

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

JOINT MEETING

MONDAY

8:30 A.M.

APRIL 2, 2012

PRESENT:

Bob Larkin, Washoe County Commissioner, Chairman  
Bonnie Weber, Washoe County Commissioner, Vice Chairperson  
John Breternitz, Washoe County Commissioner \*\*  
David Humke, Washoe County Commissioner  
Kitty Jung, Washoe County Commissioner

Robert A. Cashell, City of Reno, Mayor  
David Aiazzi, Reno City Councilmember\*  
Dan Gustin, Reno City Councilmember  
Pierre Hascheff, Reno City Councilmember\*  
Sharon Zadra, Reno City Councilmember

Geno Martini, City of Sparks, Mayor  
Mike Carrigan, Sparks City Councilmember  
Ed Lawson, Sparks City Councilmember  
Julia Ratti, Sparks City Councilmember  
Ron Schmitt, Sparks City Councilmember  
Ron Smith, Sparks City Councilmember

Ken Grein, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, President  
Scott Kelley, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Member  
Barbara McLaury, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Member

ABSENT:

Dwight Dortch, Reno City Councilmember  
Jessica Sferrazza, Reno City Councilmember  
John Mayer, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Vice President  
Dan Carne, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Member  
Barbara Clark, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Member  
Estela LeVario Gutierrez, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees,  
Member

The Commission, Board, and Councils convened at 8:32 a.m. in joint session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex,

1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, with Mayor Cashell presiding. Also present were Washoe County Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent, Washoe County Manager Katy Simon, Washoe County Legal Counsel Paul Lipparelli, Reno City Clerk Lynnette Jones, Reno City Manager Andrew Clinger, Reno City Attorney John Kadlic, Sparks City Clerk Linda Patterson, Sparks City Manager Shaun Carey, Sparks City Attorney Shirle Eiting, Washoe County School District (WCSD) Superintendent Heath Morrison, and WCSD Legal Counsel Randy Drake.

\*\* Commissioner Breternitz participated by telephone.

**12-293            AGENDA ITEM 3 – PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Agenda Subject: “Public Comment (three-minute time limit per person) – (Additional Public Comment on specific agenda items ill be limited to three-minute time limit per person after each agenda item and must be related to the specific agenda item.) Comments are to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, the Washoe County Commission, Board of Fire Commissioners for Sierra Fire Protection District and the Board of Fire Commissioners for Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District as a whole.”**

Mike Chern, Caughlin Ranch Homeowners Association Treasurer, stated that Mike Heffner spoke at the Board of County Commissioner’s meeting last week voicing concerns about potential degradation of fire and emergency services resulting from deconsolidation. He pointed out that Caughlin Ranch had about 1,900 homes in the City and 300 homes in the County. What needed to be recognized was that those 300 homes in the County were in the heart of Caughlin Ranch, but would be responded to from a station in Verdi. He spoke of a fire near his home that burned to the ground. He did not know which fire department responded, he just knew that they handled the situation. He said the Association was not taking a position with either the City or the County; their position was simply that they had an expectation of continued or increased service levels. Mr. Chern believed that increased regionalization for fire services was in the best interests of all northern Nevada citizens.

Sam Dehne spoke about the fire departments and firefighter situation. He thought Reno had the best fire fighting operation in America that was now being disbanded, which he strongly disagreed with. He commented on Animal Services and Senior Services.

**\*8:38 a.m.**      Councilmember Aiazzi arrived.

Jon Eric Johnson stated that he would be directly impacted by the increase in taxes and the diminishment of services and fire protection. He informed the Board, Commission and Council that he was a fire captain with 16 years of experience. He commented on the non-cooperation of all levels of government. Mr. Johnson thought the deconsolidation was unnecessary due to the Regionalization Plan that was a result of

cooperation between the City and County. The Plan was sustainable and would improve services and training. He voiced his concerns about standing up the new fire department and what that meant to him as a homeowner. Mr. Johnson suggested that the entities take the time to review the facts and do what was right for the community.

Connie McMullen spoke about her concerns with regard to the funding of senior programs in the County. She said that Senior Services provided funding for the City of Reno, the City of Sparks and the unincorporated area. Ms. McMullen believed if elder programs were going to be sustained in the future, another funding source would need to be found, because there were over 5,000 senior citizens receiving services in the County and that number was going to increase.

Donna Clontz, Reno Senior Citizens Advisory Board member, spoke about continued funding for senior services. She said those funds amounted to \$230,000 and that allocation brought matches from federal and State sources. She commended all the entities for meeting today because many of the services performed by each entity were regional and worked best in partnership with each other. She talked about the State tax structure and how stable and fair sources of funding were needed for services.

Steven Perez found it ironic that the City of Reno was upset because they were being asked to provide fire and medical services to areas where the City did not receive taxes. He indicated that the Sierra Fire Protect District (SFPD) provided fire protection and paramedic coverage to both the Reno and Truckee Meadows areas without compensation for approximately seven years, due to Reno's annexation policies. In his 35 years in the fire service, he had never heard of a fire service entity threatening to not provide service to anyone. He spoke about the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's (TMFPD) Station 14 and how that Station could be used as leverage. Mr. Perez noted that the recently completed fire study recommended dividing all the areas in the region into first-end station response areas.

**12-294            AGENDA ITEM 4 – AGENDA**

**Agenda Subject: “Approval of Agenda – April 2, 2012.”**

Councilmember Aiazzi felt there needed to be additional public comment after Agenda Item 10 and prior to Agenda Item 11.

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Councilmember Zadra, seconded by Councilmember Aiazzi, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Dortch and Sferrazza, and Trustees Carne, Mayer, Clark, and Gutierrez absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

**12-295            AGENDA ITEM 5 – MINUTES**

**Agenda Subject: “Approval of Minutes - February 6, 2012.”**

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Dortch and Sferrazza, and Trustees Carne, Mayer, Clark, and Gutierrez, absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5 be approved.

**12-296            AGENDA ITEM 6 – TRUCKEE RIVER FLOOD MANAGEMENT PROJECT**

**Agenda Subject: “Discussion and potential direction to staff and possible approval of the proposed First Amendment to the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement (Truckee River Flood Management Project) as it relates to the voting structure of the Board of Directors of the Flood Management Authority, and other matters properly related thereto. (Washoe County) (For possible action)”**

Greg Salter, Deputy District Attorney, noted a few errors were discovered within the first amendment approved by Washoe County and the City of Sparks. He said there were some additional opportunities for consolidate when important issues needed to have a supermajority vote. One of the errors regarded the Master Plan and inclusion in development codes. He noted a correction of significant importance regarded the Local Preferred Plan, which was a plan to be filed with the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). He also discussed the Chapter 377B plan, which would have all facilities built with the infrastructure tax. Mr. Salter said the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) needed to be presented to each governing body before it could be approved, and suggested all three plans be moved into the supermajority voting category. He defined how many votes would be required under a supermajority structure. Once prioritizing was started and projects were identified to be built, he said the Flood Management Authority (Authority) would enter into an agreement with the City of Reno or Sparks to finance the project.

Susan Ball Rothe, City of Reno Deputy Attorney, stated when this matter came before the City Council there was no mention of action pertaining to certain things being relocated or already eliminated, which was a concern. She presented those to the City Council and spoke with Mr. Salter. When she pointed out her concerns with the regulatory section, Mr. Salter informed her that section was incorrectly omitted. Her other concern was that the adoption of the amendment of the infrastructure tax plan had been eliminated. She stated Mr. Salter indicated that would be added back in, which she confirmed had happened. Ms. Rothe remarked the governing bodies were to determine the voting structure and that there would be some situations or actions that would require four out of six in favor, or five out of six in favor, in order to pass. If the voting structure

was a majority and not a supermajority, there could be a situation where a matter would pass without a representative from one entity being present.

Councilmember Smith said if items were on the agenda that required a supermajority could action be taken if all members were not present. Mr. Salter stated that was correct. Councilmember Smith asked if this needed to be reapproved since the County and the City of Sparks had already approved the agreement. Because the corrections were minor, Mr. Salter suggested re-approval could be done at this meeting. He noted that the Sparks City Attorney had not seen the changes, so they may want to review it before voting. Councilmember Smith inquired how the changes occurred. Mr. Salter explained that he reviewed the Interlocal Agreement from October 2010 before the change was made to go to unanimous voting, but that was when things got mixed up. He confirmed this agreement was the same as the original agreement presented in October 2010 with two exceptions; if there was a major change to the Interlocal Agreement, the Authority would be taken out of the loop for voting. The reason being if Sparks and the County, who created the entity and delegated some of their legislative powers to them, wanted something changed it should be done. The second item was to take the approval of the budget, which used to be in the supermajority category, and move that to a simple majority vote. If passed, Councilmember Smith asked if the agreement would need to return to the Authority. Mr. Salter stated that was correct.

Shirle Eiting, City of Sparks Legal Counsel, stated they would prefer to review this and brief the City Council.

Councilmember Ratti asked if everyone would have to be present under the new rules. Mr. Salter stated if it was a supermajority item, an affirmative vote from five members was required.

