

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

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman	George F. Ogilvie III
Vice Chairwoman	Puoy K. Premsrirut
Commissioner	Duncan R. McCoy
Commissioner	Steve Sisolak
Commissioner	Sam Bateman
Commissioner	Cody T. Winterton

COMMISSIONERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioner	Kara J. Kelley
--------------	----------------

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Special Counsel, Attorney General	Ann C. Pongracz
-----------------------------------	-----------------

COMMISSION STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Executive Director	Jayne Harkins, P.E.
Deputy Executive Director	James D. Salo
Chief of Finance and Administration	Douglas N. Beatty
Assistant Director of Energy Services	Gail A. Bates
Assistant Director of Engineering and Operations	Robert D. Reese
Hydropower Program Manager	Craig N. Pyper
Natural Resources Program Manager	Angela K. Slaughter
Natural Resource Analyst	Peggy Roefer
Senior Accountant	Gail L. Benton
Senior Energy Accountant	Kalora Snyder
Senior Energy Accountant	Richard Sanders
Office Manager	Judy K. Atwood
Administrative Assistant III	Carol L. Perone
Administrative Assistant II	Abigail Price
Administrative Assistant II	Shylo Endris

OTHERS PRESENT; REPRESENTING

City of Boulder City	Rory Dwyer
Clark County Deputy District Attorney	Leslie Nielsen
Garman Turner Gordon	Mike Sullivan
Las Vegas Valley Water District	Omar Saucedo
Self	Beverly Taylor
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Don Land
Wasatch Electric	Clint Amie

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 18, 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 January 12, 2016 meeting	1
D.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to adopt Colorado River Commission of Nevada Resolution 2016-2, commending Las Vegas Councilman Bob Coffin for his service to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission).....	1
E.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve an Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement between the City of Boulder City and the Commission.....	1
F.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-02 for Materials Purchasing Services between Peak Substation Services and the Commission.	3
G.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-03 for Materials Purchasing Services between Anixter Inc. and the Commission.....	4
H.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-03 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between PAR Electrical Contractors, Inc. and the Commission.....	4

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 18, 2016**

INDEX

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-05 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Wasatch Electric, a Division of Dynalectric Company, An EMCOR Company and the Commission.....	7
J.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Report on the Commission’s actions on protecting Nevada’s Rights to Post-2017 Hoover Power from 2006 to the present	8
K.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Requested review of liabilities presented in the Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015.....	9
L.	<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
M.	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.).....	11
N.	Comments and questions from the Commission members... ..	11
O.	Selection of the next possible meeting date.....	11
P.	Adjournment.....	11

The Colorado River Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Ogilvie at 1:10 p.m. followed by the pledge of allegiance.

A. Conformance to Open Meeting Law.

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.)

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

C. For Possible Action: Approval of minutes of the January 12, 2016 meeting.

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

D. For Possible Action: Consideration of and possible action to adopt Colorado River Commission of Nevada Resolution 2016-2, commending Las Vegas Councilman Bob Coffin for his service to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission).

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

Commissioner Bateman moved for approval to adopt Colorado River Commission Resolution 2016-2. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCoy and approved by a unanimous vote.

E. For Possible Action: Consideration of and possible action to approve an Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement Between the City of Boulder City and the Commission.

Robert D. Reese, Assistant Director of Engineering and Operations, stated that in 2002, the Commission and the City of Boulder City (City) entered into a Mutual Assistance Agreement to share emergency and technical resources, including labor and equipment, in order to facilitate the efficient, safe, and economical operation of the electrical facilities of the Commission and the City. The Commission previously executed similar agreements with some of its other utility customers.

The Commission and the City have small utility staffs. However, collectively, the staffs have more than 200 years of experience in utility operations, power procurement, technical and financial analysis, rates and regulatory affairs. Given the breadth and depth of that knowledge, the Parties desire to broaden the scope of the Mutual Assistance Agreement to be able to provide

additional services to each other as needed. The Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement broadens the scope of the original agreement and provides an alternative billing mechanism which will allow the Parties to arrange for advance funding for projects that are more complex and require more resources.

The City intends to request approval of the Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement at its City Council meeting later in February. Staff requested that the Executive Director be authorized to sign the Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement following approval of the agreement by the Boulder City Council.

Commissioner McCoy stated that the Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement will be on the City's meeting agenda for Tuesday, February 23, 2016, and stated further that this agreement will facilitate the construction of a new substation in which the City intends to construct by the new I-11 Boulder City Bypass to allow services to new business and operations. Commissioner McCoy thanked the Commission and Staff.

