

Las Vegas Wash Long-Term Operating Plan: Member Comments

Presentation to the
LVVWAC

March 10, 2020



Wash CAMP vs. LVVWAC RWQP

CAMP (LVWCC 2000)

- LVWCC Mission – “Working to stabilize and enhance the valuable environmental resources of the Las Vegas Wash.”
- Year-End Reports, annual budgets for Wash activities, LTOP

RWQP (LVVWAC 2012), Strategies Document (LVVWAC 2015)

- LVVWAC Mission - “Protect, preserve and enhance the quality and quantity of water resources in the Las Vegas Valley Watershed and to sustain economic well-being and protect the environment for present and future generations.”
- Annual Accomplishments Documents
- For the future – create separate budget for RWQ issues and fund using existing scenario or with a new one as determined by members; create mechanism in agreement(s); bring additional members to table (Small workgroup? Follow Open Mtg law.).

Wash CAMP vs. LVVWAC RWQP (cont.)

When the MAC expanded to become the LVVWAC, they increased their purview to the entire watershed, taking on regional water quality issues and developing the Regional Water Quality Plan (RWQP).

Activities on the Wash are driven by the CAMP, and the CAMP dictated what is included in the LTOP, which is only a portion of the LVVWAC's purview.

Other LVVWAC activities are driven by the RWQP, and a new mechanism needs to be developed to address current and future issues.

LTOP - Comments Received

Comments were received from:

- SNWA
- COH
- LVVWD
- CCRFCD
- CCWRD
- CLV
- CC



Most comments related to funding scenarios:

- SNWA & LVVWD – existing (Option 1)
- COH & CC – existing or existing with sales tax (Option 1 or 2)
- CLV – action-based (Option 6)

CCRFCD provided new scenario – taking on 50% of Erosion & Stormwater = 25% of total LTOP (up from 10%)

CCWRD provided comments on regional water quality issues and 10 additional funding scenarios

CCWRD LTOP Comments

CCWRD submitted detailed, well-thought-out comments. These comments, however, related primarily to regional water quality issues.

Expand LVVWAC mission not to emphasize “stabilize” and account for other efforts

- The given mission is for the LVWCC and not LVVWAC

Change Erosion & Stormwater category name to Erosion & All-Waters

- Category name pulled from CAMP
- All other water covered under RWQ

Requests inclusion of all agencies accounting for all water sources in the LV Wash; in E&S and then again – RWQ issue

- Start new process to study issue

CCWRD LTOP Comments (cont.)

Under Jurisdictional & Regulatory, recommends annual MS4 permittee workshop to support BMPs - Open Mtg law & RWQ issue

Proposed new funding scenarios request inclusion of: (RWQ issue)

- MS4 permittees
- NPDES permittees
- Clarification on CC's historic 10%
- MS4 permit dry weather data collection warrants an independent participation from them as 10% of element cost
- Shallow GW warrants an independent funding source participation

Concern for “uncertainties of the future Upper LV Wash costs (especially with the 4% Wash capital funding going to the Lower Wash over the next 20+ years).”

- The 4% cannot be used for maintenance; must be capital projects.
 - Would require change in legislation

Questions?



LTOP with new CCRFCD options

	Current FY (does not include weir maintenance and support staff)	LTOP based on current distribution percentages; no offsets	LTOP with 50% CCRFCD contribution to Erosion & Stormwater (E&S);
Total Operating Budget	\$1,059,741	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189
Federal & state funding–BOR/ NDEP grants (operating only)	\$312,000	\$0	\$0
BOR weir maintenance funding	\$0 (not included in operating budget)	\$0	\$0
Local Contribution	\$747,741	\$2,392,189	\$1,792,370*
• Wholesale Delivery	\$299,097 (40%)	\$956,876 (40%)	\$788,643 (44%)
• Dischargers <small>Based on 2-year running average flow rates</small>	\$299,097 (40%)	\$956,876 (40%)	\$770,719 (43%)
• COH	\$37,985 (12.7%)	\$121,523 (12.7%)	\$97,881 (12.7%)
• CCWRD	\$163,905 (54.8%)	\$524,368 (54.8%)	\$422,354 (54.8%)
• CLV	\$69,689 (23.3%)	\$222,952 (23.3%)	\$179,578 (23.3%)
• CNLV	\$27,517 (9.2%)	\$88,033 (9.2%)	\$70,906 (9.2%)
• CC	\$74,774 (10%)	\$239,219 (10%)	\$233,008 (13%)
• CCRFCD	\$74,774 (10%)	\$239,219 (10%)	\$599,819*

* CCRFCD will pay 50% of Erosion & Stormwater (E&S) category total of \$1,199,639. That 50% was subtracted from the total operating budget. The CCRFCD's original 10% of local contribution was then split as follows: Wholesale - 4%, Dischargers - 3%, and Clark County - 3%.

