LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Virtual Meeting Conducted via Microsoft Teams
January 27, 2026
2:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Keiba Crear, *Las Vegas Valley Water District (LVVWD, alt.)*
Dan Fischer, *Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD, alt.)*
Priscilla Howell, *City of Henderson (COH)*
Lisa Kremer, *Clark County (CC)*
Joemel Llamado, *City of North Las Vegas (CNLV)*
Zane Marshall, *Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA)*
Andrew Trelease, *Clark County Regional Flood Control District (CCRFCD)*
Charles Trushel, *City of Las Vegas (CLV)*

Also Present:

Patrick Almeido
Taryn Alves
Erik Anderson
Steven Anderson
Jason Bailey
Eric Bauer
Elizabeth Bickmore
Danielle Collins
Richard Donahue
Jason Eckberg
Alexei Luganov
John Tennert
Todd Tietjen
Debbie Van Dooremolen
Xiaoping Zhou

1. **Welcome/Call to Order**
   Chair Joemel Llamado called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. **Public Comment**
   Seeing no request for public comment, Joemel moved forward with the meeting.

3. **Introductions**
   Attendees are listed above.

4. **Receive Presentation, Discuss and Authorize Staff to Proceed with Contracting a Consultant for the Weir Lifespan Assessment**
   Ryan Pearson, SNWA, presented an overview on the condition and lifespan of the Las Vegas Wash weir system. He explained the types of weirs currently in place, including flexible riprap structures, roller-compacted concrete structures, and a concrete-skinned gabion structure. He emphasized that all the weirs rely on sheet pile cutoff walls as a critical structural component and noted that these elements are difficult to inspect due to their submerged nature.

   Ryan reviewed the 2020 facilities assessment report which documented surface conditions but did not evaluate sheet pile integrity. He discussed ongoing maintenance activities, including sediment and vegetation removal, and noted that maintenance relies primarily on visual inspection which is required annually by the Las Vegas Wash Long-Term Operating Plan. While no signs of imminent failure have been observed, he explained that visual inspections alone cannot assess below-grade deterioration, which limits confidence in long-term lifespan estimates. An assessment of the sheet pile is most desirable but requires expertise.

The presentation included a discussion of potential strategies for estimating remaining weir life, such as examining corrosion rates, and in-situ testing. Estimated replacement costs were also discussed, based on historical construction costs and costs based on current construction conditions. He added that each approach has limitations and more accurate planning would require improved condition data and external expertise.

Committee members had extensive discussion regarding the challenges of assessing sheet pile conditions and the absence of an established plan for this type of infrastructure. Dan Fischer recommended referring to the experts in the Operations Study Team to deliver ideas to help make decisions. CCRFCD's recent efforts to develop a standard operating procedure (SOP) and conduct a pilot assessment may serve as a potential model. Priscilla Howell and Andrew Trelease agreed that there is a need for consistency and better understanding of weir lifespan to determine long-term financial planning, and avoid unexpected future capital funding demands. Zane Marshall acknowledged that while no immediate structural failures are anticipated, proactive asset management is necessary which might involve a professional services agreement. Ryan discussed the limitations of in-house expertise and members agreed that outside technical assistance would be required to establish an SOP that defines evaluation criteria and supports lifecycle cost planning. It was noted that firm cost estimates cannot be determined until a qualified consultant is selected and negotiations begin.

Following the discussion, Joemel Llamado summarized the overall discussion points and made a motion to authorize Ryan's team to continue working with the Operations Study Team, begin preliminary scope and develop an SOP, and authorize him to have cost discussions with a selected firm, and return with proposed scope options and associated cost ranges for future consideration and approval. Dan seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment. Meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.