Councilmember Gustin asked if it was taken into consideration for a majority vote that an affirmative or negative vote would be needed from each of the entities, because one entity could have four in favor and two opposed, and the item would still pass. Mr. Salter stated that could occur in a majority vote scenario. He said this arrangement was engineered so the important things all three governments should sign off on would be moved into the supermajority category. It was the hope that the supermajority scenario would prevent one entity from not having a say. Councilmember Gustin stated his focus was on the budget, which apparently could be approved with a simple majority. Mr. Salter stated that was correct because it was required per State law.

Paul Lipparelli, County Legal Counsel, stated the approval of the budget itself was a majority vote; however, the CIP was a supermajority item, and no budget process could operate unless the CIP was in place and approved by the supermajority.

Councilmember Gustin stated if there was a supermajority vote approved by the Authority, it would have to go to each entity and be approved by each entity. Mr. Salter indicated there was one category where it would require approval by a governing

body, and that would happen if the Authority decided to implement Master Plan amendments or amendments that involved development code changes.

Councilmember Carrigan stated those changes would then go back to the entity for a vote and return to the Authority; however, one person on the Authority could stop the action by voting no. Mr. Salter stated that was correct. Ms. Rothe stated it could be brought to the three entities first and then brought to the Authority.

Councilmember Aiazzi stated when the Flood Authority was being formed, the choice was given to have a unanimous voting structure or look at representation. He said there was no other Board in the community that was represented two, two and two; it was usually population based or based on another assessment ensuring equal responsibility. This Board was given taxing authority, which meant they could raise taxes that could go toward the School District without a vote from any other entity. He said that was the discussion, whether six individuals could decide or whether the Board could be expanded and have the base more equal along representation whether by valuation or population. Councilmember Aiazzi thought this was coming forward because of problems at the Authority; however, these changes would not fix those problems because there were still two members of the Authority that were consistently voting no on certain issues and two different members consistently voting no on other matters. He said the Flood Project was moving forward and still working with the Corps and indicated that \$100,000,000 had been spent on flood control locally. He said he did not have confidence in the Authority to come forward and tax and because of the change in the Corps stance, things needed to be changed. Councilmember Aiazzi stated he would not support this unless representation was discussed.

Mr. Lipparelli did not agree with the notion that this had to go back to the Authority for endorsement. If the entities who created the Authority voted to change the structure, he said the structure was changed and, if that structural change included taking the Authority out of the process of approving amendments to the Interlocal Agreement, then it was his belief it would happen without the Authority's endorsement.

Councilmember Lawson asked if the other two Legal Counsels agreed with Mr. Lipparelli.

John Kadlic, Reno City Attorney, stated that the City of Reno would like to analyze the situation and recommended the Council not vote on this item today. Ms. Eiting concurred and said that the City of Sparks would prefer to review the voting structure.

Commissioner Jung questioned if there would be a discussion in terms of the voting structure for the Authority. She felt the entities would meet again, but nothing would be accomplished. She remarked that the funds needed to be transferred and a Director was needed so that projects could be built and demonstrate to the Corps that the region was serious in regard to flood control.

Councilmember Smith disagreed with Councilmember Carrigan and thought issues should go to the entities first and then to the Authority. He said everyone had a stake in flood control, but felt that Sparks had one of the biggest areas of concern for flooding. He read from a January 2012 newspaper article where it stated that the Reno City Council put off a vote that would change the voting structure of the Authority. The article continued by stating the Corps had changed the project from a 117-year protection level to a 50-year protection level. He commented that the Authority never said they would not replace the Virginia Street Bridge; in fact, they funded the design and visioning process. The change in voting structure would not change any of the projects being planned for future flooding. He said the Authority did not have the power to tax; however, the State allowed them the authority to assess fees to raise funds for the project. Councilmember Smith said the current voting structure was not working because they were basically fighting over the issuance of a contract to hire an Executive Director, that by consensus vote, was hired last October. The last offer from the City of Reno was a four-month contract, which was rejected by the Authority and the Acting Executive Director. He confirmed that the City of Sparks and the County were committed to the project and committed to a full partnership with the Corps. He asked that the City of Reno put this project back on track.

Sparks Mayor Martini thought Washoe County was the most affected by flooding and felt that the Authority should be made up of representatives from Washoe County.

Katy Simon, County Manager, commented that a great deal of analysis had gone into the proposed voting representation structure with 13 different models being analyzed. She believed that Reno Mayor Cashell thought the Senatorial model worked best. She explained that the County was not prepared to bring that analysis forward to the entities.

Commissioner Humke asked for a description of the affect a delay would have on some issues. Currently, he said there was no director of the Authority and the public wanted joint meetings to hopefully come to a resolution on several of the issues.

Jay Aldean, Acting Flood Project Director, stated that the Authority had been working with the Corps. He said he would soon attend a meeting with the Corps and would ask some difficult questions. Regarding the Flood Project staff and their frustration, he thought the Authority's failure to nominate anyone as a director had been difficult for staff and difficult to receive further funding, because the Authority could not be stood-up without a director. As far as moving and planning, staff was working on a plan to move forward with or without the Corps.

Ken Grein, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees President, stated that the School District had huge concerns regarding their bus yards, which covered over 100 facilities. He said schools had been through flooding before and had been financially disastrous.

Councilmember Schmitt stated this had been going on since 1998, and he wondered how many unanimous votes occurred. Mr. Aldean stated he had heard approximately 1,300 unanimous votes had been taken. Councilmember Schmitt stated there had been that many unanimous votes previously, but we were down to one that was not.

Councilmember Aiazzi agreed with Councilmember Smith that everyone was affected, but when it came to taxing, others would be affected that were not affected by flooding. The Authority could put a fee on everyone in Washoe County, and he believed that was where representation came into play. He said it was not so much as what got built, but who would pay for it and right now it was paid out of sales tax, partly through a fee Sparks placed on their sewer bills. The item that stated the Virginia Street Bridge replacement was put on an agenda for Flood Control in order to transfer funds to the City of Reno to build the bridge, but it was taken off the agenda by the Chair and not discussed. He confirmed that the City of Reno was committed to flood control.

Councilmember Aiazzi stated that the City was so committee that two members went to Sacramento and told the Corps they would support their position for a 50-year plan, which omitted portions of downtown Reno. He said over 1,300 unanimous votes occurred, but now because a few were not unanimous, the rules were being questioned. He was upset there was not a list of projects that needed to be completed or the costs for those projects. Councilmember Aiazzi thought there needed to be discussion about representation on the Authority and if the fees would be levied. The first concern of the taxpayers was if the Authority could levy fees, the public wanted to have a strong hold over how that could happen. In this scenario, only one person from the City of Sparks would have to vote to raise fees everywhere, or one person from the County or City of Reno, which was not even close to a majority of the representation on the City Council.

Chairman Larkin asked counsel if the motion Mr. Salter recommended met with approval. Mr. Lipparelli stated Mr. Salter conferred with Ms. Rothe on the changes, but it was his understanding that the City of Sparks had not had an opportunity to review the changes. He said the District Attorney's Office was satisfied with the motion and the County could take action.

Commissioner Jung asked Mr. Aldean when the upcoming meeting with the Corps was scheduled. Mr. Aldean stated that the meeting was scheduled for April 9, 2012. Commissioner Jung asked how much money Sparks had raised for flood projects. Shaun Carey, Sparks City Manager, replied that the fee charged was specifically for the improvement of the North Truckee Drain and had raised about \$8 million of the estimated \$50 million project.

Commissioner Jung stated she was not prepared to vote on this because it did not solve the current problems. Due to the dysfunction of the Authority, she made a request during the last meeting to have a professional mediator. She stated there was a professional mediation service in the Truckee Meadows that offered their services for

free. Commissioner Jung reiterated she would not support the new voting structure since it would not solve the problems being faced at this time.

Commissioner Weber questioned who authorized two members of the Flood Project to speak with the Corps about a 50-year project. Councilmember Aiazzi replied that he contacted the Corps because he was not receiving information from staff. He went with no authority or message from the Flood Project.

Commissioner Humke made a motion to approve Agenda Item 6. Chairman Larkin seconded the motion. Commissioner Humke thought the public should be informed that the County was taking steps to move forward in order for the funds to be transferred. Commissioner Jung stated she would not support the motion.

Mayor Cashell clarified the motion was in reference to the voting structure and not the make-up of the Authority. Commissioner Humke stated that was correct. Chairman Larkin stated it was as the agenda specified.

Commissioner Breternitz stated he was prepared to move ahead and thought the structure did not need to be changed.

On call for the vote, the motion passed 4 to 1 with Commissioner Jung voting “no.”

Councilmember Lawson agreed with Legal Counsel. Fundamentally, he said the changes were not that significant. However, from a business sense, if he was the Corps and had 50 suitors requesting money from them and one of those suitors could not agree on anything, they would be placed on the bottom of the list. He thought egos should be put aside and consider what was best for the citizens of the County.

Councilmember Carrigan agreed that Legal Counsel should review this more closely. He thought it should go to the Authority first and then come before the entities.

Ms. Eiting recommended the Sparks City Council defer voting on this item to allow Counsel time to review.

Councilmember Gustin stated he would defer to Legal Counsel, because the representative and the City Attorney both said they wanted to review the document further. Mr. Kadlic confirmed that he wanted to review everything including the voting structure and the make-up of the Authority.

