

The meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 12, 2016 at the Clark County Commission Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada.

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE

Vice Chairwoman
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

Puoy K. Premsrirut
Kara J. Kelley
Duncan R. McCoy
Steve Sisolak
Cody T. Winterton

COMMISSIONERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman
Commissioner

George F. Ogilvie III
Sam Bateman

DEPUTY ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Special Counsel, Attorney General
Special Counsel, Attorney General
Deputy Attorney General

Jennifer T. Crandell
Ann C. Pongracz
Christine Guerri-Nyhus

COMMISSION STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Executive Director
Deputy Executive Director
Assistant Director of Energy Services
Assistant Director of Engineering and Operations
Hydropower Program Manager
Natural Resource Analyst
Senior Accountant
Office Manager
Administrative Assistant III
Administrative Assistant II
Administrative Assistant II

Jayne Harkins, P.E.
James D. Salo
Gail A. Bates
Robert D. Reese
Craig N. Pyper
Warren Turkett
Gail L. Benton
Judy K. Atwood
Carol L. Perone
Shylo Endris
Gina L. Goodman

OTHERS PRESENT; REPRESENTING

City of Henderson
Consultant
Overton Power District No. 5
Overton Power District No. 5
Piercy Bowler Taylor and Kern
Southern Nevada Water Authority
Southern Nevada Water Authority

David Cherry
Sara A. Price, Esq.
Mendis Cooper
Terry Romero
Richard Bowler
Jordan Bunker
Omar Saucedo

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2016**

INDEX

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
A.	Conformance to Open Meeting Law	1
B.	Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.).....	1
C.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Approval of minutes of the November 10, 2015 meeting	1
D.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Selection of Vice Chairman.....	1
E.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to adopt Colorado River Commission of Nevada Resolution 2016-1, commending Berlyn D. Miller for his service to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission).....	1
F.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-04 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Summit Line Construction and the Commission.	2
G.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Presentation of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada’s Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015	6
H.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Status update on the hydrologic conditions, drought, and climate of the Colorado River Basin, Nevada's consumptive use of Colorado River water, and other developments on the Colorado River.....	10
I.	Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.).....	12

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2016**

INDEX

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
J.	Comments and questions from the Commission members.....	12
K.	Selection of the next possible meeting date.....	13
L.	Adjournment	13

The Colorado River Commission meeting was called to order by Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut at 1:31 p.m. followed by the pledge of allegiance.

A. Conformance to Open Meeting Law.

Ms. Jayne Harkins, Executive Director, confirmed that the meeting was in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

B. Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.)

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

C. For Possible Action: Approval of minutes of the November 10, 2015 meeting.

Commissioner Sisolak moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCoy and approved by a unanimous vote.

D. For Possible Action: Selection of Vice Chairman.

Commissioner Kelley made a motion to appoint Commissioner Premsrirut to Vice Chairwoman. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Winterton and approved by a unanimous vote.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut thanked the Commission for the honor and privilege to serve in the capacity of the appointment to Vice Chairwoman. The experience of serving as a Commissioner has been inspirational and applies to both working for the Commission as well as her career. The Commission has a very important mandate as the trustee in Nevada's interests in the Colorado River.

E. For Possible Action: Consideration of and possible action to adopt Colorado River Commission of Nevada Resolution 2016-1, commending Berlyn D. Miller for his service to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission).

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut thanked Berlyn D. Miller for his service to the Commission. Mr. Miller provided guidance and tenacity through the process of learning the functions of the Commission, and the Commission passing resolution 2016-1 to commend him is well deserved.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if Mr. Miller will be at the February 2016 meeting.

Ms. Harkins answered no. Mr. Miller's schedule will prevent attendance at a future meeting. Mr. Miller's choice was to allow the Commission to proceed in his absence. Staff will deliver the resolution to Mr. Miller once approved by the Commission.

Commissioner McCoy stated that Mr. Miller has been a gentleman and has trained the newest Commissioners for the past 6 to 8 years. It has been a pleasure working with Mr. Miller and Commissioner McCoy's wishes Mr. Miller the very best.

Commissioner Kelley stated that Mr. Miller is a silent advocate for Las Vegas, and the State of Nevada. Mr. Miller has been instrumental in the growth of Las Vegas in tourism and so many other things, and regrets that the time served together on the Commission was so short. Mr. Miller will be missed.

