

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

**SPECIAL MEETING**

MONDAY

11:00 A.M.

DECEMBER 19, 2005

PRESENT:

**Bonnie Weber, Chairman**  
**Bob Larkin, Vice Chairman**  
**Jim Galloway, Commissioner**  
**David Humke, Commissioner**

**Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk**  
**Michelle Poché, Assistant County Manager**  
**Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel**

ABSENT:

**Pete Sferrazza, Commissioner**

The Board met in a special meeting in the Commission Caucus Room of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Building A, Second Floor, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

**05-1310      AGENDA**

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, on motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Humke, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Sferrazza absent, Chairman Weber ordered that the agenda for the December 19, 2005 special meeting be approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Gary Schmidt, Washoe County resident, discussed the new procedure for public comment that was introduced at the December 13, 2005 Commission meeting; and he offered suggestions for improving the process.

**05-1311      DISCUSSION – FISCAL YEAR 2006/07 BUDGET PROCESS –  
BUDGET DIVISION**

Lisa Gianoli, Budget Manager, presented an overview of the budget process for fiscal year 2006/07. She reviewed the budget calendar and pointed out key dates regarding the budget process. She noted the first set of numbers from the Department of Taxation would be received on February 15, 2006. She said these numbers presented crucial indicators as far as the gas tax, consolidated tax, and property

tax were concerned. Ms. Gianoli stated AB 489, the property tax limitation legislation, could delay the date. She confirmed the Department of Taxation was determining how to complete the projections now that there would be limitations on property tax growth.

Commissioner Larkin requested budget presentations and said it was up to the department heads as to what they wanted to present. He noted the intent was to inform the public of the work that was done by County departments. He asked that the strategic initiatives be incorporated into the budget procedure. Commissioner Larkin inquired how the strategic initiatives were integrated into the budget package and where Charting Our Course (COC) was in the process.

Ms. Gianoli explained when departments presented above base requests to the Budget Department they would state what Commission initiative that request was related to. She said staff was part way through a pilot project concerning COC. She noted staff had identified programs versus activities, and it needed to be determined how these would be ranked. Ms. Gianoli stated that process would not be an integral part of the budget for the upcoming year.

John Sherman, Finance Director, discussed the COC, the challenges of defining a program, and how departments view programs versus activities. He said staff would report to the Board after the next round of analysis.

Michelle Poché, Assistant County Manager, commented on the February 14, 2006 deadline for departments to submit performance measures, goals, and accomplishments; and she stated those were expected to be in the context of the Board's strategic initiatives and direction.

Chairman Weber detailed her requests for the schedule and the budget presentations. She asked that each department include a comprehensive organizational chart with their presentations, and she emphasized it was the goal that two Commissioners would be at each hearing. Mr. Sherman confirmed staff would work with the Chairman and Vice Chairman on the schedule for the department presentations.

**11:32 a.m.** Commissioner Galloway temporarily left the meeting.

In response to Commissioner Humke, Mr. Sherman verified staff would provide the public with information on the different activities of the departments and identify which activities were statutorily or federally required of the County.

Commissioner Humke asked if there was an ordinance that defined the base budget. Ms. Gianoli responded existing funding and contractually obligated items, already approved by the Board, were included in the base budget.

**11:35 a.m.** Commissioner Galloway returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Humke asked that a master definition of the base budget be included in the budget information, and he commented that starting the presentations earlier in the year could prevent appeals because there would be time for the Board to get their questions answered.

Commissioner Galloway asked for cliff notes on the strategic plan and the budget process that the Commissioners could keep with them to provide continuity in the interpretation of those items. Commissioner Galloway and Ms. Gianoli discussed the projecting of the property tax income.

Chairman Weber suggested a master calendar be prepared by February 15, 2006 of who would be speaking and when. She asked that the calendar be available to the Commissioners and be placed on the County website. She requested the Manager's Office prepare a notebook for the materials from the departments that could be placed there as they give their presentation. Chairman Weber asked that a display version of the strategic plan spread sheet be made available to the public, as well as the Commissioners. She said there should be guidelines identified before each presentation.