Councilmember Aiazzi understood he was the one holding things up. He stated he brought up numerous issues to the Authority about different items and not once did the Authority deem it appropriate to discuss those items. The Authority wanted to run around and change the rules without talking about the substantive arguments that he made. He said he would continue to vote no until the Authority discussed the issues.

Councilmember Smith said the Flood Project was presently a dysfunctional group, but felt that Councilmember Aiazzi was not correct in some of his statements.

**\*9:45 a.m.** Councilmember Hascheff arrived.

There was no further action on this item.

**12-297      AGENDA ITEM 7 – COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE CENTER**

**Agenda Subject: “Discussion and potential direction to staff regarding the Community Assistance Center. (City of Reno) (For possible action)”**

Jodi Royal-Goodwin, City of Reno Housing and Neighborhood Development Administrator, stated that the Community Assistance Center (CAC) had been funded through a pilot program that dedicated a share of property tax equivalent from each jurisdiction, which helped to stabilize the operation at the CAC. She explained that a commitment was being sought from the three jurisdictions to include: 1 cent from the County and one-half cent from the City of Reno and the City of Sparks, which was outlined in the staff report. Ms. Royal-Goodwin noted staff was also looking at a dedicated funding source going forward, which was the initiation of the pilot program.

Commissioner Humke asked why there was a disparity between the contribution from Washoe County and the two cities. Ms. Royal-Goodwin indicated that staff was given that direction by the three jurisdictions during a 2009 joint meeting. Commissioner Humke stated that times had changed and moved to reduce the County’s contribution by 50 percent.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked if the proposal was for all Washoe County residents to pay 1 cent in property tax and all residents of the two Cities would pay one-half cent. Ms. Royal-Goodwin replied it would be the equivalent of. Councilmember Aiazzi said of the 1 cent that went to the County, 75 percent of the one-half cent would already be paid by City residents, which meant they would bear most of the cost.

Councilmember Schmitt said one-half cent of property taxes came from the Cities residents and 1 cent came from County residents and asked if that came from the General Fund or property taxes. Katy Simon, County Manager, stated the County transferred that from funds that were in the Social Services Fund. It was 1 cent of the tax rate that was already imposed and diverted for this purpose. She said there was about \$30 million spent a year on Social Services countywide, but it was not a line-item tax.

Councilmember Ratti stated a very different spirit was present the last time this was discussed. She said it was determined to obtain money and felt each jurisdiction could have the flexibility to do what they could with the challenges faced by the budgets. Councilmember Ratti moved to keep the rate the same, because she did not

think the environment was ripe for an in-depth conversation to solve this problem and suggested maintaining the current level of funding until there could be a long-term solution.

Mayor Cashell asked if there was a second to Commissioner Humke's motion to reduce the County's portion from 1 cent to one-half cent. There was no second, therefore, the motion died.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Ratti, seconded by Councilmember Schmitt, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the City of Sparks maintain the current level of equivalency of one-half cent of property tax.

Commissioner Weber asked how much did the Social Services Department commit to the CAC. Ms. Simon replied that the County provided three full-time equivalent (FTE) staff people and approximately \$30 million of support to indigents, which included homeless people.

Kevin Schiller, Social Services Director, stated that \$30 million was dedicated in direct services to support the indigent population. He noted that Washoe County currently funded 50 percent of that cost from the Children's Services Division and 50 percent from the Adult Services Division. He confirmed there were three FTE employees to support the case management. He said emergency assistance was also funded as part of the \$30 million and recently transitioned to more of a Transitional Housing Program. Currently, 30 direct client referrals from the CAC were being served, which was tied over to the performance outcomes within the current contract.

Commissioner Weber stated none of that information was included in the staff report. She noted every cent may not be going to the CAC, but she thought there was a large portion of County staff, time and financial support that went to them. She stated that she could not support a motion when every department within Washoe County was being reduced.

Paul Lipparelli, Washoe County Legal Counsel, stated the agenda allowed the Board to give direction to staff. He assumed the motion was to direct staff to proceed with maintaining the funding level.

Commissioner Humke stated the County was contributing at an extremely disparate level already even before the cash transfer.

For Washoe County, on motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Breternitz, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Humke voting "no," it was ordered that Washoe County continue to provide the 1 cent property tax to maintain the services of the CAC.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Hascheff seconded by Councilmember Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Sferrazza

and Dortch absent, it was ordered that the City of Reno maintain their existing funding levels along with the grant money.

Councilmember Schmitt stated it was important for residents of the incorporated areas to understand that one-third of their property tax bill went to the General Fund of the County, which were bulk services that the whole County received. He said people were confused with the State tax structure, and he thought it was time to study where taxes came from, where they went and that a large portion of the County's budget came from property taxes associated with incorporated residents.

**12-298            AGENDA ITEM 8 – COMMUNITY TRIAGE CENTER**

**Agenda Subject: “Discussion and potential direction to staff regarding the Community Triage Center at the Community Assistance Center. (City of Reno) (For possible action)”**

Jodi Royal-Goodwin, City of Reno Housing and Neighborhood Development Administrator, stated that the West Care Community Triage Center (CTC) was located on the campus of the Community Assistance Center (CAC) and for four years had provided medically assistance stabilization services to individuals recovering from substance abuse and/or trying to be stabilized for a psychiatric condition. Previously, the CTC had been funded through a formula that included two-thirds hospital and local jurisdiction funding, matched by one-third of funding from the State of Nevada through Adult Mental Health Services, but the hospital funding contract had expired the end of Fiscal Year 2011/12. There had been a proposed budget, which was attached to the staff report, related to recommended funding streams, or potential funding streams, which included the match. Ms. Royal-Goodwin was requesting if there was any desire and/or direction from the three jurisdictions related to a commitment for funding this activity.

Commissioner Humke stated there was nothing attached to the staff report. He moved to continue this item since all the materials were not distributed.

Councilmember Aiazzi explained that the hospital funding went away due to the bonding commitment hospitals had with the City of Reno. Mayor Cashell indicated the State passed a statute that they had to do something and then all the hospitals agreed to work with the City. Councilmember Aiazzi said he spoke with one of the hospitals who disclosed this was not paying off for them. He said by doing the triage outside of emergency rooms money would be saved. He asked if an analysis had been conducted to determine if that was a true statement.

Amy Roukie, West Care Regional Vice-President, stated she currently operated the CTC on Record Street. She said a significant analysis had been completed in combination with working with local partners to compare what the CTC did in comparison to the hospitals. A number of the services provided by the CTC were in lieu of the emergency room. She said the majority of the referrals were self-referrals because in the past patients had come from the emergency room; however, now the patients went directly to the CTC. She said when patients stayed at the CTC, not only were they being

medically stabilized, but were also being connected with community resources, housing, treatment services, food, clothing and shelter. She indicated that a number of the serial inebriate population was no longer on the streets.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked if there had been an analysis on the dollars spent. Ms. Roukie stated that had been done on a number of levels. One report related to the serial inebriate population and saw that over a 12-month period there was a \$6 million cost to the community and the hospitals, versus \$1 million for the CTC. The CTC charged approximately \$300 for treatment per day versus \$1,500 to \$2,000 per day charged by a hospital.

Commissioner Jung inquired on the likelihood that this population had private insurance. Kevin Schiller, Washoe County Social Services Director, stated that this population was 99.9 percent uninsured and qualified as the indigent population. If those citizens were admitted to emergency rooms, Commissioner Jung asked who paid for their hospital bills. Mr. Schiller replied that Renown Hospital would be the hospital for their admission. He explained there was an eligibility process with the hospitals, and the bills would be submitted to Social Services, and then based on eligibility, Social Services would pay the bill. He explained that when law enforcement responded to a call that dealt with someone intoxicated or mentally ill, they tried to move the CTC into the middle since it would save law enforcement time and allow them to collaboratively respond better.

Commissioner Jung stated that the whole County paid for the indigent population. Mr. Schiller stated that was correct, and as Ms. Roukie indicated, one of the issues the County consistently struggled with in the budget was how to manage those cost savings and reductions in the indigent population with the hospitals. Currently, staff was working on ways to serve that population and adjust rates. Typically, Mr. Schiller stated the County paid a percentage of the billable charges. He indicated that he would be going before the County Commission to move toward a validated rate, which would be a Medicaid rate structure and would have a negative impact to the hospitals on what the County was paying in terms of those costs. Mr. Schiller stated that the validated rate structure would have a direct financial impact to Renown. Commissioner Jung asked if the County paid at the level that Renown demanded. Mr. Schiller replied that the County paid at the percentage of eligibility for whatever the bill was. Commissioner Jung questioned why the hospitals were not funding the CTC since it seemed their one-third share was cheaper in the long run. Mr. Schiller stated there had been dialogue with the local hospitals, but the hospitals had been trying to analyze in terms of how the clients were circulating.

Councilmember Ratti thought the initiation of the project was a “pilot program” to see if there could be an impact on serving the hardest clients at a lower cost and asked if the pilot program had time to prove itself. Mr. Schiller stated as a Social Services Director and, dealing with this population, the program was effective and was an efficient way to spend taxpayer dollars. He said when this program was initiated it was centered on that medical clearance component for the mentally ill and severely chronic

client. As budgets reduced, it had become more difficult to be positive, in terms of how to fund programs. He said the staff report outlined that \$190,000 was projected to be spent through the end of the fiscal year, which was for direct medical costs.