Commissioner Sisolak said Mr. Miller exemplifies what the definition of public servant and volunteer really is. Mr. Miller was prepared, and his expertise and demeanor will be sadly missed. Mr. Miller was a valuable member of the Commission and his service is appreciated.

A copy of the resolution is attached and made a part of the minutes. (See Attachment A.)

Commissioner Kelley moved for approval to adopt Colorado River Commission of Nevada Resolution 2016-1. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCoy and approved by a unanimous vote.

F. *For Possible Action:* Consideration of and possible action to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-04 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Summit Line Construction and the Commission.

Robert D. Reese, Assistant Director of Engineering and Operations, provided a summary of Contract No. SA-15-04 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Summit Line Construction and the Commission.

The Commission's Power Delivery Group (PDG) (which is comprised of seven employees) is able to efficiently and economically perform a great deal of the operations and maintenance of the Commission's high-voltage transmission and distribution system and its customer-owned electrical facilities themselves. These include ten electric substations owned by the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA), three electric substations owned by the Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD) and the electric substations at the Basic Industrial Complex. Experience has shown, however, that certain other functions can be performed more effectively utilizing the services of outside contractors, particularly when an emergency situation requires specialized equipment and/or expertise and an abundance of manpower, or when an improvement or replacement project requires a short-term increase in manpower and equipment. The PDG staff must have the resources to respond to the need for repair, rehabilitation or replacements, especially in an emergency situation.

During the past two years, the Commission's customers have asked the PDG staff to take on complex electrical projects such as:

- Repair work on a medium-voltage cable that failed on the customer's side of the demarcation line.

- To supply labor, equipment and materials for rehabilitation of pumping plants 3, 4, 5 and 6—to construct new foundation slabs with oil containment structures; removal of existing aerial jumpers and overhead switches; relocate existing transformers to new pads; re-route control cable and conduits to relocated transformers; and install gas switches.
- Lower Lake Level Pumping Station Project (L3PS)—three phases of support for preliminary work:
 - Saddle Island 69 kV Re-route—supply materials, labor and equipment for the relocation and cutover of one 3-phase 69 kV circuit located at Saddle Island to provide temporary power for the Commission’s customer’s construction needs.
 - Saddle Island Temporary Power—install 3-phase 480 volt overhead conductor to trailer facilities for additional customer’s contractor needs.
 - L3PS 69 kV temporary substation—provide materials, equipment and labor to support the project
- Supply material, equipment and labor for installation of an additional breaker at the Advanced Wastewater Treatment Substation.
- River Mountains Solar Project—supply material, equipment and labor for the 14MW interconnection between the Solar Project and the Commission’s transmission infrastructure.

Staff anticipates that its customers will continue requests for comparable services on an as-needed basis. This is especially true of the L3PS Project—which is a large complex project in its beginning phase.

For the development of this Transmission and Distribution System Support Services contracts, Staff was asked to assess the equipment requirements necessary to provide operation and maintenance services for it and its customers’ high-voltage transmission and distribution system. Staff was asked to determine the cost of most expensive component at any one of facilities that could require replacement, and to consider this amount when determining the “not-to-exceed” contract total for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services contracts. For this contract, the most costly component to replace is a transformer at a cost of approximately \$1.2 million.

Staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) on October 5, 2015, for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services. The RFP was posted on the Commission’s and Nevada State Purchasing’s websites, advertised in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* and sent to support services companies that PDG staff has worked with in the past. On the proposal response date, December 8, 2015, proposals were received from:

- PAR Electrical Contractors, Inc. (PAR)
- Summit Line Construction (Summit Line)
- Wasatch Electric, a Division of Dynalectric Co. (Wasatch)

Commission staff evaluated these three proposals and found that all three companies complied with the requirements of the RFP. Commission staff negotiated with all three firms. Contract negotiations have been completed with Summit Line. Negotiations with PAR and Wasatch are not yet complete.

The contract for consideration under this agenda item is with Summit Line, and is an enabling-type contract that allows the Commission's PDG staff to receive support from Summit Line on an as-needed basis. It will cover certain tasks that cannot be efficiently performed with existing Commission personnel, and provides no guarantee by the Commission regarding the amount of work that a contractor will be requested to perform during the term of this contract.

The agreement proposes to retain the services of Summit Line Construction for a contract term of four years, anticipated to begin January 12, 2016. Work under the agreement will be at the request of the Commission's customers, such as SNWA, CCWRD and Basic, and as needed for the Commission's high-voltage facilities, which provides power to our water pumping, wastewater treatment and industrial power customers, and will be authorized by Commission staff through the development and execution of written task authorizations. The total combined value of task authorizations under this agreement shall not exceed \$1,200,000.00 over the term of the contract.