Commissioner Galloway commented it was important to know what was mandated and at what level of service. He said he would want to know if it was the opinion of staff that it was mandated at a certain level or if there was an alternative way to do it. He stressed the Board would not be doing their job if they did not look at alternatives.

Gary Schmidt, Washoe County resident, asked for the entire budget process to be televised, including the budget workshops. He said he was offended that no Commissioner had expressed support for property tax reform. He stated the Commissioners should ask for accountability from individual elected officers as to their lobbying efforts.

Commissioner Galloway remarked he was in favor of a limit on how much a person's property tax could increase each year. He said what passed at the Legislature was a compromise proposal. He stated he was in favor of a permanent constitutional provision, and he refuted any such statements to the contrary.

Chairman Weber thanked the Finance Department staff for working with the Commissioners on the budget process.

**05-1312      SCR 26 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE INTERIM STUDY –  
WATER RESOURCES**

Steve Bradhurst, Water Resources Director, explained Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) No. 26, as presented in the staff report. He pointed out the resolution directed the Legislative Commission to appoint a committee to conduct an interim study of the use, management, and allocation of water resources in Nevada. Mr. Bradhurst referred to the duties of the Senate Standing Committee on Natural Resources, as outlined

in the resolution. He emphasized the section in the resolution that stated, "the Legislative Commission is hereby directed to appoint a sub-committee of the committee to study the feasibility and advisability of consolidating the water-related services in Washoe County." He went over the membership of the full committee and the sub-committee, and he detailed their first meetings. Mr. Bradhurst noted Senator Mark Amodei was elected Chairman of the sub-committee. He added Senator Amodei indicated he would like presentations on frameworks of a water resource acquisition, management, and conservation entity from interested parties at the meeting on January 19, 2006. Mr. Bradhurst said on that agenda there would be an item for Washoe County, Reno, Sparks, and the Nevada Department of Transportation to give presentations on their water resources, the use and plans for the water. He gave details for filing any proposals. Mr. Bradhurst indicated other agenda items for the January 19, 2006 meeting would include an overview of the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) and a presentation from the State Engineer. He reviewed the "Summary of Alternatives for Regional Water Supply Entity," pointing out the goals and management alternatives and asked for direction and input from the Commissioners on SCR 26.

Gary Schmidt, Washoe County resident, said water was a primary concern for people in the community. He acknowledged the presentation from Mr. Bradhurst and stressed the importance of televising meetings for the public. He said the Commission Caucus Room was a secret room, and he did not support holding meetings in it.

Greg Dennis, Reno Sanitary Engineer, asked if this topic could be discussed at the January 12, 2006 joint meeting with Washoe County, Reno, and Sparks. He was supportive of a collaborative approach.

Diana Langs, Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID), stated the SVGID Board members supported consensus, a technical staff, and each entity having one vote. She said all parties needed to meet together to discuss this issue.

Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID), voiced his support for a Regional Water Resource Acquisition, Management, and Conservation Agency or a new authority being established similar to the SNWA. He emphasized the importance of consensus and equal representation of each entity.

Ben Hutchins, City of Sparks, stated Reno and Sparks were interested in working with the County in a mutual effort concerning water services. He said this item should be an ongoing issue on the joint meeting agendas.

Commissioner Humke commented this was not an ordinary interim study because of the impact it would have on Washoe County and other entities in the community. He remarked there were problems with the study because the gathering of information followed the policy decisions, and it should be the other way around. Commissioner Humke stated a letter should be sent to the sub-committee, with the Chairman's signature, asking for a more forgiving schedule. He confirmed the

Commissioners did not have enough time to consider this as a Board of County Commissioners subject to the Open Meeting Law.

Commissioner Galloway agreed with Commissioner Humke's comments and asked for a recommendation from Mr. Bradhurst.

Mr. Bradhurst concurred that legislative committees normally spend time collecting information before they move forward with a recommendation. He suggested the Commissioners gain input from staff, the local government elected officials, SVGID, STMGID, and other water purveyors. He stated his recommendation, at this point in the process, would be for the creation of a Regional Water Resource Acquisition, Management, and Conservation Agency or a new authority being established similar to the SNWA. He favored the first option because it would be the most effective in terms of financing, and the second option would take time to become operational.