Councilmember Ratti stated there had been some additional layers added to train the community about citizens in need of social services. She supported this program, but thought the information needed to demonstrate spending this money now to save significant money later was not in the staff report. Mr. Schiller stated he was reviewing the CTC budget between all the jurisdictions. Councilmember Ratti stated it was not known where the hospitals were at this point on their share, and asked about the State funding. Mr. Schiller stated the State was going to use the match and continue to fund for the next fiscal year.

Commissioner Humke stated that the staff report implied that the State was withdrawing or reducing their funding. Mr. Schiller stated the County provided a match to assist with that funding, also there were several pass-downs that occurred in the last legislative session, which would have a direct impact on the department's budget, but there was always a question mark as to the stabilization of the funding.

Ms. Roukie indicated the funding was secured through the State for the next two years. In conversations with the hospitals, she said although no commitment had been made, her understanding was if the jurisdictions contributed their funds, the hospitals would be willing to contribute their third per the intent of the 2006/07 legislative session.

Commissioner Humke commented that the State had not been bashful about taking Washoe County funds from medical programs and wondered if the State would withdraw their funding once the new budget year began. Mr. Schiller said those legislative pass-downs would have about a \$3 million hit on the department's budget. In this specific line item, his understanding was that it was solid, but everything impacted everything else. Commissioner Humke wondered if a conditional motion could be made on behalf of the County to wait and change the budget if necessary if the State requested more funds from the County.

Councilmember Schmitt stated this was a State legislative unfunded mandate to Washoe County. Ms. Royal-Goodwin indicated it was not an unfunded mandate, but if the CTC did not operate, the \$500,000 committed to the operation would be lost. Councilmember Schmitt stated it was a two-thirds unfunded mandate. Ms. Roukie said the State provided a match to what was defined as a need in the community. She remarked that the CTC originated in southern Nevada, based on the crisis in the emergency rooms with the over-crowding of the behavioral-health clientele.

Councilmember Schmitt understood that the hospitals contributed two-thirds because it saved them money. Ms. Roukie stated that was correct because they were intending to save money by not having that clientele in their emergency rooms. However, Councilmember Schmitt said it was determined during the experiment that it

did not save them money, so now they wanted the taxpayers of Washoe County to pick up those costs. Ms. Roukie did not believe that was correct. She believed they were saving money but there were many contributing factors that caused them to see this type of clientele in their emergency rooms.

Councilmember Gustin believed in this model and studies had shown a tremendous amount of savings accomplished by triage centers and taking care of the serial inebriate, which was a huge problem across the country. He said the cycle of recidivism had to be broken and this model helped to do that.

Mr. Schiller stated as the jurisdictions reviewed the numbers and evaluated the program, he requested that continuum of care be considered. A key component was how to move from cash assistance and an emergency assistance process to a transitional housing component. He said there were clients being directly referred out of the CAC, which became part of the transitional housing. He defined the CTC as a component of continuum of care.

Councilmember Ratti stated this was a proactive, collaborative project and seemed to be working and saving taxpayer dollars. She said a way had to be established to maintain the funding, be a good partner to the State and the hospitals in order for this project to continue and savings realized.

Councilmember Hascheff stated this was a great program and felt it was critical to move forward and not lose State funding. He asked if staff was looking for direction from the jurisdictions to find a way to provide the local match. Ms. Royal-Goodwin said staff was seeking a desire on behalf of the jurisdictions to fund the program and direction on how to make it work and then return with the final plan.

Mr. Schiller stated Renown was the primary hospital that served indigent clients. Between the three hospitals, the percentage was set for the hospitals and indigent, but Renown and St. Mary's were the primary hospitals. Councilmember Aiazzi asked if Washoe County refunded those hospitals 40 percent. Mr. Schiller explained that he would review the bills for eligibility and, based on billable charge, those would be approved, and Washoe County would pay 40 percent of that cost for both Renown and St. Mary's. Councilmember Aiazzi stated when Washoe Medical Center was sold by the County, there was an agreement in place that they would do indigent care for cost. Mr. Schiller explained one of the issues they always struggled with was rising costs. He was trying to evaluate a new process and find a third-party vendor that would use the Medicaid rate as the base-validated rate and then any percentage adjusted above that would be to help meet their need in terms of meeting that cost. Councilmember Aiazzi asked if it was fair to make both hospitals pay the same amount when Renown made the deal. Mr. Schiller said Renown was the largest service provider for indigents and were the most financially impacted. He said the County paid the same rate for St. Mary's and Renown. Councilmember Aiazzi stated Renown's costs would include their bond rating and their new tower, but that should not relate to the costs of providing indigent care. He thought a discussion was needed with Renown because of the deal made with the County 30 years ago.

Councilmember Zadra asked if staff had requested any kind of partnership funding from the hospitals for the triage operation. Mr. Schiller stated discussions started about a year ago concerning the CTC and the budget. The representative from the Hospital Association attended the meeting and one of the issues was looking at the hard data in terms of cost savings for the hospitals. Because the Social Services Department was the primary payer of those indigent costs, he could clearly outline where cost savings were seen for that process.

Councilmember Zadra asked if a financial impact was anticipated in the assessment received from St. Mary's due to their pending sale since they now would be a for-profit operation. Speaking from experience, Mr. Schiller stated there would be some level of impact in terms of costs. He said St. Mary's had reduced their outreach programs and CTC was an outreach program. He thought St. Mary's would go down to core hospital services versus community outreach.

Chairman Larkin believed there was a motion from Commissioner Humke to continue this item due to the lack of information contained in the staff report. Commissioner Humke stated that was correct. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Councilmember Ratti stated she would like to direct staff to work together with the jurisdictions to determine how to arrive with their portion of a balanced investment and work with the hospitals to make sure they were also on board.

Councilmember Lawson wished to add a component to look at the business community for assistance and not put the onus on the taxpayers.

Councilmember Schmitt requested a report to the City Council on the savings, who was participating in the savings and how much it would cost the City of Sparks.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Ratti, seconded by Councilmember Carrigan, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Schmitt voting "no," it was ordered that staff be directed to work together with the jurisdictions to determine how to arrive with their portion of a balanced investment and work with the hospitals to ensure they were on board. It was further ordered to come up with a way to facilitate some investments from local governments and to match investments made by the State and hospitals.

Commissioner Jung made a motion to direct staff to work together with the jurisdictions to determine how to arrive with their portion of a balanced investment and work with the hospitals to ensure they were on board. Also, to come up with a way to facilitate some investments from local governments and to match investments made by the State and by hospitals. Commissioner Weber seconded the motion.

Commissioner Humke felt it was premature for a motion because there were too many unanswered questions and the void was determination of hospital participation.

For Washoe County, on a call for the vote, the motion passed 4 to 1 with Commissioner Humke voting “no.”

For the City of Reno, On motion by Councilmember Zadra seconded by Councilmember Gustin, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Sferrazza and Dortch absent, it was ordered that staff be directed to work together with the jurisdictions to determine how to arrive with their portion of a balanced investment and work with the hospitals to ensure they were on board. It was further ordered to come up with a way to facilitate some investments from local governments and to match investments made by the State and hospitals.

**12-299            AGENDA ITEM 9 – REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES FUND**

**Agenda Subject: “Update and status report on the proposed tax rate adjustment for the Regional Animal Services Fund. (Washoe County) (For possible action)”**

Sheri Mendez, Washoe County Finance Director, said the status of the tax adjustment between Regional Animal Services and the County’s General Fund had been discussed since September 2011. She said the County was no longer looking to make the tax adjustment. She and County Manager Katy Simon were proposing that the tax adjustment not be made and it would not be included in the County’s budget for Fiscal Year 2012/13.

Councilmember Schmitt asked about the planned use for the \$5.7 million in reserve funds. Ms. Mendez stated she did not have the answer, but the reserves could be used for capital spending going forward, or to increase Animal Services on a going forward basis. She said property taxes were declining and were expected to drop another 3 percent in Fiscal Year 2012/13. She said in the next couple of years there was a possibility that their revenues would not cover their expenditures, which would reduce their reserves. Councilmember Schmitt asked if there was a forecast based on funding and reserves for the next two years. Ms. Mendez stated that property tax revenues were projected to decline by 3 percent next year, but departments were working on three-year plans, which would be due in December 2012.

Councilmember Schmitt stated that the governing body was raising a tax and spending what was necessary, but there was over \$5 million sitting in an account and it was known that services had been overcharged for the last ten years. He wondered what the responsible thing was to do with those funds was and should the reserves be kept, should the taxpayers be informed that they overpaid for services and refund them, should the tax rate be adjusted for the services in the future, or not do anything and continue to put those revenues in the fund.

Ms. Simon explained that Animal Services was now under the authority of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) and the WCSO had requested an internal audit be conducted. She said they would review the audit and determine what, if any, adjustment was warranted in the future funding for Animal Services. She noted that the Board of County Commissioners had the authority to lower the tax, but it would require a vote of the public to raise that tax again.

