

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

MONDAY

11:00 A.M.

AUGUST 21, 2006

**SPECIAL MEETING**

PRESENT:

**Bob Larkin, Chairman**  
**Bonnie Weber, Vice Chairman**  
**David Humke, Commissioner**  
**Pete Sferrazza, Commissioner \***

**Amy Harvey, County Clerk**  
**Katy Singlaub, County Manager**  
**Paul Lipparelli, Legal Counsel**

ABSENT:

**Jim Galloway, Commissioner**

The Board met in special session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

**AGENDA**

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, on motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried with Commissioners Galloway and Sferrazza absent, Chairman Larkin ordered that the agenda for the special meeting of August 21, 2006 be approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There was no response to the call for public comments.

**06-895**

**CHARTING OUR COURSE PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION  
PILOT PROGRAM RESULTS - FINANCE**

John Sherman, Finance Director, reviewed the background information on the Charting Our Course (COC) Program Prioritization pilot project as detailed in the agenda memorandum. He drew the Board's attention to page 3 outlining the Departments and ten specific programs that were chosen for the pilot project and page 4 explaining the criteria that was established to evaluate each program to test the system before initiating the program County-wide. The criteria was established in order to determine how each program related numerically in importance in making funding decisions in order to achieve effective allocating in shaping the government and

responding to citizens. Mr. Sherman explained that both the COC and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) ranked the importance of each of the 17 criterion, and there were only two where the weighted scores differed as delineated in Table 1 of the staff report. He then reviewed the results of the scoring as shown in Tables 2 and 3, noting that the difference in the BCC and COC rankings resulted in two programs being reversed, and discussed various ways the Board could use this type of information as one of their tools in determining how to allocate resources.

\* **11:19 a.m.** Commissioner Sferrazza arrived.

Mr. Sherman reviewed the conclusions staff reached after performing this exercise, such as the difficulty of having an allocation purely mathematical without a way to differentiate programs with the same scores. An important conclusion was that there would be benefits to reaching concurrence on the definition of a program as “a collection of interrelated activities that are dedicated to or correlated with the achievement of a common outcome and serves a common base of customers,” and staff would suggest that be included in the program descriptions. Another conclusion was that the weighted scores could provide meaningful qualitative input as one factor, among others, to be used in making resource allocation recommendations and decisions.

Mr. Sherman said this was a very intriguing idea to try to come up with a way to objectively quantify a way to allocate resources within the County. The project has some challenges but also the benefit of program descriptions being formulated using the same questions. He said he would suggest that the project be implemented as far as having the department programs described in this common manner each using the same, very specific elements, which could be set up in a standardized form for each department to use.

Chairman Larkin asked how the program descriptions would translate into the budgeting process. Mr. Sherman responded that the program descriptions would be included in the packets, in the budget workbook, and in the budget book that gets published. He also said the final program descriptions should have some nexus with the goals and objectives of the County priorities. Chairman Larkin commented there are a lot of variables in how budget decisions are made, and attitudes about programs fluctuate; but he believed there would be some benefit in looking at the results and bringing it back in terms of how each department and the programs rank. He also cautioned that this information standing alone could be misinterpreted and discussed sun setting this process.

In response to Commissioner Sferrazza, Mr. Sherman explained the ranking and scoring information, as well as the scoring results, presented in the tables in the agenda memorandum. Commissioner Sferrazza requested to see some of the actual scoring sheets, which staff provided to him.

**11:25 a.m.** Chairman Larkin temporarily left the meeting, and Vice Chairman Weber assumed the gavel.

Vice Chairman Weber stated this project provides that each department describe each of their programs in a standardized format so they can be ranked against each other, which gives the Board more information to use when making the budget decisions. In response to the Vice Chairman, Mr. Sherman outlined the next steps in the process.

**11:40 a.m.** The Board recessed.

**11:46 a.m.** The Board reconvened with all Commissioners present except Commissioner Galloway and with Chairman Larkin presiding.

Commissioner Sferrazza noted that he reviewed some of the scoring sheets; and, while some are finite, others are very subjective depending on who is doing the evaluating.

On motion by Commissioner Weber, seconded by Commissioner Humke, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Galloway absent, Chairman Larkin ordered that the Budget Division staff be directed to work with the Departments to develop the program descriptions within each Department, including their unique customer base, expected outcomes and interrelated activities and that the weighted scores of qualitative input be used in addition to other factors currently being used in making resource allocation recommendations.

The Board members also expressed their gratitude and appreciation to the COC committee members and staff for all the time and hard work they put into this effort. Commissioner Weber suggested the Manager send a letter to everyone involved relaying the Board's appreciation and letting them know the Board's decision and how the information will be used.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

---

**ROBERT M. LARKIN**, Chairman  
Washoe County Commission

**ATTEST:**

---

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

*Minutes Prepared by  
Sharon Gotchy, Deputy County Clerk*