Each Task Authorization shall contain:

- a detailed description of the work to be performed by the contractor.
- a detailed breakdown of costs to be paid by the Commission to the contractor for performance of the work.
- a schedule identifying the timeframe under which the work is to be completed.

Staff believes Summit Line is well qualified and fully capable of providing the support services to the Commission and recommends approval of this agreement.

Commissioner Kelley asked what is the process in choosing which contractor to assign work should an emergency arise.

Mr. Reese answered that Staff would develop a scope of work, with a description of the work needed and the timeline of when the work would need to be completed. The scope of work description would then be presented to the contractors. Once the contractor returns the estimated time it would take to complete the work, Staff would identify which contractor would be able to best meet the needs of the Commission. This is an enabling contract meaning that if there are no requests for work from the Commission's customers then there is no funding expenditure paid to the contractor.

Commissioner Kelley asked if the customers fund the work within their facilities, what happens if the work is not within the customer's facilities. Is that what the \$1,200,000.00 dollars would cover?

Mr. Reese answered no. Currently the Commission owns and operates 17 high voltage facilities. Within that infrastructure there are 34 miles of transmission lines. In an event that a failure occurs with any of the components within that area, then the customer that is in that service area, such as SNWA, would pay for those repairs and labor costs. The customers can also request work to be completed for any additional projects as well.

Commissioner Kelly raised the question that if the customers are reimbursing the Commission for the costs what is the \$1,200,000.00 potential expenditure for.

Mr. Reese replied that it is for the contract amount. If work is needed, and this contractor has the best availability and price for the task, then the task would be awarded to the contractor and the amount would go against the contract. Even though it is being funded by the customer, the amount subtracts from the amount on the contract authority the Commission has.

Commissioner Sisolak stated the customer would be the source of the funding if the work is the customers project.

Mr. Reese answered correct.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut noted that regardless of where the source of the funds come from the Commission still needs the authority to enter in to a contract for the amount.

Mr. Reese answered correct.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut asked whether previously, when the Commission has entered into contracts with contractors under the premise that the Commission has worked with the contractor in the past, Summit is a contractor that the Commission has not worked with before. Why did Staff consider this contractor?

Mr. Reese answered that availability is the main reason. When an RFP is prepared for upcoming projects, the contractors are measured by skills, expertise and references. By adding an agreement with Summit, it allows the Commission more flexibility. Summit also has a license to perform high-voltage work.

Commissioner Sisolak stated that by contracting with multiple support services, when scope of work is prepared and presented to the contractors, who decides which contractor will perform the work?

Mr. Reese answered Staff makes the decision.

Commissioner Sisolak asked whether the customer funding the work will have any part in selecting which contractor is used.

Mr. Reese stated absolutely. It would also be based on the Staff's recommendation as to which contractor would best be able to complete the work. The scope of work is only prepared at the request of the customer. This is an enabling contract for work as needed. This is not the same as a capital project which Staff would bring to the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Sisolak asked how a disagreement between Staff and the paying customer would be resolved.

Mr. Reese stated that the work is only preformed at the request of the customer.

Commissioner Sisolak asked would the customer make the call.

Mr. Reese answered yes. Staff is very customer oriented and only act on the behalf of the Commission's customer best interest.

Commissioner McCoy stated this is an enabling contract as well as a not-to-exceed contract, for work to be performed as needed during the period of the contract.

Mr. Reese answered correct.

Commissioner McCoy clarified there are not any specific projects outlined for future work. This is on-call for the customer when the customer needs work done.

Mr. Reese said correct. There is a difference between maintenance and operation projects versus a capital construction project. Staff is looking at the system that the Commission currently operates for this type of contract.

Commissioner Kelley moved for approval to award Contract No. SA-15-04 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Summit Line Construction and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCoy and approved by a unanimous vote.

<p>G. <i>For Information Only:</i> Presentation of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada's Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015.</p>
--

Ms. Harkins introduced Agenda Item G and Richard Bowler, the Commission's external auditor, reported that the audit of the financial statement of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for the year ended June 30, 2015, was complete. The audit did not produce any comments of findings that need to be reported to the Commission. Mr. Bowler said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chairwoman Preamsritut asked if Mr. Bowler could take a moment to provide a brief overview of the process for completing the audit.