Undersheriff Todd Vinger confirmed that an audit was requested for the entire Animal Services. Also, being reviewed were positions that had been eliminated, infrastructure and equipment replacement. Councilmember Schmitt asked if cost savings were realized with placing Animal Services under the WCSO. Undersheriff Vinger replied there would be savings in overhead and management, which was covered under the WCSO. The budget itself, as stated many times, was separately funded as opposed to the WCSO; but clarified there would be no co-mingling of funds. Undersheriff Vinger said the goal was to establish the most efficient way to provide the service; however, there had not had been enough time yet to look through every aspect of Animal Services in order to find the most efficient process. Councilmember Schmitt stated when the consolidation was completed ten years ago it was for a tax incentive. He thought there should be some reporting to local bodies on how the funds would be used since all the bodies had agreed on how to fund Animal Services.

Councilmember Zadra stated there had cuts across the board to balance all the budgets, as well as Animal Services. She asked if those cuts would continue in future budgets. Ms. Mendez replied that concessions from employee groups were still being sought. She said the Animal Service fund would take a hit to their revenues, spending would have to be reduced and decisions made with regard to how much of those reserves would be used in the future. She said to use the reserves without looking at cuts in spending was not sustainable. Councilmember Zadra stated there was over \$5 million in reserves, and as cuts were proposed for this year, asked if that department anticipated being reduced. Ms. Mendez stated there was direction from the Board of County Commissioners to make cuts across the board, which currently stood at 4.5 percent. She said it made sense to encompass those reductions in the Animal Services fund, given the fact there would be a 3 percent decline in property tax revenues along with a reduction as a result of the Incline Village refunds.

Councilmember Zadra asked if the audit was financial and had there been assurances that best standards and practices, presented when the consolidated agreement was approved 10 years ago, had been met by the Humane Society and other industries. Undersheriff Vinger responded their request was to audit the funds in the account as well as the controls for all funds. He said they were also reviewing all aspects of the operation to ensure it was run efficiently within the national guidelines of Animal Services controls. He said the WCSO was open to dialogue from all entities to make certain that Animal Services was running at the expected standards. Undersheriff Vinger commented that the best way to run Animal Services was in a consolidated format and it was up to them to take care of the organization and listen to all the people.

Councilmember Lawson thought it was important to review the motivation on the tax that took place, because it had been overfunded from the start. The reason was there would be a fund balance and in the future when the tax sunsetted, there would be enough money to build another animal shelter and upgrade the services. He understood it was difficult in these economic times to have this large fund balance, but he thought the WCSO was doing a good job and to continue “as is.” Undersheriff Vinger agreed 100 percent and said there was no capital account to move forward.

With respect to Councilmember Zadra, Commissioner Jung did not support direction to cut Animal Services just because everyone else was being cut. She asked when the Reno City Council anticipated a receipt of their findings. Barbara DiCanno, Community Liaison, stated she was scheduled to go before the Reno City Council on April 25, 2012. She explained the committee was meeting every week in order to provide the multitude of information being collected. Commissioner Jung requested the entities present today receive copies of that information.

In response to Councilmember Schmitt, Ms. Simon stated there was a portion of the ballot question that went for bonds that was additional to the 3 cents and paid off a considerable amount. Ms. Mendez clarified those bond payments were not paid out of the Animal Services Fund, but were paid out of the County General Fund.

Councilmember Schmitt remarked that there was a separate bond issue for operations and a separate bond issue for building; however, the building was close to being paid off. Ms. Simon indicated that the building was not paid off, but there were 3 cents for operations and an additional amount for the bonds to build the facility. She said debt payments were still being made from the County’s debt service. Councilmember Schmitt requested staff provide the report because that was not in the original report of the bonding portion since he thought the 3 cents covered the operations and the building.

There was no action taken on this item.

**12-300      AGENDA ITEM 10 – WASHOE COUNTY SENIOR SERVICES**

**Agenda Subject: “Update and status report on Washoe County Senior Services programs and service levels. (Washoe County) (For possible action)”**

Grady Tarbutton, Senior Services Director, stated that Senior Services was a regional program that served every senior citizen in Washoe County and that Senior Services was mandated under County Code. He listed the mandates as Adult Day Health Services, the Homemaker Program, the Legal Program, the Nutrition Program, the Representative Payee Program, Social Services and Facilities Management. With the budget situation, he said Washoe County could not provide all the responsibilities in terms of meeting the needs of senior citizens. He said he would like everyone to think of Senior Services as a funnel that fed people who were most at risk. At the very top of that funnel there had to be collaborative relationships, which there was from the City of Sparks and the City of Reno.

Mr. Tarbutton conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the Clerk. He discussed their mission, mandated services, and the number of people served by place of residence. In addition to their budget, another challenge was the population growth of seniors. He said a good job had been done in terms of public health, social security, Medicare and other programs that had extended life expectancy and had kept people in their homes. He commented that the programs in Washoe County were working towards keeping people independent. He reviewed the budget for Senior Services over the past four years and the projections for Fiscal Year 2012/13. He explained that 2012 revenues and expenses were linked to the Foreclosure Mitigation Program, the Incline Village tax refund and employee voluntary separations. Mr. Tarbutton said the goal for the upcoming year was to strengthen the network of services for profit, nonprofit, and county and State government that served seniors. There were many services people could pay for themselves, but the network needed to be strengthened to provide better services. He discussed Reno and Sparks Parks and Recreation's role in conjunction with the Washoe County Senior Services and the 2012/13 system overviews. Mr. Tarbutton said their long-term goal was to look at a different structure, because it was difficult to meet all of the needs of seniors in the future.

Commissioner Jung stated it was important to point out that it was cost effective to have seniors age in place, which was also in response to data collected nationally that the number one fear for seniors was that they would be institutionalized. She believed these programs were addressing those fears by helping senior citizens stay in their homes.

Councilmember Lawson remarked that Senior Services was funded by ad valorem taxes similar to Animal Services, but unlike that program, it was not overfunded. Currently, they were experiencing a shortfall that would need to come from Washoe County's General Fund and asked on the amount of that shortfall. Mr. Tarbutton responded that the General Fund shortfall was predicted to be about \$230,000. Councilmember Lawson stated they also received matching funds from the federal government. Mr. Tarbutton confirmed they received 1 cent in ad valorem tax, which had no sunset. He explained that money was used to match federal dollars, whether that be Medicaid, the Older Americans Act or other grants. Councilmember Lawson asked if the \$230,000 was not funded, how much matching grant money would be lost. Mr. Tarbutton said that would be between \$400,000 and \$500,000.

Councilmember Hascheff understood that the County had to make difficult decisions with respect to cuts, but the Senior Advisory Board was concerned about the \$230,000 short fall, the loss of the matching funds and all of the programs and, based on the shortfall, services that Washoe County could not provide. He said the three entities needed to jointly come up with solutions to keep services in place because further cuts would be devastating.

Councilmember Ratti said the Daybreak program was a perfect example where a senior citizen who was home by themselves could receive care as opposed to placing that person in a nursing home. The voters approved funding in the past, but she did not believe it was enough. Fortunately, people in the community did not want to see seniors suffer, and she thought more funding would be approved under a new ballot initiative.

Katy Simon, County Manager, said that the Tentative Budget for Washoe County did not include reducing the General Fund subsidy to Senior Services. She stated there was less of a decline in property tax revenues and some of that would be used for seniors.

Councilmember Aiazzi thanked the County for not cutting their funding and stated he would support a ballot question for additional money being given to senior services. However, if the voters voted for an additional 2 cents, the Debt Management Commission (DMC) would tell the entities where to lower their cap rate. Councilmember Carrigan suggested shifting a penny from Animal Services to Senior Services, which would not place the cap rate in jeopardy.

In response to the call for public comment, Stephen Jacobs said he had been talking to senior groups and agreed the fear of seniors was ending up in a nursing home. He approved of raising additional funds to help seniors.

Sam Dehne spoke on the Daybreak program and how much money he thought was wasted in the community.

**11:30 a.m.** Mayor Cashell left the meeting and Chairman Larkin assumed the gavel.

Connie McMullen, Senior Services Advisory Board Chair, thanked the County for not cutting services. She said she would like to see a concrete assurance they were going to be able to move forward with services.

Donna Clontz, Reno Senior Citizens Advisory Board, thanked all entities for their continued work and support of the seniors in the community.

Councilmember Aiazzi stated the penny could be taken from Animal Services and added to the Senior Services. He believed all entities could agree on a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) or a dedicated funding source. Paul Lipparelli, Legal Counsel, stated the entities could discuss it, but could not make a decision on that today.

**11:35 a.m.** Mayor Cashell returned to the meeting.

Councilmember Schmitt and Councilmember Aiazzi discussed direction to staff with regard to a ballot question or how they could agree to not impose the 1 cent tax. The County could then determine to divert the 1 cent to Senior Services, which he believed he could trust them to do.

Ms. Simon stated the schedule required a ballot question would need to be submitted by mid July. Councilmember Zadra said she received information previously about the exponential growth in senior numbers and those requiring services. She said it would be beneficial for all entities to have those numbers, which would help in moving forward and determining proactive steps, because a significant growth pattern was being projected.

Before a decision was made, Councilmember Lawson said he would like to see what the affects would be by taking 1 cent away from Animal Services and what it would do if added to Senior Services.

Councilmember Ratti and Councilmember Gustin agreed with moving forward, but also concurred that research would need to be conducted in order to provide each entity all the information with regard to the right amount to take away from Animal Services and moving it to Senior Services.

Chairman Larkin stated this issue would also be considered at the next mayor's and chair meeting.

There was no action taken on this item.

