

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION
RENO CITY COUNCIL
SPARKS CITY COUNCIL
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

JOINT MEETING

MONDAY

8:30 A.M.

FEBRUARY 1, 2010

PRESENT:

David Humke, Washoe County Commissioner, Chairman*

John Breternitz, Washoe County Commissioner

Kitty Jung, Washoe County Commissioner

Robert A. Cashell, City of Reno, Mayor

David Aiazzi, Reno City Councilmember

Dwight Dortch, Reno City Councilmember

Dan Gustin, Reno City Councilmember

Jessica Sferrazza, Reno City Councilmember

Sharon Zadra, Reno City Councilmember

Geno Martini, City of Sparks, Mayor

Mike Carrigan, Sparks City Councilmember

Julia Ratti, Sparks City Councilmember

Ron Schmitt, Sparks City Councilmember

Ron Smith, Sparks City Councilmember

Estela LeVario Gutierrez, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees,
President

Barbara McLaury, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees,
Vice President

Nancy Hollinger, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member

ABSENT:

Bonnie Weber, Washoe County Commissioner, Vice Chairperson

Bob Larkin, Washoe County Commissioner

Pierre Hascheff, Reno City Councilmember

Phil Salerno, Sparks City Councilmember

Ken Grein, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member

Dan Carne, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member

Barbara Clark, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Member

Scott Kelley, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member

The Commission, Board, and Councils convened at 8:35 a.m. in joint session in the Reno City Council Chamber, One East First Street, Reno, Nevada, with Mayor Cashell presiding. Also present were Washoe County Clerk Amy Harvey, Washoe County Manager Katy Simon, Washoe County Legal Counsel Melanie Foster, Reno City Clerk Lynette Jones, Reno City Manager Donna Dreska, Reno City Attorney John Kadlic, Sparks City Clerk Linda Patterson, Sparks City Manager Shaun Carey, Sparks City Attorney Chet Adams, Washoe County School District (WCSD) Superintendent Paul Dugan, and WCSD Legal Counsel Randy Drake.

** Due to technical difficulties, the first 35 minutes of the meeting was not recorded. **

Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerks called the roll for their respective entities, and the Commission, Councils, and Board conducted the following business:

10-104 AGENDA ITEM 5

Agenda Subject: “Approval of Minutes – August 17, 2009.”

On motion by Councilmember Zadra, seconded by Councilmember Gustin, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Salerno and Hascheff, Chairperson Humke, Commissioners Weber and Larkin, and Trustees Clark, Kelley, Grein and Carne absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5 be approved. It was noted the Washoe County Commission and the Washoe County School Board did not have a quorum.

10-105 AGENDA ITEM 6 – PUBLIC COMMENT

Agenda Subject: “Public Comment (three-minute time limit per person) – (Additional Public Comment on specific agenda items will be limited to three-minute time limit per person after each agenda item and must be related to the specific agenda item.) Comments to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District, and the Washoe County Commission as a whole.”

Garth Elliott discussed the current economic disaster. He felt local governments should learn from private industry and renegotiate their labor contracts. He said citizen groups should be used to help eliminate waste.

Gary Schmidt discussed his being a candidate for the Nevada State Senate and current economic problems.

8:40 a.m. Chairman Humke arrived at the meeting.

Sam Dehne said he had attended local government meetings in an attempt to keep local governments out of their current economic pickle.

Agenda Subject: “Joint update on regional economic outlook, and status report on local government actions to address revenue shortfalls. (Reno, Sparks, Washoe County, and Washoe County School District.”

John Sherman, Washoe County Finance Director, conducted a PowerPoint presentation that covered the current economic climate, the actions taken to address deficits, the revenue forecast, and the ongoing structural deficits. A copy of the presentation was placed on file with the Washoe County Clerk.

Mr. Sherman said local governments were close to the end of their ability to use their reserves to help meet budget shortfalls because long-term use of reserves was not viable.

Mr. Sherman explained how the State funding for the Washoe County School District worked, and noted how the State’s numbers were used to build the School District’s budget.

Mr. Sherman indicated there were some signs the bottom had been reached, but the revenues were not available to support the current cost structures of the various entities. He noted the majority of the costs were for employees.

In response to the call for public comment, Gary Schmidt discussed his background. He said he predicted the bubble would burst because of the artificial values placed on property by the Assessor. He stated the problem occurred across the nation, but Nevada’s problem was the worst. He said it would cost \$8-\$10 billion to bring the courts and schools back to a sustainable level.