Mr. Reese stated that the expanded scope of work the Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement will allow Staff to model the substation to accommodate new growth in the Boulder City area. He clarified that the construction or building of a new facility would not be included in this agreement. If the Commission undertakes the construction or building of a new facility on behalf of Boulder City, Staff would bring this before the Commission as a capital project.

Commissioner Winterton inquired regarding section 13.1 of the agreement, which addresses safety, and asked who is in charge of safety if the Commission is providing assistance to Boulder City during a construction project? If the Commission is in charge of providing its safety assistance, and Boulder City is providing their own safety and something were to happen, how would the indemnification process work? Who would be responsible for indemnification?

Ann Pongracz, Special Counsel Attorney General, responded that these types of indemnification clauses are standard in mutual assistance agreements that the Commission has approved for decades. Ms. Pongracz stated that the indemnification used in the mutual assistance agreements is used in contracting with other government agencies within the State of Nevada and not with private entities. She offered to check if there are any changes in how the State handles indemnification issues these days. Ms. Pongracz urged the Commission to not delay consideration of this item today. If the recommendation is that Staff change or modify the mutual assistance agreements going forward, Staff would bring that back to the Commission for consideration. She further noted that there is a meeting tomorrow at the Attorney General's Office, with the Virtual Practice Group for transactional attorneys where this issue could be considered. If possible, Ms. Pongracz would like to take questions to them and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Winterton stated that he was fine with that suggestion. One of the points that he did not touch on earlier, was the ultimate responsibility for safety as it seems to be unclear. When and if something happens, he feels as though there would be a lot of finger pointing as it is not clear.

Commissioner McCoy moved for approval of the Amended Mutual Assistance Agreement between the City of Boulder City and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bateman and approved by a unanimous vote.

F. *For Possible Action:* Consideration of and possible action to approve Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-02 for Materials Purchasing Services between Peak Substation Services and the Commission.

Ms. Harkins recommended that Agenda Items F and Item G be taken together.

Mr. Reese stated the Commission owns, operates and maintains a high-voltage transmission and distribution system and is responsible for operating and maintaining an additional 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.

Operation of the electric facilities for these Commission customers routinely requires purchase of individual items and replacement parts including relays and metering equipment, which typically cost between \$5,000.00 and \$30,000.00, communication modules which cost between \$3,000.00 and \$10,000.00, transformer bushings which cost up to \$100,000.00 each, tap changer controls which cost approximately \$12,000.00, replacement switches which cost between \$7,000.00 and \$15,000.00, and from time to time it may be necessary to replace transformers, which cost up to \$500,000.00.

On September 10, 2013, Contract No. SA-13-02, and on March 11, 2015 Amendment No. 1 with Peak Substation Services (Peak) were approved by the Commission to serve as a means to purchase needed electrical materials.

Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-02 is to increase the amount of the contract by \$450,000.00 to a not-to-exceed amount of \$900,000.00 over the term of the contract. This contract is an enabling type contract that provides no guarantee by the Commission regarding the amount of business that will be requested of the vendor during the term of this contract. The Commission has enabling type contracts with multiple vendors so it can solicit quotations from multiple vendors to obtain the best possible value for the customer. Vendor quotations are reviewed by a team of Commission staff, with input from the customer. Staff then issues a purchase order to the vendor offering the most favorable terms.

Peak has provided excellent service for the Commission's Power Delivery Group's materials purchasing needs.

Chairman Ogilvie commented that the briefing materials state that these expenditures are paid for by the Commission's customers SNWA and CCWRD, and asked if the customers are aware of the increase and if they have approved this increase.

Mr. Reese replied that there are three funding agencies and each agency has its own operating budget with the Commission. Each customer submits a written request for work to be done to the Staff. Under the operation budget, if a repair is necessary, Staff is in direct contact with the customer to review any expenditures.

Commissioner Bateman moved for approval of Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-02 for Materials Purchasing Services between Peak Substation Services and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut and approved by a unanimous vote.

G. *For Information Only: Consideration of and possible action to approve Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-03 for Materials Purchasing Services between Anixter Inc. and the Commission.*

Ms. Harkins recommended that Agenda Items F and Item G be taken together.

Mr. Reese provided background for the Commission's consideration of Amendment No. 2 to Contract SA-13-03. The Commission approved Contract No. SA-13-03 on October 8, 2013 and Amendment No.1 to that contract on March 11, 2015 with HD Supply Power Solutions, Ltd. (HD Supply) to serve as a means to purchase needed electrical materials. On October 5, 2015, the Commission was notified that HD Supply was acquired by Anixter Power Solutions, LLC and that it would merge with Anixter, Inc. (Anixter) on January 4, 2016. An Assignment Agreement between the Commission and Anixter was signed on December 8, 2015 by the contract representative for the Commission.

Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-03 seeks to increase the amount of the contract by \$450,000.00 to a not-to-exceed amount of \$900,000.00 over the term of the contract. This contract is an enabling type contract that provides no guarantee by the Commission regarding the amount of business that will be requested of the vendor during the term of this contract. The Commission has enabling type contracts with multiple vendors so it can solicit quotations from multiple vendors to obtain the best possible value for the customer. Vendor quotations are reviewed by a team of Commission staff, with input from the customer. Staff then issues a purchase order to the vendor offering the most favorable terms.

Commissioner McCoy moved for approval of Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. SA-13-03 for Materials Purchasing Services between Anixter Inc. and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairwoman Premsrirut and approved by a unanimous vote.

H. *For Information Only: Consideration of and possible action to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-03 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between PAR Electrical Contractors, Inc. and the Commission.*

Ms. Harkins recommended that Agenda Items H and I be taken together.

Mr. Reese provided background for the Commission's consideration to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-03 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services. The Commission's Power Delivery Group (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. 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 Power Delivery Group (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.
- Supply of 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 installation of 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 anticipated that SNWA, CCWRD and customers at the Basic Industrial Complex will continue to request the Commission to provide such services on an as-needed basis. This is especially true for SNWA's L3PS Project—which is a large complex project in its beginning phase.

For the development of this Transmission and Distribution System Support Services contract, 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 the most expensive component at any one of the 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 Company (Wasatch)

Commission staff evaluated these three proposals and found that all three companies complied with the requirements of the RFP. Commission staff have successfully negotiated agreements with all three firms.

Contract No. SA-15-03 for consideration under this agenda item is with PAR and is an enabling type contract that allows the Commission's PDG staff to receive support from PAR on an as-needed basis. It will cover certain tasks that cannot be efficiently performed with existing Commission personnel. The enabling type contract 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 PAR for a contract term of four years, anticipated to begin February 18, 2016. Work under the agreement will be at the request of the Commission's customers, such as SNWA, CCWRD and Basic Substation Project, 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 PAR is well qualified and fully capable of providing the support services to the Commission and recommends approval of this agreement.

Commissioner McCoy moved for approval to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-03 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between PAR Electrical Contractors, Inc. and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Winterton and approved by a unanimous vote.

I. *For Possible Action:* Consideration of and possible action to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-05 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Wasatch Electric, a Division of Dynalectric Company, An EMCOR Company and the Commission.

Ms. Harkins recommended that Agenda Items H and I be taken together.

Mr. Reese provided background for the Commission's consideration to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-05 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services with Wasatch Electric, a Division of Dynalectric Company, an EMCOR Company (Wasatch). This is an enabling-type contract that allows the Commission's PDG staff to receive support from Wasatch on an as-needed basis. It will cover certain tasks that cannot be efficiently performed with existing Commission personnel. The enabling type contract 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 Wasatch for a contract term of four years, anticipated to begin February 18, 2016. Work under the agreement will be at the request of the Commission's customers, such as SNWA, CCWRD and Basic Substation Project, 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 Wasatch is well qualified and fully capable of providing the support services to the Commission and recommends approval of this agreement.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if Wasatch has always been a Division of Dynalectric Company.

Mr. Reese replied no; they merged within the last 2 years. The Commission did have a contract with Wasatch a few years ago.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if Staff dealt with Dynalectric before.

Mr. Reese replied no. The people that are at Wasatch currently are the same people that Staff dealt with previously.

Chairman Ogilvie stated he knew a few years ago Dynalectric tried to attempt to withdraw a bid with UMC, and anytime their name is shown he is hesitant.

Commissioner Sisolak asked how the contractor will be selected. Will it be done on a case-by-case basis, or a rotating list, or dependent upon the price and bid? Will some contractors get all the work and not others?

Mr. Reese replied that Staff will get the scope of work from the Commission's customers, and once received Staff will submit it to each contractor. Each contractor can choose to respond with a price estimate, availability, and projected completion time. Depending on those responses, Staff and the customer will select which contractor to use. The benefit of having three contractors is that staff and the customer have the option of not utilizing one of them if they do not perform satisfactorily.

Commissioner Sisolak moved for approval to approve award of Contract No. SA-15-05 for Transmission and Distribution System Support Services between Wasatch Electric, a Division of Dynalectric Company, An EMCOR Company and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bateman and approved by a unanimous vote.