#### **12-301        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 are to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, the Washoe County Commission, Board of Fire Commissioners for Sierra Fire Protection District and the Board of Fire Commissioners for Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District as a whole."**

Sam Dehne spoke about the Daybreak program and filing campaign policies and expenses.

**11:45 a.m.**    The Sparks City Councilmembers and the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees left the meeting.

**11:46 a.m.**    The Reno City Council convened with the Washoe County Board of Commissioners, which convened as the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District and the Sierra Fire Protection District with Commissioner Weber temporarily absent and Commissioner Breternitz participating by phone.

**12-302            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 are to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, the Washoe County Commission, Board of Fire Commissioners for Sierra Fire Protection District and the Board of Fire Commissioners for Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District as a whole.”**

Sam Dehne spoke about the Daybreak Program and the dismemberment of the Reno Fire Department.

**11:54 a.m.**      Commissioner Weber returned to the meeting.

**12-303            AGENDA ITEM 11 – FIRE SERVICE AND CONSOLIDATION**

**Agenda Subject: “Fire Update, discussion and potential direction relating to Interlocal Agreement for Fire Service and Consolidation, including such items as employees, real properties, fire suppression and prevention services, mutual and automatic aid, service contracts, fiscal issues, potential regionalization of future fire services, communications and scheduling of future meetings between the government entities which are parties to the Interlocal Agreement. (City of Reno and Washoe County) (For possible action)”**

In response to the call for public comment, Jeff Church stated the issue of the fire services contract boiled down to the inability of Washoe County to afford the Reno fire contract, and the four-person mandated crews and backfill requirement, which Washoe County had no say in. He requested the Board try to resolve this issue the BRAC way, which would constitute forming a committee of non-governmental members to study the issue and propose solutions. The panel would hold discussions, hear testimony, propose solutions and the City and County would vote for the proposals with no amendments. His proposal was placed on file with the Clerk.

**11:56 a.m.**      Chairman Larkin left the meeting.

Will Brown stated that he was a retired fireman. He discussed the costs savings to the City of Reno because of the consolidation. He felt there had to be a reason other than economics behind the breakup and said fire protection was too important to allow egos to play a role.

Carole Billau submitted two letters, which were placed on file with the Clerk. She discussed associated costs between the County and the City and asked that all monies be combined. She requested the entities continue the Interlocal Agreement for another year and stand-up a committee of fire management individuals to make decisions.

Jon Eric Johnson stated he had 16 years of fire service experience and firefighters solved problems. He said that members of the Council and the Commission approached the people who actually fought fires and asked them to arrive at a solution, which they did. The last Board meeting the Commission received advice to slow down because the deadlines causing this head-long rush to disaster were self imposed. He encouraged the entities to keep meeting and talking to do right by the citizens.

Jon L. Johnson said he retired from the Reno Fire Department and had served on the Governor's Committee for "two-in and two-out." He said the agreement bailed out the County and gave them consistent four-man engine companies, which was a national standard. The agreement also provided better response time and better training. He believed the plan would cost more money, cut public safety by over 50 percent and increase insurance rates.

Lea Wobbe stated she was a volunteer firefighter and spoke about the dissolution of the Interlocal Agreement. She was angry that it took so long for volunteer equipment to be repaired, because the union would not allow mechanics to work on volunteer equipment unless it was on overtime, which had been eliminated. She indicated that the volunteers were being notified three to five minutes after the career stations were dispatched. Ms. Wobbe agreed that volunteers were needed in the Red Rock and Gerlach areas, but other than that volunteers were not needed and were considered an unwanted source of funds being used with little or no return. She reported on the mistreatment by the Reno Firefighters and how the volunteers were treated during the Caughlin fire.

J.R. Riffle supported Washoe County divesting themselves from the Reno Fire Department. He said it was financially suicidal for Washoe County to stay with the City; however, he hoped the two sides could achieve some compromise on the particular locations where mutual aid was an issue. He agreed a committee of non-elected stakeholders should be formed to arbitrate the mutual aid situation and offer other solutions.

Mike Pilcher said working as separate agencies was chaotic, while being consolidated was seamless and efficient with regard to delivery of services, absent jurisdictional boundaries. He suggested that the "marrying" of four Sierra Fire Protection District (SFPD) stations would be much easier than "divorcing" from 13 Reno fire stations. He discussed the isolated valleys and commented that he did not know how to stand and watch a structure burn while waiting for another engine company to arrive. He encouraged continuation of the potential regionalization of future fire services, communications and scheduling of future meetings between the government entities, which were parties to the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Pilcher appreciated the volunteers and realized they were supplemental in nature.

Steven Perez said 65 percent of the fire departments within the United States were volunteers and, when there was enough money, four-person crews were the measure of any fire department. He said 85 percent of all calls were emergency medical

calls and it took four to five minutes to save a life. He discussed and defined automatic aid and mutual aid. Mr. Perez strongly recommended taking the decision out of the hands of the politicians and placing the question on the ballot. He believed people would not mind an increase in taxes to ensure they were provided the best service.

Lee Leighton said over 10 years ago a group decided on an agreement to bring fire protection together. He stated regionalization worked and was proven with the recent Washoe Drive and Caughlin Ranch fires. He noted there had been many changes proposed, which was normal, but he asked that the elected officials work together. He did not agree with raising taxes while eliminating services.

Lonnie Feemster, NAACP, stated his concern about the diversity seen in the Fire Departments over the years, which was due to a lawsuit. He was in support of the agreement when it was first initiated, but wondered if it was necessary to file a lawsuit every time progress was needed. Mr. Feemster discussed racism and different cultures within the community.

Cathy Brandhorst said response time was crucial. She spoke about an incident at the Sundance and about other issues of interest.

Sam Dehne spoke about dismembering the fire department by Washoe County. He said Washoe County was making the most important decision of the year but three out of the five commissioners would not be re-elected. He thought they should abstain from voting.

Cliff Low stated it was too late to stop the dissolution of the agreement and was in favor of the deconsolidation. He noted firefighters did not work for free, fire equipment was not donated and believed the whole issue revolved around money. He thought the City was holding the residents of the unincorporated areas hostage because of the deconsolidation and said there had to be an automatic aid agreement.

Ronald Bath, J. Scott Bensing, Gregory Peek and Blane Smith asked that their three minutes be yielded to Perry DiLoreto.

Perry DiLoreto thought it was a disservice that the Sparks City Council left the meeting since they were part of the community and should be involved in this discussion. He believed the most important issue facing the community was how the three entities dealt with one another. What he witnessed was not sound political leadership, but open hostility, and he assumed no sound lasting decisions would be reached if this behavior continued. Mr. DiLoreto believed there were fair and equitable resolutions to all the issues. He remarked that officials were not fighting for constituents, but fighting themselves, which was not in the best interest of the community. Doing the right thing might cost someone an election, but that paled in comparison to someone losing their home or their life. He asked the elected officials to be good leaders and make sound decisions. He read and submitted a letter, which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Commissioner Humke voiced his frustration that the Sparks City Council was not participating in these discussions. Mayor Cashell indicated that the City of Sparks had not been involved in this issue since the beginning. He thought the City of Reno and Washoe County should consider a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA).

Councilmember Aiazzi stated his concerns regarding mutual aid. He asked how the true-ups within the existing contracts worked with Stations 9 and 13. In accordance with the Interlocal Agreement, Michelle Hobbs stated there was an amendment last year which concerned Stations 9 and 13 located in Stead. If there were savings because the City browned-out Station 9, part of those savings would go back to the TMFPD. Councilmember Aiazzi indicated that Station 9 was a Reno station and Station 13 was a Washoe County station, which was one of the reasons those Stations could merge. He said the City gave credit back to the County for responding into the City and that they had been paying for mutual aid. The other question was one penny in property tax in the City equated to half-million dollars and the City's budget for fire services was \$28.5 million. Ms. Hobbs explained that was the General Fund contribution or 57 cents in taxes for the citizens in the City to receive fire protection. Councilmember Aiazzi thought it was a County oversight that they were going to have islands in the Hidden Valley and Caughlin Ranch areas since the County was not able to provide service levels in those areas. He said the City felt they were being asked to provide primary aid in those areas. He commented that they did not have a problem with mutual or automatic aid and both entities should help each other out in those areas.

Councilmember Aiazzi stated in the North Valleys the TMFPD had been responding to the City on many occasions, but in the breakup, the City would be standing-up Station 9 so those calls would go away. The quid pro quo of "you cover us and we will cover you" would also go away, because Reno firefighters would respond to fires in the City. He said it had been over looked that the union had agreed to take a 12 percent cut. With the current tax rates, he said if the County dipped slightly into their reserves, but less than what they were taking from their reserves to stand up the new department, a JPA could be started by July 1st.

In response to the volunteer who spoke during public comment, Councilmember Aiazzi stated if there were those types of difficulties, it would be a violation of the contract and could have been addressed.

Councilmember Aiazzi stated there was no reason why this could not be fixed; however, he did not want to continue fighting about how a "Board" should be made up and said that should be decided upfront and then move forward.

Mayor Cashell said the makeup of the Board would be decided by the JPA as part of the negotiations. Councilmember Aiazzi stated if a JPA was going to be established it would need to be worked on diligently and another joint meeting be scheduled to determine the makeup. Mayor Cashell said if entities agreed to negotiate a JPA everything would have to halt in order to complete the work. Councilmember Aiazzi

indicated that the City was required to send out layoff notices before July 1st, but those could be rescinded if needed.