Sam Dehne said Mr. Sherman’s presentation was excellent, but scary. He discussed the cuts he felt were needed.

** The recording of the meeting was started during the following public comment. **

Garth Elliott said he was concerned about the community. He stated he did not agree with Mr. Sherman’s assessment on how the area could climb out of the current economic mess. He said he felt using volunteers with technical expertise should be looked at, and he discussed how Josephine County, Oregon, used volunteers with its police force and Community Development to save \$250,000 a year. He stated that might not seem like much, but Josephine County’s budget was one tenth the size of Washoe County’s budget.

Councilmember Dortch pointed to the property tax projections on page 14 of Mr. Sherman’s presentation and asked if the entities were communicating with each other. He acknowledged the numbers were estimates for next year, but he wanted to know how those numbers were arrived at and why they were so different. Mr. Sherman

said the entities did communicate with one another and the County Treasurer just sent the next year's property tax forecast out to local governments.

Mr. Sherman said one of the anomalies was the School District's budget had to be built using numbers from the State instead of the local numbers, which was why the County's and the School District's numbers were different. He advised there were different circumstances within the boundaries of the Cities versus the County, which accounted for the differences in their numbers. Councilmember Dortch felt if a 15 percent decline was being projected for the City of Reno, the County's percentage should be half that. Mr. Sherman stated because the County had less commercial development and the commercial sector was hard hit, having more commercial development would account for the higher negative number for the two cities. Councilmember Dortch asked if it made sense the percentage was over double. Mr. Sherman said not necessarily, but these were initial forecasts and the numbers would be trued up once examining the parcel analysis was completed. Councilmember Dortch asked how long that would take. Mr. Sherman speculated within the next several weeks.

Councilmember Sferrazza asked what had been agreed to regarding employee concessions. Mr. Sherman replied the biggest concession was from the Washoe County Employee's Association (WCEA), which was the County's largest. He said it was negotiated that there would be no increase in the employees' wage package and there would be a 2.5 percent reduction in wages for a ten month period. He noted a lot of employees in the non-represented groups, including management, took the same reduction. He said individual employees reduced their wages even further on a voluntary basis. Councilmember Sferrazza asked if that was accomplished by furloughs. Mr. Sherman explained the voluntary reductions were simply reductions in pay for working the same hours.

Councilmember Sferrazza asked what the County was requesting of the employees going forward. Mr. Sherman replied the associations had been approached regarding pay and benefit reductions, but those reductions were subject to collective bargaining. He said discussions were just beginning with the employee associations, so the specifics were not yet available. He stated details would be discussed over the next several months. He noted the discussions would also include what growth factors would cause pay and benefits to increase.

Councilmember Sferrazza asked when a compensation and class comparison was last done. Mr. Sherman replied he did not know if there had been a concerted effort by local governments to compare their compensation and pay systems on a position-by-position basis. He noted samplings were done, and Washoe County did a pay study a year ago to see how Washoe County compared, not only to local entities, but with entities with which the County would recruit from and which would recruit from the County. He noted that study concluded the County was right on par.

Councilmember Sferrazza requested the same information from the City of Sparks. Shaun Carey, Sparks City Manager, said the three Managers had initiated

meetings regarding their labor agreements and were building a compensation survey that would stretch across all three organizations. He stated a comparison of the health plans was recently compiled.

Mr. Carey said for the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2009, the City of Sparks used a combination of measures to reduce employee expenses, which included employee's taking advantage of the PERS subsidy and leaving voluntarily, the layoffs last January, and getting favorable labor concessions from most of the City's employee associations. He said the managers and mid-managers reduced their wages 4.25 percent across the board and the City Council's reduction was in excess of that amount. He advised the fire department's contract extension included not paying the last fiscal year's cost of living adjustments (COLA's) and the police department's contract contained no COLA increase. He said because of cost and staff reductions, the City of Sparks was able to survive last year.

Mr. Carey said this year the City Council's direction was not to have any increase in employee costs, which would be done by retaining the same reductions as for the prior fiscal year. He advised that would leave a gap of some \$400,000, which would have to be met by reducing some services. He said the City Council was committed to maintaining its workforce, but understood that fiscal stability might require workforce reductions if concessions were not received.

