

## LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Southern Nevada Water Authority  
100 City Parkway  
Las Vegas, NV  
October 8, 2013  
2:00 p.m.

Members Present: Kevin Eubanks, *Clark County Regional Flood Control District (alt. CCRFCD)*  
Dan Fischer, *City of Las Vegas (alt. CLV)*  
Rick Holmes, *Las Vegas Valley Water District (LVVWD)*  
Priscilla Howell, *City of Henderson (COH)*  
Tom Minwegen, *Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)*  
Reed Scheppmann, *City of North Las Vegas (CNLV)*  
Randy Tarr, *Clark County (CC)*  
Ron Zegers, *Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA)*

Also Present:

Keiba Crear	Lisa Luptowitz
Sandra Donnelly	Zane Marshall
Kathy Flanagan	Quang Phan
Sandra Harris	Jane Pike
Chuck Hauser	Brenda Pohlmann
Gerry Hester	Peggy Roefer
Zach Hills	Seth Shanahan
David Johnson	Andrew Trelease
Ebrahim Juma	

**1. Welcome/Call to Order**

Tom Minwegen called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

**2. Introductions**

Participants introduced themselves.

**3. Approve June 11, 2013 Meeting Summary**

Motion to approve the summary passed.

**4. Receive an Informational Update on Matters Related to the Las Vegas Valley Watershed Advisory Committee (LVVWAC) on Items that may appear on Future Regular Board Meetings of LVVWAC Members' Appointing Agencies**

Dan Fischer reported that the CLV Council approved modifications to the Stormwater Quality Ordinance, Sewer Ordinance and a Wastewater Ordinance. A possible future item is a response to the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) Directive and Standards (DandS) to approve any discharges to any BOR facility. One concern is the vagueness of the word "facility." BOR released an edited version of the DandS, however, it is more stringent than the original, applying to stormwater, groundwater, wastewater treatment, etc. Comments are due by

November 12, which is the same date as the next scheduled LVVWAC meeting. Dan will send the information and his response to LVVWAC members.

Kevin Eubanks reported the CCRFCD board will receive a presentation on design and construction along the Las Vegas Wash (Wash) from Sloan Channel to Bonanza Road and Flamingo Wash below Nellis Boulevard.

**5. Receive Presentation Regarding the Status of Perchlorate Treatment at Kerr-McGee/Tronox/NERT**

Peggy Roefer presented. In 1997, the state of California required perchlorate monitoring of groundwater and Metropolitan Water District (MWD) found perchlorate in Colorado River water. MWD began extensive sampling for perchlorate throughout the Colorado River system, Boulder Basin and the Wash, the latter is where concentrations became higher. Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) characterized perchlorate concentrations in the Wash, contacted the manufacturers, and began site characterizations. NDEP and Kerr-McGee began aggressively removing perchlorate within 12 months of the discovery and they share information on a quarterly basis with SNWA. Initially SNWA met with Kerr-McGee and AMPAC, however, current meetings are with the Nevada Environmental Response Trust (NERT). NDEP maintains oversight of the facilities with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) providing review of the sites. Of the two perchlorate manufacturing sites, one was owned by the United States government from 1945-1962 and by Kerr-McGee and its predecessors from 1945-1998. Production at that site was curtailed in July 1998 and the process was shut down in March, 2002. The second site was owned by Pepcon (AMPAC) from 1958-1998. The plant was destroyed in an explosion. Peggy showed maps of perchlorate plumes and remediation infrastructure and charts of progress from initial discovery to current status. Peggy noted that in 2011, Kerr-McGee finalized bankruptcy and NERT was created by the bankruptcy court. To date, NERT has spent close to half of its funding.

In January 2013, NERT decided to change operators from Viola to Envirogen. In June 2013, Kerr-McGee/Tronox/NERT operations experienced numerous maintenance and performance issues, impacting the Groundwater Extraction Treatment System. In late June, numerous maintenance and performance issues impacted the Groundwater Extraction Treatment System due to power fluctuation. In July, the water level was just three feet from the top of the 11-acre pond, so NERT, NDEP and EPA accelerated the operator transition from Viola to Envirogen. Currently, the Kerr-McGee/Tronox/NERT operations are performing better with 23 days of storage available at the pond and perchlorate discharge is less than 4ug/L/week. At the AMPAC site, on-site groundwater is extracted and treated. Sludge from AMPAC is processed by NERT. Impacts to SNWA included implementation of weekly sampling for perchlorate in raw and finished water and notification to the public should perchlorate concentrations rise above 18 ug/L. SNWA sampled and found levels of 11ug/L. From that time, there has been weekly sampling for perchlorate in raw and finished water. Once NDEP adopted an interim action level of 18ug/L, SNWA ceased artificial recharge above that level. In addition, SNWA received negative media attention concerning drinking water. EPA is in the process of developing a maximum contaminant level (MCL) for perchlorate. Should that level be > 4ug/L, no additional treatment is likely, as concentrations in Lake Mead continue to decline with the current treatment. If the MCL is greater than 4ug/L additional capture at the source will be necessary and additional treatment may be necessary. Whatever the standard is,

no exceedance will be allowed. A consultant was contracted to examine expected cost should the standard be lower than 4ug/L. Evaluations included ion exchange, carbon adsorption, high pressure nanofiltration or reverse osmosis membranes, electro dialysis reversal, fluidized bed reactor and membrane biofilm reactor. To treat 1,000 mgd to 0.5 ug/L would require 200 ion exchange trains with construction cost of \$511,726,000 and annual operating and maintenance cost at \$63,228,000. To treat portions of the flow and blend to 1 ug/L would require 800 mgd with 166 ion exchange trains and construction cost would be \$21,085,000 with annual operating and maintenance at \$48,186,000. Although the researched volume is less than the expected <4ug/L, this evaluation shows how problematic the treatment process could be.