Mr. Bowler stated that during the audit process, the first step is identifying areas of risk. Then we perform tests of the financial transactions in the areas of risk. These tests may determine adjustments to internal controls that may be discovered in the process to prevent weaknesses in those controls. There was no weakness identified with this year's audit.

Vice Chairwoman Preamsritut asked about the Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada (PERS) net pension liability listed in the audit report.

The Commission held a discussion regarding the PERS liability and Staff will arrange a meeting with PERS Staff and the Commissioners to assist in any additional questions.

Commissioner Sisolak asked about the expenditures for the Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP).

Ms. Harkins answered that the funds listed are reserves in case something happens in the MSCP. For example, if there were a fire at one of the habitats and additional funds are needed for recovery efforts, funds are available. The Commission has always budgeted a \$500,000.00 amount in the event the program was to make a call on it. The program has not made calls for any reserve funds in the past.

Commissioner Sisolak asked about the non-operating revenues under the proprietary fund. It shows a decrease of \$2,175,00.00 which is a significant decrease when the net position is only \$1,100,000.00. What is the reason for the negative changes in net position?

Mr. Bowler explained that the decrease is related to the payments on the bonds.

Commissioner Sisolak stated that the net position of \$1,100,000.00 will not be enough to cover the difference.

Mr. Bowler stated that there will be adequate revenue generated in the subsequent year.

Commissioner Sisolak asked how the change went down, from \$2,100,000.00 to \$1,100,000.00. How did that happen?

Mr. Bowler stated that the negative change has been on-going since the bonds were issued and the facilities were constructed and placed into operation. Eventually the loss will reverse itself as the bonds interest charges decline and principle on the bonds are paid off.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if next year this were to happen again, does the Commission have the reserves to cover the decrease.

Mr. Bowler said that in the early years of the bond payments, the power delivery fund is accumulating a deficit that will be offset in the later years of the process, until it breaks even at zero.

Commissioner Sisolak asked whether the audit anticipates the net position to be negative next year.

Mr. Bowler answered that it may be, yes.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if the deficit keeps being carried forward as a negative until it turns around.

Mr. Bowler answered it will reverse itself eventually, with respect to the bonds.

Commissioner Sisolak asked where in the financial documents is the Other Post-Employment

Benefits (OPEB) liability recognized as the PERS liability is now recognized.

Mr. Bowler answered that the OPEB information is not set forth as separate number. The difference between the OPEB and the PERS liability is that reporting requirements of OPEB are different.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if the financial documents have a figure that recognizes unfunded OPEB benefits.

Mr. Bowler answered no he did not think there is a figure listed.

Mr. Bowler stated that the reason for this is that the Commission is an agency of the State. That information is disclosed in the State of Nevada's financial statements. All that is required in the agencies financial statements is disclosure of the fact that the information is available in the State of Nevada's financial statements, and provide a brief summary.

Commissioner Sisolak asked whether Staff knew what the State of Nevada's liability is.

Mr. Bowler answered the information is available in the State's financial statements.

Commissioner Sisolak commented that some agencies are taking steps to accumulate some money towards that total. This has been done at several of the other boards that he represents.

Commissioner Sisolak asked what the limits on the accrual of sick and vacation leave for employees are.

Ms. Harkins stated for annual leave it is 240 hours.

Ms. Christine Guerci-Nyhus, Deputy Attorney General, stated for sick leave there is no limit on the accrual of time, but there is a limit to how much is paid out for sick leave when leaving service to the State.

Commissioner Sisolak asked how much is paid out on sick leave.

Ms. Guerci-Nyhus stated that the employee is paid the sick leave depending on the number of years employed upon retiring from the State. A small portion of the sick leave is paid to the employee, but it is not near the amount that is paid out for the city or county employees.

Commissioner Sisolak confirmed that maximum an employee can carry over for vacation leave from year-to-year is 240 hours.

Ms. Guerci-Nyhus answered that is correct.

Mr. Bowler stated that the OPEB liability will be required to be accrued by State agencies in the future.

Commissioner Sisolak said that it would be nice to set aside reserves but the amount is an enormous number and the agencies that he is a part of have not been able to accomplish the accrual of cash.

Commissioner Kelley stated that the Commission should question whether the State has a plan for setting aside the needed amounts.

Mr. Bowler stated that the State is doing the best it can, and that PERS is not fully funded either.