Commissioner Galloway said, if he had to make a choice at this time, he would select a Regional Water Resource Acquisition, Management, and Conservation Agency because it was more likely to preserve the provision for a consensus. He noted he was not comfortable with a new authority being established similar to the SNWA. He stated any legislation should have a provision that the body should go to an elected board if it was not a consensus and it did not have all entities on an equal voting basis. Commissioner Galloway stressed more time was needed to work out better solutions. He said he would like to see a common table of water dedication requirements established, and the conservation piece retained at the Water Planning Commission and with the County Water Plan.

Mr. Bradhurst commented it was difficult for the officials of the SNWA to develop a water conservation ordinance that applied in all areas. He said they were able to develop the ordinance because of consensus. He explained the SNWA worked things out at the staff level and then the elected officials were briefed on the issues.

Commissioner Galloway stated he did not want to lower the quality of life for anyone in this area, and he desired to offer a menu of choices to developers regarding their needs for water.

Commissioner Larkin stated there were three fundamental issues that he had been tracking, and these must be resolved prior to any discussion about a model that would be embraced. He said the issues were as follows: stabilization of water rights prices, continuity of the product delivery, and concrete, scientific resource management. He stressed those three areas should be the focus of the sub-committee meeting on January 19, 2006. He recommended the SNWA come on that day in order for the Commissioners to meet with them. He stated the schedule was far too aggressive, and it would be impossible to get a model recommendation by that January meeting.

Chairman Weber pointed out the Commission Caucus Room was not a secret room; Commissioners had been meeting in the Caucus Room for years; and a large

amount of Commission business was conducted in that location. She explained why it would not be possible to add any items to the joint meeting agenda on January 12, 2006.

Chairman Weber commented consensus was important, and she agreed the process should be slowed down. She concurred that the discussion needed to take place first and policy would follow. She was concerned that the Legislature was doing that because it was important to gain input from the public and all entities involved.

In response to Chairman Weber, Mr. Bradhurst explained the difference between Washoe County Water Resources and Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) was Washoe County Water Resources had an integrated water resource management program that included water, wastewater, reclaimed water, remediation of the ground water, and water planning; and TMWA focused on providing the utility for water alone.

Commissioner Galloway moved that the committee be requested to consider a more forgiving schedule in order for a table to be prepared that would include problems that needed to be dealt with and allow for a legislative action to follow the needs that had been addressed. Commissioner Humke seconded the motion.

Commissioner Galloway commented without this the Board could find they were grouping too many things together in one legislative act when they could be dealt with in a different manner through a different structure. He said this would allow the Board to gain the public input on the list of tasks, which would be helpful to the Sub-Committee.

Commissioner Humke sought to amend the motion. He stated, if the Board was asking for forgiveness as to the schedule, the Board should come forward with a work product. He suggested that January through mid-March 2006 the Commission hold hearings in the service areas of SVGID, STMGID, and Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) to gain public input and to come forward with a work product that would deal with the core issues of conservation, stabilization of water rights prices, continuity of the product delivery, and concrete, scientific resource management. He said County and Legislative staffs could collaborate to bring forward a valid work product, rather than a product that could be considered rushed.

Commissioner Galloway withdrew his motion.

Following further discussion, Commissioner Galloway moved that the Board commit to holding meetings to receive public input, pursue a work product that would list tasks and vital issues, direct staff to issue a letter to that affect and ask the Legislative Committee for forgiveness in terms of the schedule, and report back to the Board. Commissioner Humke seconded the motion.

Commissioner Galloway noted the tasks would drive the legislative solution and provide vital information to the Legislature.

On call for the question, the motion passed on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Sferrazza absent.

\* \* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

---

**BONNIE WEBER**, Chairman  
Washoe County Commission

**ATTEST:**

---

**AMY HARVEY**, County Clerk  
and Clerk of the Board of  
County Commissioners

*Minutes Prepared by  
Lori Rowe, Deputy County Clerk*