

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

**RETREAT**

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

JANUARY 12, 2009

PRESENT:

**Bonnie Weber, Vice Chairperson**  
**Bob Larkin, Commissioner**  
**John Breternitz, Commissioner**

**Amy Harvey, County Clerk**  
**Katy Simon, County Manager**  
**Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel**

ABSENT:

**David Humke, Chairman**  
**Kitty Jung, Commissioner**

The Board met for a retreat at the Ranch House at Rancho San Rafael Regional Park, located at 1595 North Sierra Street, Reno, Nevada. Vice Chairperson Weber called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and the following discussions ensued:

**09-06            AGENDA ITEM 1**

**Agenda Subject:** “Public Comment. Comment heard under this item will be limited to two minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the commission agenda. All public comment for this meeting will be heard during this item. Comments are to be made to the Commission as a whole.”

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**09-07            AGENDA ITEM 2**

**Agenda Subject:** “Washoe County Budget: Discussion, identification of issues and possible direction to staff regarding the Fiscal Year 2008/09 and/or Fiscal Year 2009/10 Washoe County Budget.”

John Sherman, Finance Director, placed a staff report on file with the Clerk. He noted there had been a pronounced acceleration of the unemployment rate, and more than 7,500 jobs were lost in Washoe County from 2000 to the present time. He briefly discussed the trends of decreasing consolidated tax revenues and pointed out the County was on pace for a 12 percent decrease for fiscal year 2008/09. He emphasized there had been an unprecedented double-digit decline in consolidated tax revenues for the

last five consecutive months. He stated a thorough analysis of property tax revenues was underway for fiscal year 2009/10, but property tax revenues were expected to be flat or slightly decreased. Mr. Sherman said the current employee cost structure continued to increase. He indicated the PERS contribution rates for fiscal year 2009/10 were expected to go up by approximately 3.5 percent for public safety employees and 1 percent for all other employees. He anticipated there would also be increased costs associated with merit increases, longevity pay, employee health benefit costs, and the Prefunded Retiree Medical Cost Liability Fund.

Mr. Sherman explained it was very difficult to do projections with any degree of certainty. He provided three different revenue scenarios based on the economy stabilizing in its current situation, a further decline in the economy, or full-scale deterioration of the economy. Using the second scenario and assuming no layoffs or labor cost concessions, he estimated roughly a \$50 million structural gap in fiscal year 2009/10 that would accelerate to about \$70 million in fiscal year 2010/11. He noted more finely tuned projections and analysis that took a line item approach would be forthcoming to explain the gap. In addition to holding positions vacant and ongoing incremental reductions in services and supplies, he reviewed the highlights of three different budget balancing strategies, to include: (1) evaluation of programs for cost reductions; (2) restructuring of labor costs; and (3) strategic use of available fund reserves to bridge the transition and brace against economic uncertainty.

Mr. Sherman recommended two broad applications for the use of fund reserves. He pointed out it would take time for an organization as large as Washoe County to change its structure and reduce costs. Therefore, he stated cash reserves would be needed to cover payroll and expenses during the lag times associated with bargaining with the employee associations and the built-in timeframes for any workforce reductions. He indicated reserves would also be needed should there ever come a time when there was not enough cash in the bank to make payroll or to pay vendors. He said such events might not allow adequate time to come before the County Commission. He expressed concern that changes in the economy were happening so fast the County could find itself in such a situation sometime in the next two or three months.

Mr. Sherman laid out budget timelines leading up to the presentation to the County Commission on January 27, 2009. He stated development of the 2009/10 budget would commence immediately after decisions were made for the 2008/09 budget.

Commissioner Larkin referred to the graph on page 4 of the staff report, showing the year-over-year percentage change in expenditures compared to the change in revenues for each fiscal year beginning in 2003/04. He expressed concern about the trend that showed the growth in expenditures exceeding the growth in revenues dating back to 2006. He questioned whether the County's budgetary model, which relied on growth rather than decline, might have exacerbated some of the budget issues. He wondered if reevaluation of the approach might help to avoid future problems. Based on a Consumer Price Index/change in population methodology, Mr. Sherman indicated the County had come in below the targeted amounts for labor cost increases for the previous two years.

He pointed out that such a methodology was designed to produce a ceiling number, but the proposed and adopted budgets for the previous two years had not grown because staff recognized that revenues were not lining up with costs. Commissioner Larkin remarked that all budgets in all levels of government had grown during the heyday years of expanded economies, and were currently way beyond what the governments could carry. He requested the County Manager and Finance Director look deeply at any process contributing to the structural issues. Katy Simon, County Manager, explained Commissioner Larkin was referring to the FTMS model, which was a system from the International City/County Management Association for modeling significant components of public finance budgets. She stated the approach was similar to what was done in private businesses. She said the model looked at debt coverage ratios and infrastructure investment, and helped to provide warning signs over time. She indicated the County used the model in its financial analysis, but the budget numbers were based on the limits of County revenues, the requirements identified by departments, and the service priorities identified by the Board.

