

The meeting was held at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at the Clark County Commission Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada.

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman	George F. Ogilvie III
Vice Chairwoman	Marybel Batjer
Commissioner	Bob Coffin
Commissioner	Duncan R. McCoy
Commissioner	Berlyn D. Miller
Commissioner	Steve Sisolak

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE VIA TELECONFERENCE

Commissioner	J. Brin Gibson
--------------	----------------

DEPUTY ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Senior Deputy Attorney General	Jennifer T. Crandell
Senior Deputy 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 Engineering and Operations	Robert D. Reese
Manager, Energy Services	Gail A. Bates
Manager, Hydropower Program	Craig N. Pyper
Manager, Natural Resources Group	McClain L. Peterson
Senior Energy Accountant	Gail L. Benton
Office Manager	Judy K. Atwood
Administrative Assistant III	Carol Perone
Administrative Assistant II	Becky Miller

OTHERS PRESENT; REPRESENTING

American Pacific Corporation	Jack Stonehocker
Consultant	Sara A. Price, Esq.
Overton Power District No. 5	Mendis Cooper

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 12, 2013**

INDEX

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
A.	Conformance to Open Meeting Law	1
B.	Comments and questions 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 15, 2012 and December 11, 2012 meetings.....	1
D.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Selection of Vice Chairman.....	1
E.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve an agreement between the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) for the reimbursement of preliminary engineering costs for the relocation of the Commission’s transmission line structures for Phase 2 of the Boulder City Bypass Project	2
F.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to approve an agreement for Remedial Measure Fund Account for the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program between the United State Bureau of Reclamation and the Commission.....	3
G.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to ratify the Commission’s petition for leave to intervene and protest filed in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER13-684-000 concerning NVEnergy’s proposed revision to the terms of Energy Imbalance Services in Schedule 4 of the Open Access Transmission Tariff	6
H.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Status update on the Commission’s efforts to implement the provisions in the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011 (H.R. 470) passed by Congress Nevada.....	9

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 12, 2013**

INDEX (Continued)

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I.	<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	11
J.	Comments and questions 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
K.	Comments and questions from the Commission members	12
L.	Selection of the next possible meeting date.....	12
M.	Adjournment	12

The Colorado River Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Ogilvie at 1:05 p.m. followed by the pledge of allegiance.

A. Conformance to Open Meeting Law.

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

B. Comments and questions 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 November 15, 2012 and December 11, 2012 meetings.

Commissioner McCoy moved for approval of the minutes of the November 15, 2012 and December 11, 2012 meetings as written. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairwoman Batjer and approved by a unanimous vote of those present. Commissioner Miller was not present for the vote.

Chairman Ogilvie welcomed the newest member of the Commission, Commissioner Steve Sisolak.

D. *For Possible Action:* Selection of Vice Chairman.

Nevada Revised Statutes 538.111 provides that at the first meeting of the Commission in each calendar year, the Commission shall elect a Vice Chair for the ensuing calendar year.

Commissioner McCoy made a motion for reappointment of Vice Chairwoman Batjer. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Coffin and approved by a unanimous vote of those present. Commissioner Miller was not present for the vote.

E. For Possible Action: Consideration of and possible action to approve an agreement between the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) for the reimbursement of preliminary engineering costs for the relocation of the Commission's transmission line structures for Phase 2 of the Boulder City Bypass Project.

Robert Reese, Deputy Director of Engineering and Operations, provided a report on the Boulder Bypass Project and the need for transmission line relocation which is attached and made a part of the minutes. (See Attachment A.)

Commissioner Berlyn Miller arrived at this time.

The Nevada Department of Transportation has initiated a highway improvement project identified as the Boulder Bypass Phase I Project on State Highway 93/95 in the Railroad Pass area. Phase 2 of this project, which is being developed by the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTCSN), requires the relocation of six transmission towers that are part of the Commission's River Mountains Project 230-kV transmission line. The project will require transmission line modifications and design and preparation of the construction documents for this relocation.