Commissioner Sisolak said that with PERS if there is a shortfall, then the employee contribution would be raised, which makes it difficult for agencies because if they do not have the budget they cannot raise rates. The unfunded OPEB is a risk.

Mr. Bowler stated that it is a problem.

Commissioner McCoy said that an item in the Management Discussion and Analysis that relating to the Power Administrative Charge, in 2014, a charge of \$1,140,050.00 was collected by the Commission. In 2015, the amount collected was reduced to \$220,817.00. The text in the financial statement says that the decrease was a result of the suspension of the Power Administrative Charge for ten months in fiscal year 2015. Perhaps there could be a brief description of what has happened.

Ms. Harkins explained that the Commission carries a reserve related to the Administrative Charge. This reserve is evaluated, every time a budget is prepared. Staff analyzed the amount and felt there was too much reserve. Rather than issuing refund checks to the customers, Staff did not charge customers the Administrative Charge for ten months to bring the reserve back down to an amount that was appropriate. The decision to suspend the charge was based on working with customers and asking them what would be their preferred method to reduce the reserve fund.

Commissioner McCoy said thank you that is very helpful.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut asked regarding the OPEB liability, while the Commission is not obligated to disclose because the State is disclosing the information, it does not answer who is obligated to pay for it. Some further information on the liability would be helpful to the Commission.

Ms. Harkins stated that Staff will follow up on the request.

Commissioner Sisolak stated that funds should be separated in a restricted account for OPEB, because if the Legislature or Governor ever decides to sweep accounts again, the restricted account would preclude the funds from being swept.

Ms. Harkins said that though it has happened in the past, it is her understanding that the Commission's money is customer money pursuant to contract. Due to that fact the Commission has escaped all of the past sweeping of funds. The experience has been that the agency funds has

been safe.

Commissioner Kelley stated that if the experience is due to a legal constraint that precludes the State from taking the funds, then the basis of that constraint would be helpful to know. If not, then that is a vulnerability for the Commission, and something which the Commissioners should be aware.

Ms. Harkins stated that will be added to the list of follow up information to be provided to the Commissioners.

H. *For Information Only:* Status update on the hydrologic conditions, drought, and climate of the Colorado River Basin, Nevada's consumptive use of Colorado River water, and other developments on the Colorado River.

Warren Turkett, Natural Resource Group Analyst, provided a report on the following:

- Unregulated Inflow into Lake Powell as of January 5, 2016
- Storage Conditions as of January 5, 2016
- Reservoir Storage as of January 10, 2016
- Lake Powell Projections based on December 24-Month Study
- Lake Mead Projections based on December 24-Month Study
- U.S. West Drought Monitor as of January 5, 2016
- U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook as of December 17, 2015
- Colorado River Basin River Forecast Center
- Precipitation – Colorado River Basin as of January 5, 2016
- Monthly Precipitation for December 2015
- Seasonal Precipitation, October 2015 – December 2015
- Monthly Precipitation, Las Vegas, NV as of January – December 2015
- Cumulative Precipitation, Las Vegas, NV as of January – December 2015
- Las Vegas Average Temperature
- Water Use in Southern Nevada as of January – November 2015
- Monthly Consumptive Use Comparison
- Cumulative Consumptive Use Comparison
- Hydropower Capacity

A copy of the report is attached and made a part of the minutes. (See Attachment B.)

Commissioner Kelley asked if the current intake pipe being built is number 3.

Mr. Turkett answered correct.

Commissioner Kelley asked at what Lake elevation level is the piping for intake 3.

Mr. Turkett answered 890 feet, but only when the pumping station becomes operational.

Commissioner Winterton asked if the Lake level elevation drops, and Nevada hits a Tier 2, what will happen.

Mr. Turkett asked if the Commissioner was referring to a shortage condition.

Commissioner Winterton said yes.

Mr. Turkett said that if the Lower Basin is in a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 shortage, then there is a reduction in the amount of water available to use by the Lower Basin States. If there is a projection that Lake elevation falls below the 1075ft projection, based on the August run, then Nevada takes a shortage of 13,000 acre-feet, and 320,000 acre-feet less to Arizona, and 50,000 acre-feet less to Mexico. It would be an approximately 4% cut for Nevada. The water cuts increase at each Tier.

Ms. Harkins added that because Nevada's use is about 200,000 – 225,000 acre-feet, and the cut is based off of Nevada's 300,000 acre-feet allocation, Nevada should not see a change in water availability.

