Fontaine said oral general public comment will be held this Friday, September 29, 2017 at 1:00 pm in Carson City. Public comments will be broadcast over the internet. The Remand Hearing is based on four specific findings by Judge Estes which include: 1) The addition of Millard and Juab counties, Utah in the mitigation plan so far as water basins in Utah are affected by pumping of water from Spring Valley Basin, Nevada, 2) A recalculation of water available from Spring Valley assuring that the basin will reach equilibrium between discharge and recharge in a reasonable time, 3) Defining standards, thresholds or triggers so that mitigation of unreasonable effects from pumping of water are neither arbitrary or capricious in Spring Valley, Cave Valley, Dry Lake Valley and Delamar Valley, and 4) Recalculation of the appropriations from Spring Valley, Cave Valley, Dry Lake Valley and Delamar Valley to avoid over-appropriation or conflicts with down-gradient, existing water rights. Jeff Fontaine asked if the Authority would like him to provide testimony on their behalf to be part of the record. He said he would be happy to express the Authority's concerns and relate those to specific issues that the State Engineer is going to consider. Gary Perea suggested that Jeff Fontaine work with Simeon Herskovits, Esq. to provide a more detailed written comment, if possible. Jeff Fontaine said the comment should be no more than five pages and it is due Friday, October 20, 2017. The Central Nevada Regional Water Authority is not a party in the case before the State Engineer but can provide written public comment. Jake Tibbitts said the Eureka County Board of Commissioners voted to submit written comments on this case as well. He said it would be wise for other counties to consider doing the same. He said the Board's comments should focus on 3M Plans. Jeff Fontaine said he would like the Authority to review the comments he created. Chair Joni Eastley suggested to Jeff Fontaine to submit his draft to the grant subcommittee members and anyone else who would like to review the comments prior to submission. A special teleconference meeting will be held so the Authority can review the comments and approve them for submission.

Discussion and Possible Action on the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority Functions, Mission, Activities and Priorities – The Authority's Board of Directors and Executive Director will have a facilitated discussion to access and possibly take action on the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority's functions, mission, activities and priorities. Chair Joni Eastley said a questionnaire was sent out to board members asking for feedback on the Authority's current activities, direction, etc. A poor response was received on the questionnaire. This item was discussed at the June 17, 2017 meeting but no action was taken. The Central Nevada Regional Water Authority Form, Functions and Mission statement was reviewed. Jeff Fontaine introduced Marlene Rebori, UNCE Community Development to help facilitate this discussion. Dr. Rebori is a specialist in community and organizational

development with the Reno Cooperative Extension. He gave her work background and stated she works with community groups and local governments in facilitation, problem solving and public involvement. Marlene Rebori said she is here to help the Authority have an effective discussion. She asked how much time members are willing to invest in the discussion. Chair Eastley said she would like the meeting to be done by 1:30 p.m. It was determined that this item will be discussed and placed on a future agenda for action. Marlene Rebori asked if everyone was familiar with the questionnaire that was previously distributed. She referred to one of the questions asking, "Is the Authority meeting your needs?" She wants to review the function and purpose of the Authority and to look at how effective the Authority is in meeting the functions and the purpose of the Authority. She wrote the functions down and put them in themes to help facilitate the discussion. She provided a handout on CNRWA Functions: Marlene Rebori said she would like the Authority to look at the handout, is this on track and do you agree with this? How effective is the Authority in meeting the functions that are laid out? The first discussion was on the INFORM AND EDUCATE function.

- Formulate and present united positions to the Nevada Legislature, agencies of the State of Nevada, U.S. Congress, federal agencies and other government entities on water and water-related issues pertaining to Nevada, and in particular to the Authority's member counties.
- Communicate the functions, activities and issues of the Authority to public and private interests by way of meetings, a website (www.cnrwa.com), news releases and the annual Great Basin Water Forum.
- Host the Great Basin Water Forum per MOU signed by three counties in California, two counties in Utah and the Authority.

FACILITATE:

- Be a place where governments (federal, state and local), the environmental community, business community, and the public can discuss water and water-related issues with representatives of eight Nevada counties.
- Facilitate the development and maintenance of a water resource data base to a) better understand water resources in the Central Hydrographic Region and member counties, and b) effectively use and manage the limited water resources in the member counties.

MONITOR:

- Monitor available water supplies from all sources within Nevada's Central Hydrographic Region and member counties; assess the extent to which proposals to develop and export water from the Central Hydrographic Region and member counties may adversely impact the availability of water for use by communities, residents, businesses and ecosystems in the member counties; and, respond to proposed water resource projects that may adversely impact member counties.
- Protect and enhance a balance between the human environment and natural ecosystems in the Central Hydrographic Region and member counties as they relate to water resource development.