Councilmember Aiazzi said he assumed Washoe County's and the School District's numbers would be the same percentage change, which was not what was shown on page 14 of Mr. Sherman's presentation. Gary Kraemer, Washoe County School District Chief Financial Officer, said he was not sure why the percentages were different, except the District might not accrue and write off property taxes at the same percentage as the County, which was an accounting choice made by the different entities. Councilmember Aiazzi asked if the percentage change should be the same. He understood the School District had to use the State's numbers for budgeting, but he felt in previous years the numbers were the same while now there was a 30 percent difference between the two numbers. Mr. Kraemer said he would have to meet with Mr. Sherman to figure out why the percentages were different.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked about the percentage of sales tax the County received. Mr. Sherman replied it would be somewhere in the 60 percent range if gross numbers were used. Councilmember Aiazzi indicated he was told the City of Reno received about 28 percent. He said one of those numbers would be off if the City of Reno and the County predicted the same rate of decline but the County received twice as much in sales tax. Mr. Sherman said he understood the concern regarding the confusion with the numbers, and he suggested the Finance Directors get together to provide a revised schedule with an apples-to-apples application of the numbers.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked what the State took from each entity. Mr. Sherman replied the reduction in property tax revenues primarily involved the County's operating rate and a reduction in the property tax used for capital investments for the

County and the two cities. He advised there was also a reduction in the sales tax for the two cities and the County because the State increased its collection fee. He did not recall if any revenue diversions occurred for the School District. He said over the biennium the County would lose approximately \$25 million. Councilmember Aiazzi asked how much the cities lost. Mayor Cashell felt it was probably \$5 million from the City of Reno and \$1 to \$2 million from the City of Sparks. Councilmember Aiazzi said people had to be told that a lot of the local problems were caused by the Legislature. Mr. Sherman agreed it certainly compounded the problem.

Jeff Cronk, City of Sparks Finance Director, said the State took \$450,000 in capital funding from the City of Sparks and the increase in the collection rate for sales taxes equaled \$175,000.

Mr. Kraemer explained the School District had budget reductions of \$3 million two years ago, \$10 million last year, and the budget had to be cut and fund balances reduced by \$32 million this year.

Councilmember Gustin said the statement on the Structural Deficits slide, page 16, that stated "...past growth trends are not likely to be repeated" would have a profound impact on anyone reading that statement. He stated the area's growth was precipitated by people moving from California when housing prices were high there. He asked what trends would not likely be repeated and for a sense on how that bullet point was put together. Mr. Sherman said on the revenue side, everyone knew in hindsight that there was a speculative housing bubble that built up across the country. He stated the housing boom was precipitated by very inexpensive mortgage money. He said that drove up construction jobs and produced a lot of housing that people primarily from California purchased. He said once the speculative bubble collapsed, that revenue stream ceased. He said the nation was in the worst recession in the last 50 years and typically employment would lag any recovery. He stated the conventional wisdom was jobs would not be added the way they had been added over the last decade, but would be back to the levels of the preceding two decades. He said jobs would be dampened and revenues would not be there, but there was a built-in cost structure, primarily with labor costs, which would increase costs faster than what it was believed revenues would increase. He stated that was the definition of a structural deficit. Councilmember Gustin said the trends would improve, but they would not be as heated as they were before.

Mr. Kraemer advised once the economy recovered, the 3 percent property tax cap would still be in play, while health benefit costs were projected to go up from 8 to 20 percent every year. He said the money for the School District would be dampened because of what would be received from the State due to the decrease in gaming and sales taxes.

Councilmember Gustin asked Mr. Sherman if he and his counterparts were developing the sustainable plans mentioned during Mr. Sherman's presentation. Mr. Sherman replied he did not know if they would be developed by Finance specifically, but all of the governing bodies in this room had those conversations. He said there had been

discussions with the governing bodies about cost structures needing to be changed because the revenue would not be available to pay for the current costs. He explained if the workforce was reduced, but the underlying cost structure was not changed, the costs would continue to go up. He said the cost structure needed to be realigned to fit with the anticipated revenues.

Councilmember Gustin noted 70 to 90 percent of the budget was for wages and benefits. Mr. Sherman replied health benefit costs increased faster than any other area.

Councilmember Smith asked if the 3 percent property tax cap was maintained if a house was sold under foreclosure. Mr. Sherman explained how properties were valued in Nevada. He said the property tax cap bill had a two layered cap. The 3 percent cap related only to owner-occupied residential properties, and it had to be applied for. He said if a foreclosure was bought and then occupied by a renter, the 3 percent cap would not apply; but it would if the house was owner-occupied. He said the tax cap for rental or commercial properties was 8 percent. He stated the last number he heard was 40 percent of the residential properties in Washoe County were owner-occupied.