Commissioner Kelley asked whether the Lake Mead Projection slide is based on January the 1st measurement.

Mr. Turkett answered that the slide is based on projections, and the determination will be made in August. The August run is used to look at the January 1st elevation.

Commissioner Kelley confirmed whether they measure in August for January implementation.

Ms. Harkins answered yes. Once the determination is made for that year, it stays that determination for the whole year.

Commissioner Kelley asked if that analysis occurs in August.

Ms. Harkins answered yes. That analysis occurs in August.

Commissioner Kelley asked if it is just August or an additional time period.

Ms. Harkins answered just August, the August run looking forward. If a shortage is declared for example in January 2017, water deliveries would be lower. However, if there was an unexpectedly large inflow of water in the spring, in April there could possibly be some adjustments. Typically once the determination for the year is set, it remains the same for the whole year, but an April adjustment is possible.

Commissioner Kelley asked whether, when Staff talks about temperature and usage, there a correlation between the x amount of degrees and x amount of elevation. Is there a direct correlation?

Mr. Turkett answered that there is a correlation, but does not know the numbers off hand. SNWA does those types of analysis, looking at water use, and the different residential, commercial use depending on temperature. The numbers that are provided to prepare the report are total numbers. That makes it harder to do that analysis. But the information can be acquired and reported back to the Commission.

Commissioner Kelley stated that would be appreciated. Anything that can help with being an advocate and educator on the subject helps.

I. Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.)

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

J. Comments and questions from the Commission members.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Winterton stated that with his opportunity to attend the Colorado River Water Users Association conference, it was a very good experience to help him understand that there are a number of issues up and down the Colorado River that are being negotiated. In wearing a Nevada badge, it put him in a position to have a number of other people from other states approach him and engage in conversations with him. It was quickly apparent that Staff is very well respected among all of the States and he wanted to take a moment to thank Staff. While being in that environment and being able to interact with all the different State Representatives for the Colorado River, he was proud to say he was associated with the Commission and the SNWA. It was a pleasure to be a part of a group that is seen up and down the Colorado River as problem solvers; people that are at the forefront of conservation. There are a number of very complicated issues that Staff is dealing with. Commissioner Winterton thanked the Commission Staff and Executive Director.

Commissioner Kelley wanted to echo Commissioner Winterton's statement. Having ancillary experience with water issues, and her previous experience with sales tax for the 2nd straw, and being at the Chamber of Commerce for conservation issues, she is trying to educate the public. But for the foresight of the Las Vegas Valley Water District and SNWA in partnership with the Commission, there would not be this incredible leadership story to tell. Commissioner Kelley's experience was in the ability to share our history with communities that did not have to worry for so long, and are now struggling with the drought.

Commissioner Sisolak stated that there is no controlling the precipitation but there is control with the exception of cloud seeding, thru the SNWA and Desert Research Institute to try and get more snowfall to assist with snowpack. What can be changed is the consumptive water use. The

water use continues to decrease, year-over-year comparatively, which speaks to what the SNWA is doing and the community.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut stated that there is a misconception that Lake Mead is going down in elevation because of Las Vegas, because it is a city in the desert using and taking all of the water. As Commissioners, two of our most fundamental duties, is to make educated decisions, to get as much information that is available in order to make the most informed decisions. Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut stated that she wanted to thank Staff for constantly giving the Commissioners information and answering all of the questions, to fuel that knowledge. It places the Commissioners in a better position to make decisions. The second prong of the Commissioners duties is to disseminate an accurate message to the public, to the extent of speaking with constituents and clear up some of the misconceptions regarding not only Nevada's allocation of water but the consumptive use as well. That is something that the Commission engages in and she is thankful to Staff for helping the Commissioners.

Ms. Harkins introduced Christine Guerci-Nyhus, Deputy Attorney General, the Commission's new legal counsel. She is assisting in the contract work with the power and delivery and when Ms. Ann Pongracz, Special Counsel Attorney General retires, then Staff will go back down to two legal counsels. Ms. Guerci-Nyhus was selected in the Attorney General's office to support the Commission, and Staff is happy to have her assistance.

Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut stated to Ms. Guerci-Nyhus on behalf of the Commission welcome, and the Commission looks forward to working with her in her new capacity.

K. Selection of the next possible meeting date.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 18, 2016, at the Clark County Commission Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada.

L. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 2:44 p.m.

Jayne Harkins, P.E., Executive Director

APPROVED:

George F. Ogilvie III, Chairman