The relocation of the electric transmission facilities as needed to accommodate Phase 2 of the Boulder Bypass Project requires that the Commission provide the RTCSN with an estimate of the cost of the relocation, and that the RTCSN and the Commission enter into a written agreement for reimbursement of preliminary engineering costs. The RTCSN and the Commission have negotiated the agreement which is proposed for approval by the Commission. The RTCSN has already approved and signed the agreement.

The Commission's total estimated cost for the relocation of the electric transmission facilities is \$175,000. Details of the estimated costs are set forth in Exhibit B of the agreement. Actual costs might exceed this original estimated cost and RTCSN agrees to pay the Commission's actual costs.

Commissioner Miller moved for approval of the agreement between the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada and the Commission for the reimbursement of preliminary engineering costs for the relocation of the Commission's transmission line structures for Phase 2 of the Boulder City Bypass Project. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairwoman Batjer and approved by a unanimous vote.

F. *For Possible Action:* Consideration of and possible action to approve an agreement for Remedial Measure Fund Account for the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program between the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Commission.

Sara A. Price, Esq., Consultant, has been working on the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (LCR MSCP or Program) since before it was implemented. The Commission was part of the founding group that put the Program together. As a consultant to the Commission, this is the primary work Ms. Price performs for the Commission.

The agreement before the Commission today is part of the normal implementation of the Program. The LCR MSCP is a 50 year joint program between Federal Parties and Nonfederal Parties, including the Lower Basin States and a number of water and power stakeholders. It provides for compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). The purpose of the Program is to conserve and work towards the recovery of 26 listed species, and to protect and maintain wildlife habitat along the lower Colorado River from Lake Mead to the southern international boundary with Mexico through the implementation of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The LCR MSCP is now in its seventh year of implementation.

Over the life of this Program, the Parties anticipated the need to address circumstances that may cause adverse changes in the normal course of Program development, implementation and maintenance, such as fire damage. To that end, the HCP identifies specific options or remedial measures to be implemented if such adverse changes occur. And to ensure there is sufficient funding to implement a remedial measure if the need arises, the LCR MSCP documents provide for setting aside contingency funding starting in year 6 of the Program through year 25, up to a total Federal/Nonfederal maximum amount of \$13,270,000 (2003 dollars). This funding is part of the original \$626,180,000 (2003 dollars) Program Cost and it will be set aside pursuant to the same cost share percentages set forth in the Funding and Management Agreement. Federal Parties bear 50%, Nonfederal Parties bear 50%. Of the Nonfederal Parties share, California Parties bear 50%, Arizona Parties bear 25% and Nevada Parties bear 25%. See Section 8, Funding and Management Agreement.

Section 7.5.1 of the Funding and Management Agreement, authorizes the State Parties to establish interest-bearing accounts for the deposit of funds by State Parties which may be made available to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) for the administration and implementation of the Program. The Commission currently maintains such an interest bearing account with the State Treasurer to fund ongoing habitat maintenance under the Program.

On April 25, 2012, the LCR MSCP Steering Committee approved Program Decision Document 12-001 (attached hereto as Exhibit A to the proposed Remedial Measure Fund Account Agreement) approving the establishment of State Remedial Measures Fund interest bearing accounts. The Steering Committee considered it in the Program's best

interest to have these funds earn interest for the following reasons: (1) Reclamation is not authorized to hold funds in interest bearing accounts; and (2) earning interest on these funds, which are contingent in nature and to be collected over a long period of time, protects against inflationary erosion. Accordingly, all remedial measure principal funding (both Federal and Nonfederal amounts) will be set aside by the State Parties into their respective State accounts pursuant to their established Nonfederal cost share percentages. The Federal Parties, then, will pay that much more into the Program implementation, reducing the State contributions. In this way, the Parties gain the benefit of segregating the full remedial measure contingency funding into interest bearing accounts while at the same time preserving the original financial obligations set forth in the Funding and Management Agreement. For example, pursuant to the schedule provided in Table 7-1 of the HCP, the Commission will set aside its \$1,658,750 obligation (in 2003 dollars) as well as 25% of the Federal obligation \$1,658,750 in 2003 dollars for a total amount of \$3,317,500 in 2003 dollars. Reclamation will then credit Nevada the amount it sets aside for the federal portion. The Agreement further provides that Nevada's quarterly funding obligation will be met when the funds are set aside, regardless of how much or how little is ultimately earned or lost in principal under the Remedial Measure Fund Account. Any interest earned on the funds will be added to the Account and available to Reclamation for implementation of a remedial measure up until one year prior to the expiration of the Program. At that time, any interest remaining in the Account will be the property of the Commission and distributed back to the Nevada Parties pursuant to Nevada's in-State Cost Share Agreement.