Councilmember Zadra said regarding the sustainable plan, there was a difference in PERS between each of the entities on how employees were treated and who paid for what. She asked if the formula for PERS was the same regardless of which entity someone worked for. Mr. Sherman said all public employers were treated the same, but public employees were treated somewhat differently depending on whether or not an employee was a public safety employee. He said the only distinction was by type of job and not by governmental entity.

Councilmember Zadra suggested exploring if it would be more feasible to have a common process for all of the entities and would there be a benefit to having the same management formula. Mr. Sherman said typically most employers paid the rate with little being passed to the employees. He stated the formula of what had to be paid was driven by State law.

Councilmember Zadra asked how the governing bodies could help achieve sustainable plans. Mary Ann Parrot, City of Reno Finance Director, stated the City Council gave direction in three areas during a budget workshop held last week to address the \$15.2 million 2010/11 structural deficit. She said the first was to set aside approximately \$5 million of onetime set-aside funds that were not employee-benefit based in anticipation of decisions coming out of any special legislative session. She said the State in 2009/10 withheld City of Reno budgetary funds in the amounts of \$1.2 million as an ad velorum takeaway, \$500,000 in unfunded mandates, and \$1.2 million in increased sales tax administration fees.

Ms. Parrot said the second area was the City Council directed the City Manager to return to the employee associations to determine additional employee concessions for 2010/11. She noted the \$15.2 million deficit represented a significant

percentage of the \$180 million General Fund budget. She said the total payroll costs were approximately \$130 million in salaries and benefits and employee concessions would be approximately 11.5 percent of the payroll.

Ms. Parrot said the third area was the City Council directed staff to come back before the City Council at the end of February with an update on employee discussions to determine whether a resolution authorizing additional layoffs would be needed. She noted the City of Reno was faced with additional layoffs to assist in balancing an additional \$6 million deficit for 2009/10. She stated the City was taking a variety of approaches with regard to employee concessions to deal with the \$15.2 million deficit for 2010/11.

Councilmember Zadra felt the residents clearly needed to hear the State took several million dollars from the City of Reno along with money from the other entities. She stated she was concerned that the numbers presented to the governing bodies needed to be trued up, because she was concerned how the State would view the local governments not having the correct numbers. She stated she did not mean this as a criticism of staff because the numbers changed daily but, when such dire information included language that indicated “won’t ever recover”, that type of language was unacceptable. She acknowledged it would take awhile, but there would be a rainbow at the end. She said the fact that the numbers needed to be trued up should be noted in the report.

Mayor Cashell stated back in the 1970’s and 1980’s, gaming rebounded when there was a problem. He noted Nevada was around number seven out of the nine states that had some type of lottery or gaming when it came to collecting taxes. He stated he personally did not see gaming ever bouncing back in his lifetime.

Commissioner Jung asked what the bottom-line hit was for Washoe County as a whole in terms of the Legislature taking revenue or charging more for collecting taxes, because that action had regional effects regardless of the jurisdiction. She agreed with Councilmember Zadra that the entities’ argument that local governments could not take another hit got weaker if the entities did not even have their arms around the numbers. Mr. Sherman replied each of the entities did their own analysis and that information was not compiled for this report, but that could be done.

Commissioner Jung also agreed with Councilmember Zadra that it was speculative that the region would never be better again. She said clearly the entities needed to look at their structural deficits, but to tell the public that the area would never be prosperous again was ridiculous. She advised she asked staff to stop speculating on what future markets would look like, because she did not believe such speculation was helpful. She felt what was helpful was to be aware there was a structural deficit and that the entities were trying to work as a region to close the gap.

Commissioner Breternitz said he was an optimist, but being optimistic over the course of the next five years or so about financial projections would be a little

misleading. He felt even though it was a tough way to look at things, it was beneficial to be expecting little or no growth in revenue. He believed it would be better to be realistic rather than coming back and making further cuts.

Mr. Sherman said between the County and the two Cities, the number Commissioner Jung asked for earlier was approximately \$30 million, but the School District was in a different situation and would require more discussion regarding the nuances of that situation.