Chair Joni Eastley suggested adding "And legislation" that may adversely impact member counties (to the second to the last line under the first bullet under Monitor). It was noted that it is covered in the very first bullet under Inform and Educate. Jake Tibbitts suggested adding language: "promoting water resource master plans" in either Inform and Educate or Facilitate.

ADVISE:

- Combine limited fiscal and staff resources for the purpose of obtaining technical support, legal counsel and policy advice necessary for sound water resource decisions in member counties and in the State of Nevada.

ENGAGE:

- Encourage citizen participation in water supply and management issues that are of concern to member counties and the Authority.

Commissioner Demar Dahl commented on the need for ocean water desalination to solve Las Vegas' water situation. He said that Mike Dunbar from California said it wouldn't happen in California. He feels that the Authority needs to incorporate proactive statements rather than defensive statements in the CNRWA Functions. Marlene asked if the functions are fairly accurate of what the Authority is supposed to do. The second stage of the discussion will continue after lunch.

The meeting recessed at 12:00 noon for lunch and reconvened at 12:20 p.m.

Marlene Rebori asked Authority members to break into small groups and discuss and answer the first question: “What is CNRWA doing well?” The follow-up question is, “What could or should CNRWA be doing?” After the answers are received there will be a group discussion. This could then be discussed and acted upon at the next Authority meeting. Norman Frey said what the Authority originally set out to do is groundwater monitoring programs so the communities would have data available to them to protect them. This could be added to the functions. Answers to the question “What is CNRWA doing well?” include political engagement. Chair Joni Eastley reiterated that the Authority is having an impact on Nevada Water Law. Other answers include, Feedback to Authorities, Centralized with Consistent Data, Monitoring National Trends, Disseminating Relevant Information, Assisted in ensuring water plans are in place for every member county and Central Forum for discussing Water Issues. “What could or should CNRWA be doing?” Answers include: Public Outreach and Education, Assist with identifying and promoting novel and alternative water resources to preclude proposals to acquire and export water from central Nevada, Educate ourselves better, Annual field trips, Proposed legislation, Review and update of county water plans and help promote and assist in getting it done, and Developing a strategy to reinforce member commitment (discussion on getting members to attend meetings regularly and replacing members who do not attend). Chair Joni Eastley said she would like to post CNRWA member County’s Water Resource Plans on the CNRWA website or a link to their water resource plan. Chair Eastley stated that the Authority needs to be more aggressive at signing up new associate and government partners. Marlene Rebori suggested that the information gathered from this discussion be typed up and sent out to members so they can prioritize what the Authority should be doing or could be doing. She asked if there is one thing that stands out that the Authority needs to tackle. Chair Joni Eastley said posting the county water resource plans on the CNRWA’s website would be the easiest to accomplish. It would be the Executive Director’s job to post them. Gary Perea said as far as priority, reinforcing member commitment would be number one. Marlene Rebori suggested discussing member commitment at a future meeting. Marlene Rebori said the board’s role is to set the organization up for success, set the priorities, establish the policy, and put in place everything that’s needed for the effective governance of the organization. The Executive Director implements what the board sets forward. How effective is the board itself? Jeff Fontaine said that the CNRWA’s website is not dynamic. He said so much more can be put on the website and made available to members. He said all of these presentations could be put on the website as well. It was suggested that member counties have a link on their websites to the CNRWA website. Wilma Mansfield will consolidate the discussion sheets and will send them out to board members. Chair Eastley thanked Marlene Rebori for her assistance in this discussion.

Board Member/Executive Director Comments – Board members and the Executive Director can make announcements, request information and discuss topics for future agendas.

Jeff Fontaine thanked the Authority for allowing him to be their Executive Director. He reiterated his interest and compassion for what the Authority does. He expressed public appreciation to Joni Eastley, Steve Bradhurst, Ed Beutel, Elko County and Wilma Mansfield for their assistance in his transition. He said he met with partners of the Authority. Frank Whitman commented on the Humboldt Basin Working Group. It was noted that this could be a presented

at a future meeting. Norman Frey commented on is it necessary to have so much emphasis on place of use of a person's water right.

Next Meeting. The next meeting will be held Friday, December 1, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. in Fallon. A special teleconference meeting will be held before that date to discuss the grant and comments on the Southern Nevada Water Authority water rights application hearing on remand Spring, Cave, Dry Lake and Delamar Valleys.

Public Comment. There was no public comment.

Adjourn. Chair Eastley adjourned the meeting at 1:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Wilma Mansfield
Wilma Mansfield, Secretary

Approved this 27 day of APRIL, 2018

Joni Eastley
Joni Eastley, Chair