This proposed Agreement for Remedial Measure Fund Account for the LCR MSCP is consistent with the terms set forth in the Steering Committee's Program Decision Document 12-001, as well as the Remedial Measure Fund Account Agreements being entered into in California and Arizona. Accordingly, Staff recommends the Commission approve this Agreement and authorize the Executive Director to execute it on behalf of the Commission.

Ms. Price stated Jason Thiriot, Natural Resources Analyst, developed a comprehensive update on the Program in September, which is in PowerPoint format with information and pictures. The PowerPoint presentation can be made available to any of the Commissioners who might be interested in a better understanding of the Program. It's a very comprehensive Program and Staff would be happy to provide a briefing to those interested.

Commissioner Coffin asked if any new species have moved in or been identified in the lower Colorado River and flow areas all the way to Mexico.

Ms. Price asked if Commissioner Coffin was referring to brand new, never discovered species.

Commissioner Coffin replied yes.

Ms. Price replied she is not aware of any such species.

Commissioner Coffin stated sometimes there are cross border species conceivably in the Delta that decided to migrate depending on the changes in the physical characteristics of the Delta as it dries a little more.

Ms. Price said that is true. Lake Mead has the Quagga Mussels that are creating a problem and is a typical situation that can happen. If an invasive type of species is creating havoc by destroying something, we would obviously have to address it; and noted that she is not aware of any new species.

Commissioner Coffin asked if mussels invade the territory of other species, conceivably species that can be eradicated by them, or are they just parasitical on everything else.

McClain Peterson, Manager of the Natural Resources Group, replied that the Quagga Mussels do compete with the Asiatic clam which is another invasive species. The Quagga Mussels seem to fare better than the Asiatic clam.

Ms. Price said Quagga Mussels do clog the pumps and create all sorts of problems.

Mr. Peterson stated the only other species that has made it into the system is the Tamarisk Leaf Beetle that was introduced in Southwestern Utah to help remove Tamarisk from the system.

Commissioner McCoy asked if the funding account would be alive as long as the Program is alive for 50 years.

Ms. Price stated that is correct.

Commissioner McCoy asked what are the safeguards to prevent the taking of this money for other purposes from Nevada and other states that are participating.

Ms. Price replied that there was a case in Arizona where their Legislature went and swept monies out of the water banking account; monies that Nevada had originally deposited. It was declared unconstitutional in Arizona, although they were not required to fund back the money. In Nevada, in the Clean Water Coalition litigation, the court found that the Legislature inappropriately attempted to sweep the Clean Water Coalition's funds.

Here, if the Legislature were to sweep our LCR MSCP accounts, and thus the Commission failed to have the funds to pay Reclamation as invoiced, Nevada would be in breach of the contracts under the Program, in turn jeopardizing our Section 10 Permit authorization and our ability to have water diversions and power production on the Colorado River. Ms. Price stated Douglas Beatty, Chief of Finance and Administration, regularly meets with Legislative staff, to keep them informed.

Ms. Harkins stated there were a series of discussions about whether each state should hold its own funds or one state should manage the whole Remedial Measure Account Fund. There was concern with the sequestration issues of having the federal government

hold the funds. For California, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, holds the funds for Southern California and offered to do the same for all the organizations and the Federal parties. Commission staff was uncomfortable with that suggestion because of the experience with Arizona. The thought was to hold Nevada's funds in Nevada, and the Commission would continue to work with the Legislature, in keeping them informed on how critical these funds are to preserving Southern Nevada's ability to continue to receive water and power from the Colorado River.

Commissioner Sisolak asked for clarification on the Arizona issue that was mentioned and if he understood it correctly. The Arizona Legislature swept the funds, it was ruled unconstitutional and they did not have to pay it back.