Mr. Sherman said his perspective was that this country and its economy were extremely resilient and robust. He stated the country did go through a fairly horrific period in its history but, when discussing the new normal and the rebasing of the economy, he was looking at not returning to the growth rates experienced in the 2000's; and he was talking about a constrained growth in revenue for the next five years. He felt the revenue streams would be like those from the 1990's, but would have to pay for 2010 cost structures. He said the challenge was dealing with those two things together. Councilmember Zadra appreciated that statement because it was what she had expected to see in the report. She felt no one on the dais had on rose-colored glasses and the Board, Commission and Councils had the responsibility to manage through the upcoming challenges; but the term "not ever" could not be accepted because it suggested there was no goal to shoot for. She said things needed to be put in place to resolve the current issues, but everyone needed to act today for a time when it would be better. Mr. Sherman said he felt keeping people employed was critical and jobs were the single-most important issue in this community.

Mr. Kraemer pointed out the School District cut \$3.8 million two years ago and \$10 million last year and faced a \$15 million shortfall. He stated originally the Governor requested a 10 percent cut for the rest of this fiscal year and for the next fiscal year, which added up to a \$20 million additional cut. He indicated that amount could increase significantly based on information that came out last week. He noted the School District's numbers were not normally combined with those of the other entities in Washoe County. He advised the special legislative session would control the School District's funding, which was why their numbers were not as far along as those of the other entities.

Councilmember Schmitt said talking about economic forecasting struck a nerve. He said there were many economic forecasts all with varying views. He felt it was hard for staff to give bad news, but they were saying the past 24 months had been difficult and everyone had better get ready for a decade or more of difficult times.

Councilmember Schmitt said a whole series of things had to go into economic forecasting per State law. He stated the last report he did around eight months ago took into account appreciation, depreciation, and the property tax cap. He said it was indicated it would take 35 years to get property taxes back to where they were two years ago. He stated there was very little anyone on the dais could do because everything being discussed, such as bargaining units, tax rates and tax caps, were all things that needed to

be addressed at the Legislature. Mayor Cashell said Councilmember Schmitt was absolutely correct and the Legislature tied local governments' hands years ago.

Councilmember Aiazzi felt local governments had to walk a fine line between giving the public the truth and scaring them. He felt things were back to the level they were five or six years ago. He said the comment that property values were half of what they were was only a concern if someone was going to sell at the very peak of the crash and only a 15 percent decline in property taxes was anticipated. He said any discussion should indicate it was worse than it was last year, but not as bad as it was eight years ago.

President Gutierrez felt everyone was frustrated, but everyone had to have a lot of courage and belief because it was a time to join forces and present a unified message.

10-107 AGENDA ITEM 8

Agenda Subject: "Staff Report: Review and Action on a Resolution supporting Home Rule (discussion on fiscal and non-fiscal control.) (Sparks)"

In response to the call for public comment, Gary Schmidt indicated everyone that lived in the State lived within a local jurisdiction. He said the State did not have direct constituents and did not control construction, development, or land use planning. He argued the economic cesspool the region was in was created at the local government level. He said the local governments' problems were based solely on the sprawling growth they allowed that did not pay its own way while encouraging and subsidizing the movement of California residents to Nevada, which now had to be provided for. He stated local governments had created the State's budget problems. He said the State needed to build a new economy based on farming, ranching, redesigning local governments, green energy and tourism, instead of gaming.

Steve Driscoll, Sparks Assistant City Manager, stated the staff report provided quite a bit of detail on Home Rule, which fell under the "Dillon's Rule" decision that said local governmental entities could only do what the State allowed them to do.

Mr. Driscoll said there was an Interim Committee regarding Home Rule. He noted the City of Reno had initiated a Resolution that supported local governments having more jurisdiction and more control over their day-to-day operations. He said that Resolution was mirrored by the Nevada League of Cities at its annual meeting. He stated a revised Resolution was provided as a point of discussion.

Mr. Driscoll advised there were different ways of doing business and each entity had its own rules on what could and could not be done and what fees, services and taxes they could or could not adjust or bring as new based on what the State said. He

stated this item was intended to be for the entities to talk among themselves about what the State was doing or thought about doing, and where the entities would like to go.

Councilmember Sferrazza said this was discussed at the League of Cities, and she felt the focus would be to tackle one issue at a time. She understood the Committee wanted to look at the procedural aspect of Home Rule first. She felt the Resolution was one issue and the other was the pattern of the State Legislature diverting local revenues and placing mandates on local governments.