<p>J. <i>For Information Only:</i> Report on the Commission's actions on protecting Nevada's Rights to Post-2017 Hoover Power from 2006 to the present.</p>

Ms. Harkins presented a report on the Colorado River Commission of Nevada's actions on protecting Nevada's Rights to Post-2017 Hoover Power from 2006 to the present.

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

Chairman Ogilvie recognized Ms. Pongracz, primary legal counsel, on her efforts on the Federal Legislation; Congressman Joe Heck for sponsoring the bill; and Craig Pyper for efforts in dealing with State issues.

K. For Information Only: Requested review of liabilities presented in the Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015.

Douglas Beatty, Chief of Finance and Administration, provided a report on the following:

- Compensated Absences Liability
- Retirement or Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) Liability
- Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) Liability

Commissioner Sisolak asked if Staff can carry forward the 240 vacation hours (annual leave) plus the current year.

Mr. Beatty replied yes. On December 31, an employee will lose the balance of any annual leave over the 240 hours. However if the employee continues to work until December 30 of the next year, they will be paid out for the 240 hours which was carried over plus any time that has been accrued that year, if no annual leave was taken that year.

Commissioner Sisolak inquired if this is done on a calendar year basis and not on the employee anniversary. Is this PERS compensable?

Mr. Beatty replied yes, it is done on a calendar year basis. I am not sure if it is PERS compensable, that would be a question for PERS.

Commissioner Sisolak asked about carrying forward the OPEB after 2009?

Mr. Beatty replied that if an employee was hired between 2009 and 2011 and retired from service before they have reached 15 years, then they do not get any benefit. An employee that was hired beginning in 2012 will receive no OPEB benefit upon retirement regardless of years of service.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if the amount from OPEB is carried over somewhere with some estimate of benefits for current retirees. This is a huge benefit, but we do not have a dollar amount associated with it since we are subsidized at 40, 50, or 60%.

Mr. Beatty replied no, we do not report that at all.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if this amount is reflected in the State budget.

Mr. Beatty replied it is in the State budget. PEBP is an agency of the State, and produces its own financial report. The Commission will get an assessment and will pay its share. It is only funded on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Commissioner Sisolak inquired if there is money that the Commission has to set aside to fund OPEB or is it just pay-as-you-go. Other agencies such as Metro have to set aside money each year. How is that in compliance with Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) if it is

being funded as a pay-as-you-go? What is the State reporting as liability for funding OPEB for all these agencies?

Mr. Beatty replied that the GASB does not tell you how to fund something; it just tells you how to report it. The unfunded liability is 1.2 billion dollars. You would expect that figure because funding is on a pay-as-you-go basis; the percentage of unfunded liability to payroll is 92%. I feel the reason that it is funded on a pay-as-you-go basis is because it is determined each legislative session how much the benefit will be. This benefit is not guaranteed and during the any legislative session they could do away with this benefit.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if this was true for the County as well, or just the State.

Mr. Beatty replied just the State.

Commissioner McCoy commented that every government entity that falls under these GASB rules is going to have to report unfunded liabilities and everyone that is going to read these reports are going to be horrified because of how these liabilities skew the reports. I think it may not be a bad idea to have language in the Management's Discussion and Analysis portion of the financial statement regarding these figures being described, as well as a mathematical analysis and the probability of this actually occurring.

Mr. Beatty replied that Staff can certainly look at adding that information.

L. *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.*

Angela Slaughter, Natural Resources Program Manager, provided a report on the following:

- Unregulated Inflow into Lake Powell as of February 8, 2016
- Storage Conditions as of February 8, 2016
- Lake Powell Projections based on January 24-Month Study
- Lake Mead Projections based on January 24-Month Study
- Reservoir Storage as of February 10, 2016
- U.S. West Drought Monitor as of February 9, 2016
- U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook as of January 21, 2016
- Colorado River Basin River Forecast Center
- Precipitation – Colorado River Basin as of February 8, 2016
- Monthly Precipitation for January 2016
- Seasonal Precipitation, October 2015 – January 2016
- Water Use in Southern Nevada as of January – December 2015
- Precipitation and Temperature on Valley Water Use

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

M. 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.)

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

N. Comments and questions from the Commission members.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Sisolak made an inquiry regarding a recent news release prior to the Commission meeting pertaining to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's raid on the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's office in Boulder City.

The Commission requested Staff to provide status updates to the Commission.

O. Selection of the next possible meeting date.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 17, 2016, at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Suite 4401.

P. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 2:22 p.m.

Jayne Harkins, P.E., Executive Director

APPROVED:

George F. Ogilvie III, Chairman