Jennifer T. Crandell, Senior Deputy Attorney General, clarified that Nevada completed its obligation to make payment to Arizona so Nevada was not out anything. There seems to be a slight misunderstanding. Nevada made payment to Arizona and Nevada's part of the contract to Arizona had been completed. The Arizona Legislature came in and swept the account and that injured the Arizona state agency. It did not injure Nevada. Nevada had paid its obligation.

Commissioner Sisolak asked if there was any harm to Nevada at all.

Ms. Crandell said no, there was no harm to Nevada at all.

Ms. Price said it was CAWCD who bore the brunt of this situation. The decision came out in July of 2011. The Commission is very cognizant of how important it is to continue to develop a relationship with the Legislature and continue to educate them on the Program, especially given the long term of the Program.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer stated she thinks Ms. Price was using the Arizona situation as an example of why the funds are deposited in Nevada.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer moved for approval of the agreement for Remedial Measure Fund Account for the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program between the United State Bureau of Reclamation and the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCoy and approved by a unanimous vote.

<p>G. <i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to ratify the Commission's petition for leave to intervene and protest filed in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER13-684-000 concerning NVEnergy's proposed revision to the terms of Energy Imbalance Services in Schedule 4 of the Open Access Transmission Tariff.</p>
--

Gail Bates, Manager of Energy Services, advised that on December 31, 2012, NVEnergy (NVE) made a filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to modify the terms of Schedule 4 of its Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT). The last time

the Commission met, the Commission approved an intervention in a different docket at FERC but one that is related to the filing that is the subject of this item. In the prior filing, NVE proposed to increase its transmission rates and certain other schedules in the OATT but they did not at that point propose any changes to Schedule 4. NVE waited to make a different filing to deal with Schedule 4 which is what the Commission is acting on today.

Under Schedule 4, NVE provides a service called Energy Imbalance Service. Energy providers like the Commission do our best to bring energy into the balancing area that is sufficient to meet our needs. But, because forecasting is not always perfect, when you look at the metered loads compared to what we actually bring in, there are very small differences at times. So, if we bring in a little too much energy at times, NVE will purchase it from us. If we don't bring in quite enough, NVE will supply it to us. Under Schedule 4, the pricing for this particular schedule has been an issue for many, many years. Energy that is bought and sold under Schedule 4 is typically priced at the higher of market prices or NVE's incremental costs, which could be a mix of market, generation, etc.

The problem the Commission has run into is that we have never had a transparent mechanism for identifying what goes into NVE's incremental costs and we have seen those incremental costs, on certain hours at least, rise to several hundred times the market price of power. The Commission has asked on a number of occasions for clarification and has not gotten a satisfactory explanation. Staff estimates that this issue, plus several others, has resulted in approximately \$275,000 annually in premiums above the market price of power today. The latest change proposed by NVE makes yet another small change to their pricing methodology but it does absolutely nothing to address the numerous concerns that the Commission has raised with them over the schedule over the course of time.

Commissioner Coffin said this issue was discussed at the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) but asked if Ms. Bates is saying something additional happened since the last SNWA meeting.

Ms. Bates stated no, the SNWA and the Commission filed a joint petition in this docket.

Commissioner Coffin said those who sit on the SNWA Board of Directors are familiar with this issue, and it looked like the purpose of this docket was to keep SNWA pretty much in its sights since SNWA is going to pay.

Ms. Bates replied yes, this mainly affects SNWA and its member agencies and not the general public. The Commission filed a joint protest with SNWA at FERC and we made that filing on January 22, 2013. Unfortunately, the Staff was unable to bring the matter before the Commissioners for approval prior to filing. If the Staff had waited, we would have missed the intervention deadline. Today the Commission is asking for ratification of our intervention and protest in this docket.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer asked for clarification on the pricing scheme in Schedule 4. It seems that the Commission should have been given information to track whether and how NVE is buying, particularly the surplus energy. She asked if NVE's pricing was based on the spot market.

Ms. Bates replied the Commission's best benchmark is what we know about the price of power in the market today. So the Staff has calculated that we have paid about \$275,000 annually above the market price of power. So we have used market as our benchmark.