Commissioner Breternitz said he understood for local governments to get Home Rule, it had to be done by the Legislature. He imagined some thought had been given to what was in it for the Legislature to give local governments Home Rule. He felt that was one of the tools that could be used to get somewhere with the Legislature. Mr. Driscoll responded "Dillon's Rule" would require the Legislature to act to give local governments permissions. He said what was in it for the Legislature was twofold: the Legislature spent a lot of time on things that had nothing to do with State operations or control and, from a fiscal standpoint, the discussion was on taxation and fee changes where the Legislators were reluctant to act because they perceived it was not their jurisdiction to do so; and that the local elected officials should decide certain local fees and should enjoy or suffer the political consequence for doing so. Mayor Cashell said he was willing to take the heat for raising a fee or tax.

Councilmember Schmitt said this was the first time as a local leader he had been blamed for the State's problems. He stated if that scenario was followed, each person at this table was responsible for the huge national debt, and he refused to participate in that statement.

Councilmember Schmitt said the issue of Home Rule was foreign to colleagues around the country. He felt it should be understood that Home Rule would not be achieved in his lifetime, but it should continue to be pursued.

Councilmember Sferrazza elaborated that the diversion of local revenue was affecting public safety and the Legislature was essentially taking away from the public safety local governments provided to their citizens. She said the School District was also being hurt in the process. She said the message should be gotten out to the public and the Legislators should be aware of the impact of their actions.

Mayor Cashell said if local governments were not given the mechanism to pay for Home Rule, then the State should keep it.

Councilmember Sferrazza asked if the Resolution needed to be adopted. Mr. Driscoll replied it was meant to be a point of discussion, and it was up to the elected bodies whether or not they wanted to adopt the Resolution.

Mr. Driscoll advised the spelling of the words "Intergovernmental" and "Nevada" in the Resolution's title needed to be corrected.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Sferrazza, seconded by Councilmember Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Hascheff absent, it was ordered that the Resolution for Agenda Item 8 be adopted with the above spelling corrections.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Schmitt, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Salerno absent, it was ordered that the Resolution for Agenda Item 8 be adopted with the above spelling corrections.

For the Washoe County Commission, on motion by Commissioner Breternitz, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried with Commissioners Larkin and Weber absent, it was ordered that the Resolution for Agenda Item 8 be adopted with the above spelling corrections.

The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

AGENDA ITEMS 9-13

Mayor Cashell stated because of the meeting in Carson City, he proposed scheduling another meeting to hear Agenda Items 9 through 13.

Councilmember Sferrazza asked if Item 12 regarding the Flood Control Project was time sensitive. Ms. Duerr said this could be postponed for a week, but she had presented the information to the Councils and the Commission and a vote could be taken to support the key provisions.

Councilmember Ratti felt there was some urgency regarding Item 9 for the Community Assistance Center.

10-108 AGENDA ITEM 12

Agenda Subject: “Staff Report: Discussion and possible direction on the proposed Summary of Key Provisions for a new Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between the cities of Reno and Sparks, and Washoe County to implement a new Flood Management Authority, including the financing, construction, ownership, operation and maintenance of the Truckee River Flood Management Project. (Truckee River Flood Management Project)”

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Sferrazza, seconded by Councilmember Gustin, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Hascheff absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be accepted.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Ratti, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Salerno absent and Councilmember Schmitt voting “no,” it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be accepted.

For the Washoe County Commission, on motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Breternitz, which motion duly carried with Commissioners Larkin and Weber absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be accepted.

* * * * *

10:17 a.m. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the Board, and the Councils, on motion by Councilmember Aiazzi, seconded by Commissioner Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Salerno and Hascheff, Commissioners Weber and Larkin, and Trustees Clark, Kelley, Grein and Carne absent, the meeting was adjourned. It was noted the Washoe County School Board did not have a quorum.

ATTEST:

DAVID E. HUMKE, Chairman
Washoe County Commission

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

ATTEST:

ROBERT A. CASHELL, Mayor
City of Reno

LYNNETTE R. JONES, City Clerk
City of Reno

ATTEST:

GENO MARTINI, Mayor
City of Sparks

LINDA K. PATTERSON, City Clerk
City of Sparks

ATTEST:

ESTELA GUTIERREZ, Board of Trustees
President, Washoe County School District

NANCY HOLLINGER, Clerk
Washoe County School District

*Minutes Prepared by
Jan Frazzetta, Washoe County Deputy Clerk*