**6. Receive a Presentation from Clark County Regional Flood Control District Regarding Past and Future Activities and Possible Implications for the Las Vegas Wash**

Kevin Eubanks presented on this item. CCRFCD doesn't own or operate any flood control facility. CCRFCD is the planning and funding agency and provide their ¼ sales tax to member entities throughout Clark County for implementation of the flood control master plan. Implications to the Wash are that as the valley grows, there is more volume of water going to Lake Mead. However the peak has been mitigated by the detention basin system, decreasing flood damage. In the last 10 years, 581 conveyance miles and 90 basins have been completed, which removes 53 square miles of flood zone. In the next year, several projects are eligible for construction funding. Kevin showed a map of C-1 and Pittman Wash planning areas for construction. In addition, there will be construction in the upper northern portion of the valley, including the Gowan and Central planning areas. Other projects on the 2013/2014 project list are in the City of North Las Vegas, Lower Northern Range, Lower Las Vegas Wash and Apex planning areas along with the Duck Creek/Blue Diamond and Tropicana/Flamingo planning areas. Operation and maintenance funding is provided by CCRFCD for all facilities on the master plan. Currently, contracts for operation and maintenance total \$13,700,000. The Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWMP) is designed to improve stormwater as it flows to the Wash. The Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (MS4) was first issued in December 1990. In 2003, the permit required a SWMP and in 2010 an update to the SWMP was required. The local stormwater program has undergone continuous improvement since 2003 after an EPA audit. Goals of the program are to be clear, simple and effective; consistent; cost effective; consensus based; fiscally and environmentally responsible and sensible for the Las Vegas valley. The construction site program was the first challenge to be addressed. Entities adopted the stormwater ordinances requiring best management practices on construction sites and established authority to inspect and enforce those ordinances. Each agency's building inspectors were trained to carry out inspections in accordance to the ordinances. In the New Development and Significant Redevelopment (NDSR) program, EPA expects developments to include design features that mitigate increases in peak and increases in volume. However because the valley doesn't have much rain, a proposal was submitted that looks at current measures in which regional approaches are deemed more appropriate and effective. After research, the conclusion was a required water quality capture volume for new developments of 1,439 acre feet. Kevin also gave an update on the Los Angeles County (LA County) court case. As of August, the Supreme Court ruled that flow from concrete section to a natural section cannot be deemed a "discharge." However the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court continues to hold LA County liable for high pollutant levels in the Los Angeles River; even with over 90 dischargers upstream. LA County is expected to appeal the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court decision.

**7. Receive a Presentation from Staff Regarding the Status of Stabilization Projects below Northshore Road Bridge.**

Gerry Hester reported that there are two issues of concern. Below Weir 3, the down cut rate is on target with the prediction of the Northshore Bridge being cut down another 100 feet in the next 20 years. Prior to the government shut down, the National Park Service was prepared to go to construction on Weir 4. The concern then becomes the need for Weir 5 to be constructed; however there is no funding available for that weir.

**8. Receive and Update from Staff Regarding Development of a Long-Term Operating Plan**

Seth Shanahan reported on Long-Term Operating Plan (LTOP) progress since June. Staff was asked to reply to LVVWAC with how information was changed. That item is 100% complete. Staff was asked to continue to develop a list of actions and that task is 90% complete. Staff was asked to recommend priorities and resource needs and that task is 90% complete on priorities; however the priorities were needed before the resource needs could be evaluated. Next steps include staff meeting with individual LVVWAC members to obtain further direction. Staff will continue to provide status reports to the LVVWAC as needed. Staff briefed stormwater and wastewater committees and staff will work with those committees for additional input. That task is 50% complete. The next steps also include discussion on specific topics such as: mandatory versus discretionary elements of the LTOP (e.g., what are the “core” actions); LTOP elements more efficiently performed by private, non-profit organizations (e.g., a 501[c]3); funding package resilience to little or no state/federal funding; and list of project priorities developed that could be funded if funds become available. Other items for discussion are: work performed in Lake Mead; Work for the LVVWAC but not associated with the Las Vegas Wash Comprehensive Adaptive Management Plan and work by the Wash Team in support of individual LVVWAC members.

**9. Set Next Meeting Date and Propose Items for the Next Meeting’s Agenda**

The next meeting will be held November 12 at SNWA unless otherwise notified. Members asked for an update on the BOR DandS.

**10. Public Comment**

There were no comments. Meeting adjourned.