Ann C. Pongracz, Senior Deputy Attorney General, added to Ms. Bates' comments by adding that one of the reasons for participating in this proceeding at FERC was to get access to the data that is needed to do the analysis.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer stated we should be able to compare the data, the market to the actual price that was paid and the timing of that purchase.

Ms. Pongracz replied that is correct. The Staff feels the same way and that is why we feel it is appropriate to participate in this FERC proceeding.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer asked over what period of time is being covered by the docket that is being opened.

Ms. Bates stated that the change NVE is proposing is actually a prospective change so this won't do anything to deal with any past issues. The Commission's intervention in this case will try to correct any issues going forward.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer asked over what period of time did Ms. Bates estimate that the Commission paid \$275,000 above market prices.

Ms. Bates replied that it was for an annual period.

Commissioner McCoy was interested in the date and timing of the filing. He asked if there was anything significant about NVE filing on New Year's Eve or did it just work out that way.

Ms. Bates stated NVE had posted back in October that they would make a filing on Schedule 4 by the end of the year.

Commissioner Coffin moved for ratification of the Commission's petition for leave to intervene and protest filed in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket No. ER13-684-000 concerning NVEnergy's proposed revision to the terms of Energy Imbalance Services in Schedule 4 of the Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT). The motion was seconded by Vice Chairwoman Batjer and approved by a unanimous vote.

H. *For Information Only:* Status update on the Commission's efforts to implement the provisions in the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011 (H.R. 470) passed by Congress.

Craig N. Pyper, Manager of the Hydropower Program, provided some background information for the new Commissioner. The Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011 (Act) was passed in 2011. The Hoover Dam allocations are mandated by Congress and have been since the beginning. The current Hoover hydropower contracts will expire in 2017. The Commission went to Congress with our Congressional Delegation and the Act was passed in 2011.

Under the 2011 legislation, the current Hoover customers retain 95 percent of their current allocations, creating a five percent pool, or a little over a hundred megawatts, that will be allocated to new customers. Of the hundred megawatts, Western Area Power Administration (Western) will allocate 69 megawatts to new customers within the Boulder City Marketing Area, which includes Southern Nevada. Part of Western's process started at the end of last year and the Commission was updated on this process at previous meetings.

Western held forums after their marketing criteria were introduced. The Commission had concerns with the marketing criteria, which preclude most entities in Nevada from being a top applicant with the exception of some tribes. The Commission's main focus over the last month was to research the proposed marketing criteria and to provide comments to Western.

Hoover has a unique history among the dams and has always been allocated through Congress whereas the Salt Lake City Integrated Project and Parker-Davis Project are allocated through preference and Western law. In your meeting packet, Staff provided you with a copy of the Commission's comments submitted to Western in order to help Western edit their marketing criteria on how Hoover power allocations should be marketed. Staff hope to receive a response from Western within the next month or by the spring. Staff is hopeful that Western will correct their marketing criteria in a manner that will make this resource available to Nevada applicants.

Staff continues to meet with Nevada applicants, Tribal Representatives of Southern Nevada, as well as other customers. Staff has received a lot of interest from new potential applicants and are continuing the marketing efforts. Right now, the main goal is to make sure Western understands the predicament that their proposed marketing criteria has created for Southern Nevada, to give Western options, and to show why the proposed marketing criteria should be amended.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if this is just a Nevada issue or do other states share our concern with Western's criteria.

Mr. Pyper replied that current customers such as Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) and the Arizona Power Authority also included some comments.

Even though MWD has no stake in the reallocation because they are a current customer and are going to retain 95 percent, they also indicated their support for some of the proposals that the Commission put forth. The Commission worked with them in developing some of the comments as well as Arizona Power Authority. The Arizona Power Authority even made a stronger case for the application of states in their marketing criteria. So yes, other states share our concerns. There are other entities that indicated they thought Western should market it in the same manner as other non-Hoover hydropower projects, but that is one of the things the Commission argued against. Hoover is not traditional; Hoover must be allocated according to its own separate set of laws.

Chairman Ogilvie asked what is the process by which Western is going to consider these comments.