Commissioner Humke said he was dissatisfied with the misinformation in the public sector and said this was a simple contract action. The County gave notice, under a contract, and that was all that was being done.

John Slaughter, Management Services Director, stated there were two packets prepared for this item, one prepared by the TMFPD and one by the City. In addressing the packet included from the County, he said four documents were included: a March 14, 2012 letter to the City, which was the offer of cooperative fire service; a March 27, 2012 staff report, which the Board acted on Fiscal Year 2012/13 service levels and alternatives; a March 13, 2012 staff report, which was the Cooperative Service Agreement discussion; and, an October 25, 2011 staff report, where the Board approved consolidation and moving forward.

Mr. Slaughter conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the Clerk. He said the Board had stated objectives throughout this process of achieving long-term financial and operational sustainability, as well as a regionalized sustainable fire service. He reviewed a graph showing Fiscal Year 2007/08 through Fiscal Year 2012/13.

Mr. Slaughter discussed the four components to the Cooperative Service Agreement proposal: 1) the transfer of the City employees to the District; 2) Lease of District Station 14 to the City; 3) equipment and supplies; and, 4) Automatic Aid/Initial response. He presented two maps showing the areas that would benefit from this arrangement.

Commissioner Humke asked if the TMFPD and the SFPD were established to have a dedicated revenue source. Mr. Slaughter stated that was correct, and noted that the City received their funding through the General Fund. Commissioner Humke asked if the County had negotiated new labor agreements with the TMFPD and the SFPD. Katy Simon, County Manager, indicated there were no TMFPD employees, so there were no negotiations. She explained collective bargaining was underway with the SFPD employees.

Commissioner Humke questioned if it had ever been stated that the TMFPD would not respond into the City for any fire or medical call. Mr. Slaughter replied that had never been said, and had been placed in writing. Commissioner Humke inquired on the number of proposals the Board had sent to the City to negotiate transitional items since termination notice had been given. Mr. Slaughter believed that had occurred four times.

Commissioner Humke remarked there had been much discussion in regard to a JPA and a Regional Fire Agency. He wondered if the City would be ready on July 1, 2012 to enter into an agreement with the TMFPD or any other local entity. Mayor Cashell

stated that the City was ready and would sit and negotiate a JPA. Commissioner Humke preferred the County remain on the current path, work out the separate aid agreements and each entity continue to contract with their own labor association and bind together through contract.

Commissioner Breternitz agreed with Commissioner Humke and stated that the Board had voted to begin Plan B. Because it was unclear how long negotiations would take, the County would want to ensure that everything was covered. In the meantime, he suggested working on a JPA and an advisory board, and commit to keeping automatic and mutual aid as it currently existed. This would give everyone the incentive to complete a JPA quickly.

Councilmember Aiazzi indicated that the graph in the PowerPoint presentation was a year old. He asked if the property tax decline was still projected to be 25 percent. Mr. Slaughter said that was correct. Councilmember Aiazzi said the County would keep Station 13 and then the City could keep a different station open allowing the County to provide primary response in the North Valleys. Mr. Slaughter stated that agreement would come through an automatic aid agreement. Councilmember Aiazzi stated the City's agreement allowed Local 731 to respond to fires in the City as primary responders. This Plan could be contested if the City did not put up a fire station in the North Valleys and place the TMFPD as primary responders. He said if the City stood up Station 9, he asked if the calls transferred from Station 13 went away as would the associated costs. Kurt Latipow, Fire Services Coordinator, explained that the calls would not go away, but the divvying up of the calls would change. When Station 9 was open, he said there would still be a sharing of resources, based on automatic aid and closest resource first. Councilmember Aiazzi asked if the \$1.3 million brought up was before or after the City gave the TMFPD credits to respond to the City.

Mary Walker, District Financial Consultant, stated with the true-ups from Stations 9 and 13, the TMFPD was only receiving 28.3 percent of the savings, which was their proportionate share of the contract. Their actual savings were between \$200,000 and \$300,000. Councilmember Aiazzi commented that the TMFPD was receiving something for providing mutual aid.

Councilmember Aiazzi inquired on the condition of Station 14. Mr. Latipow responded that the apparatus base was fairly new. Councilmember Aiazzi stated neither the County nor the City were saving any money by remaining in Station 14 and wondered how those savings would be calculated. Mr. Latipow stated the Regional Standard of Cover (RSOC) agreed that area would be better served by moving some stations around. However, the Station was in service, a new roof had been authorized and it was habitable. He said there may not be a savings, but there was the ability to defer until such time it was appropriate to build a new Station. Mr. Latipow said when the RSOC was done, it was obvious if the City moved ahead with stations planned for that area, Station 14 should move down the road. Councilmember Aiazzi stated the County had Station 14 for sale two years ago. Mr. Latipow clarified that the Station had not been listed for sale, but there were suitors.

Councilmember Hascheff said Commissioner Humke stated if the County's position was to maintain a regional fire agency then he thought a consensus could be reached. He agreed that the entities were stronger together and could provide better service and that costs would be avoided. He said the County had a declining revenue base in the SFPD and TMFPD and the City had put another \$1.5 million in their budget for purposes of trying to keep the fire department consolidated. Even if the County stood-up a fire department, there would still be a revenue shortfall. Councilmember Hascheff thought the JPA would allow an option to negotiate a contract the County would find acceptable and would achieve the regional goal of having a regional fire agency.

Commissioner Humke questioned why the Council was not presented the County's proposal. He stated that the County lived under the Interlocal Agreement for 11+ years with no voice and vowed that would not happen again. Commissioner Humke did not think the Commissioners would enter into a JPA with those same considerations.

Andrew Clinger, City Manager, confirmed that every proposal sent from the County had been presented to the City Council.

Chief Hernandez commented there was a staff report generated that spoke to the proposal submitted by the County for formal action, which was tabled, but evaluated. He understood that the proposal, with respect to the transfer of existing district employees, the lease of Station 14, equipment and supplies and automatic and mutual aid, was a packaged offer; however, the Council expressed a disinterest in considering a packaged offer. He said the City was engaged in discussions at the staff level regarding the lease of Station 14 and that the TMFPD had been told repeatedly that was part of a large negotiation process. On behalf of the Reno Fire Department, Chief Hernandez said they were prepared to respond to any emergency in this community.

Chief Hernandez commented that staff was requested to meet and discuss an alternative to bridge the gap between where we were now and July 1st, and to determine if there was a mechanism in place to provide a transition plan that would move toward a JPA. He said several individuals met including representatives from the County and City, both labor groups, the SFPD, Fire Chiefs, and Financial Analysts, which were given a fixed dollar amount and asked if this was a path forward to develop a plan to deliver service to the community, but had a very short timeline to generate that plan. He asked for the ability to move staff from one entity to the other, otherwise the plan would not work. He needed the capability of moving a Reno/TMFPD employee into the SFPD system in order to keep stations staffed. He would need to bring 36 SFPD employees into parity with the current City pay scale. In short, the group determined that approximately \$33,659,000 was needed to generate a staffing plan. The staffing plan included no layoffs, maintaining four-person staffing, keeping not only the existing three SFPD stations open, but also the Arrowcreek station, as well as five TMFPD stations open. He indicated there was a shortfall; however, the group identified a means to address that shortfall, which involved policy level decisions regarding what capital accounts were

funded. At the end of the day, none of the principle balances of the capital accounts would have been touched. The net savings would be an increase of \$1.7 million into the capital accounts, thereby providing continued funding into those accounts as well as maintaining continuity of service, eliminating the need for discussion for automatic and mutual aid, and achieving the highest level of delivery service to the community, which included paramedic service, and staffing of all TMFPD and SFPD stations.

Councilmember Aiazzi thought the proposal was a place to begin and wondered if it would be acceptable with the County to move toward a JPA. Commissioner Humke stated he did not have the staff report from the City. Councilmember Aiazzi asked if Commissioner Humke would agree that the issue presented by Chief Hernandez could be discussed in length and a starting point for a JPA. Commissioner Humke thought the issues were predominantly transitional. He said it could take a long time to compose a JPA, and he thought the best thing to do would be to join the entities together by contract. He said he did not want anything to do with the City's labor agreement.

Councilmember Gustin characterized public comment as being 60 to 70 percent in favor of some type of consolidation or a working agreement between the entities. He was disturbed that there were too few firefighters now and the possibility that 80 more might have to be dismissed on July 1st. Councilmember Gustin wondered how many offers had been tendered and how many firefighters were looking to be transferred. Kathy Hart, County Human Resources, indicated that 60 applications were received from City of Reno firefighters for positions with the TMFPD. She added that no offers had been made until the selection process was completed. Then testing would begin in April. Councilmember Gustin asked how many positions would be available if the deconsolidation took place. Ms. Hart stated it depended on the adopted plan, but believed there would be 64 positions.

Councilmember Gustin said the community was concerned about automatic and mutual aid. He thought it was important for the entities to commit to a timeline, because this was about the community, not the entities. He said issues did not wait for an agreement to determine how much money went from one side to the other. Based on all the negotiations that occurred, he did not see how a JPA would benefit firefighters.