LTOP with new CCWRD options

	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #7	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #8	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #9	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #10
Total Operating Budget	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189
Federal & state funding–BOR/ NDEP grants (operating only)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
BOR weir maintenance funding	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Contribution	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189
• Wholesale Delivery	\$777,461 (32.5%)	\$777,461 (32.5%)	\$837,266 (35%)	\$777,461 (32.5%)
• Dischargers Based on 2-year running average flow rates	\$777,461 (32.5%)	\$777,461 (32.5%)	\$837,266 (35%)	\$777,461 (32.5%)
• COH	\$98,738 (12.7%)	\$98,738 (12.7%)	\$106,333 (12.7%)	\$98,738 (12.7%)
• CCWRD	\$428,381 (55.1%)	\$428,381 (55.1%)	\$461,334 (55.1%)	\$428,381 (55.1%)
• CLV	\$177,261(22.8%)	\$177,261(22.8%)	\$190,897 (22.8%)	\$177,261(22.8%)
• CNLV	\$73,081 (9.4%)	\$73,081 (9.4%)	\$78,703 (9.4%)	\$73,081 (9.4%)
• CCWP	\$179,414 (7.5%)	\$179,414 (7.5%)	\$179,414 (7.5%)	\$239,219 (10%)
• CCRFCD	\$179,414 (7.5%)	\$179,414 (7.5%)	\$179,414 (7.5%)	\$239,219 (10%)
• MS4 & WQ % total budget X % area of jurisdiction	\$478,437 (20%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$358,828 (15%)
• COH	\$81,334 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)
• CC	\$225,344 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)
• CLV	\$101,429 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)
• CNLV	\$70,330 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)
• NPDES Permittees	\$0	\$119,609 (5%)	\$0	\$0

LTOP with new CCWRD options

	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #11	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #12	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #13	LTOP – CCWRD proposed funding scenario #14
Total Operating Budget	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189
Federal & state funding–BOR/ NDEP grants (operating only)	\$0	\$0	\$312,000	\$0
BOR weir maintenance funding	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Contribution	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189	\$0	\$2,392,189
• Wholesale Delivery	\$717,657 (30%)	\$717,657 (30%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$598,047 (25%)
• Dischargers Based on 2-year running average flow rates	\$717,657 (30%)	\$717,657 (30%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$598,047 (25%)
• COH	\$91,142 (12.7%)	\$91,142 (12.7%)	\$45,571 (12.7%)	\$75,952 (12.7%)
• CCWRD	\$395,429 (55.1%)	\$395,429 (55.1%)	\$197,714 (55.1%)	\$329,524 (55.1%)
• CLV	\$163,626 (22.8%)	\$163,626 (22.8%)	\$81,813 (22.8%)	\$136,355 (22.8%)
• CNLV	\$67,460 (9.4%)	\$67,460 (9.4%)	\$33,730 (9.4%)	\$56,216 (9.4%)
• CCWP	\$239,219 (10%)	\$239,219 (10%)	\$119,609 (5%)	\$239.219 (10%)
• CCRFCD	\$239,219 (10%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$1,196,095 (50%)	\$598,047 (25%)
• MS4 & WQ % total budget X % area of jurisdiction	\$358,828 (15%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$358,828 (15%)	\$358,828 (15%)
• COH	\$61,001 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)
• CC	\$169,008 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)
• CLV	\$76,072 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)
• CNLV	\$52,748 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)
• NPDES Permittees	\$119,609 (5%)	\$0	\$0	\$0

LTOP with new CCWRD options

LTOP – CCWRD
proposed funding
scenario #15

LTOP – CCWRD
proposed funding
scenario #16

Total Operating Budget	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189
Federal & state funding–BOR/ NDEP grants (operating only)	\$0	\$0
BOR weir maintenance funding	\$0	\$0
Local Contribution	\$2,392,189	\$2,392,189
• Wholesale Delivery	\$239,219 (10%)	\$1,076,485 (45%)
• Dischargers Based on 2-year running average flow rates	\$1,196,095 (50%)	\$598,047 (25%)
• COH	\$151,904 (12.7%)	\$75,952 (12.7%)
• CCWRD	\$659,048 (55.1%)	\$329,524 (55.1%)
• CLV	\$272,710 (22.8%)	\$136,355 (22.8%)
• CNLV	\$112,433 (9.4%)	\$56,216 (9.4%)
• CCWP	\$119,609 (5%)	\$179,414 (7.5%)
• CCRFCD	\$478,438 (20%)	\$179,414 (7.5%)
• MS4 & WQ % total budget X % area of jurisdiction	\$358,828 (15%)	\$358,828 (15%)
• COH	\$61,001 (17.0%)	\$61,001 (17.0%)
• CC	\$169,008 (47.1%)	\$169,008 (47.1%)
• CLV	\$76,072 (21.2%)	\$76,072 (21.2%)
• CNLV	\$52,748 (14.7%)	\$52,748 (14.7%)
• NPDES Permittees	\$0	\$0