Mr. Pyper stated Western's normal process is to propose criteria, open it for public comment, review comments submitted, and then modify their criteria. The Commission has asked Western to scrap their proposed marketing criteria because they rely too much on Western's past other processes that don't follow Hoover-specific legal requirements. The Commission's comments ask Western to re-start the process with new marketing criteria that are based on Hoover precedent, conduct a new round for public review and public comments, and then issue final marketing criteria that do comply with Hoover-specific laws. In the worst case scenario, Western would go through and make their final marketing criteria and then call for applications. Western's original time schedule was for the spring of this year to issue the final marketing criteria and then call for applications.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer asked if she was reading the information correctly, then Western would be in violation of the Federal Act.

Mr. Pyper stated the Commission Staff believes so.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer stated that's fairly serious.

Mr. Pyper replied yes.

Ms. Harkins stated that in addition to Mr. Pyper's updated on the Hoover Power Allocation Act, Director Stacey Crowley from the Nevada State Office of Energy asked Ms. Harkins to join yesterday in providing a presentation before the Joint Meeting of the Commerce, Labor, and Energy Committees regarding energy issues in Nevada. Ms. Harkins joined Ms. Crowley, Public Utility Commission Chair Alaina Burtenshaw, and Bonnie Lind, Renewable Energy Specialist for the Governor's Office of Economic Development. Ms. Harkins provided an overview on the Commission and the Act. Ms. Harkins wanted the Commissioners aware of her outreach at the Legislature.

Vice Chairwoman Batjer asked if it was stated in Ms. Harkins presentation how much the new allottee pool was.

Ms. Harkins stated yes, it was discussed.

I. *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.

McClain Peterson, Manager of the Natural Resources Group, provided a report on the following:

- Unregulated Inflow into Lake Powell
- Storage Conditions
- Lake Mead End of Month Elevation Projections
- Precipitation – Colorado River Basin
- Upper Colorado Basin Snowpack
- U.S. Drought Monitor as of February 5, 2013
- U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook as of February 7, 2013
- Water Use in Southern Nevada/January-October
- Nevada's Annual Consumptive Use: 2007-2012

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

Commissioner Coffin stated Intake No. 3 Project is under construction but at what level would it be pulling water at.

Mr. Peterson replied that once the pumping station is completed, it could pump at a level quite a bit lower than what is on the PowerPoint graph of 980 feet. Mr. Peterson believes the final design is about 893 feet.

Commission Coffin stated the trigger that has been set at an elevation for initiating construction on the pipeline for Eastern Nevada and asked what the level is set at. This was discussed at SNWA Board meeting but he was not sure if it has been discussed at the Commission meetings.

Ms. Crandell replied the evaluation set is 1,075.

Ms. Harkins added that she has been working with the Senate Government Affairs Committee to work on a Bill Draft Request that would slightly revise the Commission's bonding authority to provide an option to work with the Arizona Power Authority and the California entities to issue some bonds to pay off the debt on the Visitor Center to the federal government and re-finance that debt at lower rates. In the late 1980's or early 1990's, the federal government appropriated federal dollars to build the new Visitor Center at Hoover Dam. All of the entities are making that payment, with interest, back to the Federal Treasury. The customers are paying over eight percent on that interest rate. The Arizona Power Authority has been working with all the Hoover customers; and money could be saved if bonding is done at a lower interest rate. The federal government has indicated that all the customers have to pay off the Visitor Center at the same time.

Late last summer, the staff started working with the Nevada State Treasurer's office on what steps to take. The State Treasurer's office has allowed the Commission to use their contractor, Mr. John Swendseid, who met with staff and looked at what the Commission would have to do with the bonding authority. Mr. Swendseid looked at the Commission statutes and the Commission has clear authority to do bonds on generation of electrical power and transmission. The Visitor Center was not clearly included in the current statutes. Mr. Swendseid will review the best bond rates and advise staff. It would be saving our customers money into the future if we can work out this whole deal. This process will save our customers money here in Nevada, and save all the Hoover customers money into the future. As the Commission moves forward on this issue, the Commissioners will be kept informed.

J. Comments and questions 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.

K. Comments and questions from the Commission members.

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

L. Selection of the next possible meeting date.

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2013, at the Clark County Commission Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada.

M. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

Jayne Harkins, P.E., Executive Director

APPROVED:

George F. Ogilvie III, Chairman