Commissioner Jung asked how many days the group had to come up with the plan. Chief Hernandez replied they were given 10 days. Commissioner Jung asked Mr. Latipow how long he was given to come up with the deconsolidation plan. Mr. Latipow responded 45 days to arrive with a plan and approximately nine months to execute that plan. Commissioner Jung inquired on the impact the impasse and deconsolidation had to the region and the employees. Chief Hernandez explained that 80 employees were placed on informal lay-off notice. Because he did not know how many employees would be transferring to the TMFPD, he had to build his budget on a worse-case scenario. The impacts had been hard and challenging for the organization, but were worse for the employees. Commissioner Jung inquired on the average years of service for

those 80 employees. Chief Hernandez guessed between six to 10 years. SFPD Chief Charles Moore responded there seemed to be a new energy and excitement of moving forward with regard to the consolidation. He added the volunteers were also excited.

Commissioner Jung asked how much the County paid to the City per year for the TMFPD contract. Ms. Hobbs responded that the County paid \$11.4 million annually. Commissioner Jung stated to stand up the new department in the first year would cost \$16.4 million, which meant residents would pay more taxes for less service. She stated the vast majority of e-mails, phone calls and letters she received had been against deconsolidation. Commissioner Jung recommended a shared services agreement and then use the Transitional Plan for operations next year and stand-up a JPA for Fiscal Year 2013/14.

Councilmember Zadra said it should be simple to come together and form a JPA. She noted they had been advised by the entire citizenry, twice, to consolidate services. For the entities to be putting up roadblocks in front of that responsibility, which was owed to the community, was unacceptable. She agreed that public safety came first, and whoever responded to an area should be paid from the taxes of the citizens in that area.

Commissioner Weber respected the City Council and enjoyed working with them. She said the Board had voted four to one to move forward with deconsolidation and did not feel that decision was based on egos. She was open to conversations about a JPA or another agreement in the future; however, noted a number of people believed the Board was moving in the right direction.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked what the last proposal was the City gave to the County for mutual aid and primary response in the Hidden Valley and Caughlin Ranch areas. Chief Hernandez replied that offer was \$2.4 million. Councilmember Aiazzi stated Plan B would stand up some stations to cover those areas and, under that proposal, the County would be spending \$21 million. Ms. Walker stated the March 27, 2012 staff report showed the total amount as \$21,280,704. Councilmember Aiazzi remarked that the County would be raising expenditures by \$1.3 million. Ms. Walker indicated that the City's proposal was \$1.6 million higher than Plan B. Councilmember Aiazzi asked how much was being spent right now. Ms. Walker replied that amount was \$20.1 million and Plan B would be \$21.3 million, which meant an additional \$1.3 million would need to be raised. Councilmember Aiazzi said the extra \$1.3 million would be to stand-up a station, placing a two-person rescue crew in Hidden Valley. He asked who would cover the Caughlin Ranch area. Ms. Walker stated service to that area would be provided by Station 35 in Verdi, but the operation costs would be the same. Councilmember Aiazzi stated Verdi would cover Caughlin Ranch just as the City's plan. Ms. Walker explained that Plan B would stand-up Station 14 in south Reno with TMFPD/SFPD staff as well as Hidden Valley having a two-person rescue crew and called for a cutback to staff in order to hold down the cost of property tax increases.

Commissioner Humke asked if that would guarantee never closing or browning out Station 6. Mayor Cashell stated the County shared in the savings of the stations closed by way of a credit. Ms. Walker stated the difference was \$1.3 million; however, if there was a 25 percent decline in revenue, and a multi-year contract, the District would not have control of their expenditures. Councilmember Aiazzi asked if the City closed or browned out any of the County's stations. Ms. Walker replied that did not happen. Councilmember Aiazzi stated the City browned out stations and had less service to the citizens of Reno, but left the County's stations open because of the contract, which was the guarantee. Ms. Walker stated that was correct because the TMFPD was able to make payments to the City to keep those stations open. That was the problem, and she believed with the projected \$4.6 million loss of revenue, the TMFPD would not be able to pay the City in the future to keep all the stations open.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked if the City took \$1.2 million from the TMFPD, instead of standing up the new district, and the City would provide the service, would that make financial sense. Ms. Walker stated from a dollar standpoint, it broke even, but the problem was that the District would still not have control over the expenditures through labor negotiations. Due to the declining revenue situation, her recommendation to the Board was to continue with deconsolidation in order to get control of expenditures. Councilmember Aiazzi asked how long the Local 731 contract would last and if there were any expected raises. Ms. Walker replied the contract had another year and a half with no raises expected; however, there was a 3.87 percent decrease in salaries and the net savings was \$450,000. Councilmember Aiazzi stated the TMFPD would know those fixed costs and if the City agreed to take the three stations on for \$1.2 million, Hidden Valley and Caughlin Ranch would get better protection and it would not cost the County any more money. Then the JPA could be worked on in the next year, which would make financial sense. Ms. Walker responded that the TMFPD would still not have control over expenditures and taxes would need to be raised by 54 cents in order to pay for higher costs, salaries, and four-person staffing.

Councilmember Hascheff stated one of the outcomes was staff could be directed to review a JPA in order to maintain the regional fire agency, which would keep all the groups together and provide better service. He thought it would be a solution if both sides agreed, then mutual aid would come off the table.

Councilmember Hascheff moved to have Mayor Cashell direct staff to move in that direction, not to unwind anything, and meet every two weeks to try to stay together. Councilmember Zadra seconded the motion.

Ms. Hobbs stated the transitional contract put together by the entities did have a shortfall, and she validated the amounts as discussed by Councilmember Aiazzi. She said there was an analysis provided to the Board that had options and a proposal. She said a full packet would be given to the Board, which could be used as a starting point for discussions toward a JPA.

Councilmember Aiazzi asked if the motion could be amended to include a proposal to the County regarding mutual aid and for \$1.2 million that the City would provide service to those areas. If the JPA did not go forward, mutual aid would still need to be addressed. He did not think the City was willing to provide that for free and the County already had shown there was a cost to stand-up that service. If the City was willing to go down and meet what it would cost, that was a proposal to bring forward.

Mayor Cashell called for a vote on the motion proposed by Councilmember Hascheff, seconded by Councilmember Zadra and amended by Councilmember Aiazzi. The motion passed on a 5 to 0 vote, with Councilmembers Sferrazza and Dortch absent.

Commissioner Breternitz moved that the County direct staff to participate in the discussions after they had a chance to have a discussion with the Board as to what the expected structure, possibilities and alternatives were so the Commissioners could narrow it down as rapidly as possible. Commissioner Jung seconded the motion.

Commissioner Humke stated he made this motion in February and in June 2011, which was to begin the process of setting up a JPA, but it specifically stated to invite the City of Sparks, the Sparks Fire Department, Lyon County, Storey County, Carson City, and the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District. He said he would support the motion.

Commissioner Weber stated she would support the motion because she felt the County needed to move forward with regionalization through a JPA, which was critical to the community.

On call for the vote, the motion passed on a 4 to 1 vote with Chairman Larkin absent.

Councilmember Hascheff suggested setting another meeting for April 19, 2012. All entities concurred to tentatively set the date.

**12-304      AGENDA ITEM 12 – PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Agenda Subject: “Public Comment (three-minute time limit per person) – (Additional Public Comment on specific agenda items ill be limited to three-minute time limit per person after each agenda item and must be related to the specific agenda item.) Comments are to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, the Washoe County Commission, Board of Fire Commissioners for Sierra Fire Protection District and the Board of Fire Commissioners for Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District as a whole.”**

Russell Earle stated it made no sense to split up the department from a taxpayer and safety standpoint. He said he made suggestions through phone calls and e-

mails to the Board, but had not heard back from anyone. He proposed that each parcel in the high risk areas be assessed a fee to cover fire service costs. He added that insurance would increase for homeowners when stations were brought down to three-person crews.

Commissioner Jung and Commissioner Weber stated they received Mr. Earle's message and attempted to call him back.

Cathy Brandhorst addressed the Board regarding items of interest to her.

Carole Billau stated she attended a homeowner's association meeting and was informed her taxes would be raised because of a two-man crew. She discussed response times, stations, and crews for the Hidden Valley area. She encouraged everyone to meet and discuss all options.

Lee Leighton observed that the Board was determined to go ahead with their plan. He said the cost of service would not be what the Board originally projected. He did not agree with more taxes and less service and encouraged the entities to be open minded and review all options.

Bob Ackerman appreciated all the firefighters in the County. He noted he was a strong advocate that the County move forward with Plan B, which would provide the leverage to discuss regionalization.

Perry DiLoreto stated he knew it was difficult to change position and the County was holding fast to their decision. He encouraged the entities to consider the individuals manning the trucks and equipment and not only think about numbers and money. He said going to two-person crew could someday turn into a tragedy.

\* \* \* \* \*

**2:40 p.m.** There being no further business to come before the Commission, on motion by Commissioner Weber, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Larkin absent, the meeting was adjourned.

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**ROBERT M. LARKIN**, 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:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**KEN GREIN**, Board of Trustees  
President, Washoe County School District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**ESTELA LEVARIO GUTIERREZ**,  
Clerk Washoe County School District

*Minutes Prepared by Jan Frazzetta and Jaime Dellera,  
Washoe County Deputy Clerks*