Ms. Simon emphasized it had been the goal of County finance and financial management over the last three years to identify sustainable spending plans and cost structure changes. She stated the departments were being asked to identify any potential labor cost reductions that could be made. She referred to the bullet points on page 3 of the staff report, which listed areas where labor costs were expected to increase. She pointed out the County had no control over PERS contribution rates that were set by the State. She indicated negotiations with employee associations were underway regarding merit raises, longevity pay and the possibility of employees paying an increased share toward their health benefits. Additionally, she noted staff was looking into the possibility of sharing some of the surplus in the Prefunded Retiree Medical Cost Liability Fund on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Sherman remarked nothing like the current economic environment had been seen for more than 20 years, and possibly since as far back as the 1930's. He observed it was very difficult to anticipate such circumstances. He noted the Board took a number of steps during the prior period of extraordinary financial expansion that helped to mitigate the impact of the current situation. During that time, he stated a significant amount of increased revenue was invested in pay-as-you go capital projects that resulted in no ongoing costs for the organization. He acknowledged there had been some incremental increases in the number of employees and in employee costs, but pointed out those costs had not used up the entire amount of increased revenue. He said the County built up a lot of reserves during the expansion period in preparation for a possible decline. Although some very prudent steps had been taken over the years, he indicated the magnitude of the change and the degree of uncertainty was currently so high he did not know if anyone could really have planned for it beyond just dealing with the changes as they came along.

Commissioner Breternitz commented none of the three scenarios were very specific and asked how revenue projections could be done for budget planning in March 2009. Mr. Sherman stated there were several analytical tools used, such as time

series projections based on historical data, review of economic information and economic research from the State Economic Forum and the University of Nevada Reno, sharing of information with peer organizations such as the Regional Transportation Commission and the Washoe County School District, and review of the national economy and forecasts from economists. He pointed out there was currently a wide disparity of opinions because the uncertainty was so high. He indicated there were a lot of data intensive analytical techniques, but the economic environment required a certain amount of professional judgment. Commissioner Breternitz suggested there should be a very conservative projection of revenue flow given the circumstances. Mr. Sherman noted the third scenario was the most conservative projection. He remarked he did not wish that scenario upon anyone, but had to account for the possibility that it might occur.

Vice Chairperson Weber commented the Board of County Commissioners needed to step up to the plate and to know more about the intricacies of the budget. She stated that had been done in years past by meeting with department heads, but she did not believe the Commissioners were getting the whole picture. She pointed out the *Charting Our Course* process had been helpful. She recommended the Board come up with a policy to have no new programs and that the Board schedule more meetings to talk with the department heads about budget reductions. She referred to Mr. Sherman's statement that Finance would not have time to come before the Board to apply certain funds to pay bills, and indicated such judgments should only be made by the Board. Ms. Simon said staff was delighted to provide the Board members with all the information they wished to see in any form they wished to see it. She clarified the intention was not to have the Finance Director or the County Manager making decisions about revenues, but to obtain the Board's approval to use reserve funds in the event there was a pressing need to meet payroll or make bill payments in a timely manner. She assured the Board such circumstances would always be reported to them. Vice Chairperson Weber requested a workshop setting for the Board to meet with department heads.

Commissioner Larkin commended Mr. Sherman for his efforts at building up reserves during previous years. He suggested some of the County's cost increases had been driven by the Board's previous acceptance of the Consumer Price Index/population index as an indicator of service demands. He stated it might have set unrealistic expectations among labor and management groups that the increasing revenue trend would continue and everybody would receive ongoing increases in wages and benefits. Mr. Sherman replied it was productive to discuss what benchmarks were most appropriate. He characterized the Consumer Price Index/population index as a broad-based measurement that did not necessarily equate to the actual service demands of particular program areas or to their costs.

Commissioner Larkin referred to the three primary strategies for managing budget reductions that were outlined in the staff report. He stated the Board members had participated in detailed discussions about restructuring labor costs, but had not discussed the evaluation of programs and services in any detail. He said he did not disagree with the strategic use of fund reserves, which could be viewed as an in-house line of credit. Mr. Sherman indicated the use of reserves was a transition mechanism that could not be used

often and would only be in place for a limited period of time. Commissioner Larkin expressed concern that any reserve fund could attract other entities who might want to raid it, similar to recent actions taken by the State Legislature. He thought it was a good cash flow strategy.

Commissioner Larkin asked how staff planned to bring back a detailed discussion about the evaluation of programs and services so the Board could have a comprehensive discussion and approach it in a systematic intelligent way for fiscal year 2009/10. He pointed out there should be some kind of philosophical basis for making decisions, rather than just gutting programs. Ms. Simon indicated the first stage of such a review had previously taken place through *Charting Our Course*, which identified service priorities. She noted staff was recalibrating the outline of service priorities with a citizen survey that was already underway. She said staff would come back to the Board on January 27, 2009 with a review and would go into any detail necessary, such as line item identification of expenditure reductions by specific departments. She observed some of the reductions would have fairly significant service impacts. She stated potential reductions in the workforce would be identified at the meeting and the Board would be asked to make those difficult decisions for fiscal year 2008/09. She explained staff was also in the midst of its performance measurement program and those metrics would assist the Board in identifying the return on investment for various programs. She said the Board could structure meetings with the department heads as it wished and time would be provided to have whatever discussions were necessary to inform the Board's decisions. She emphasized there was a very immediate need for the Board to bless whatever reductions would take place at its January 27th meeting. Vice Chairperson Weber suggested meeting at 10:00 a.m. on that day. She remarked everyone had done a really great job with *Charting Our Course* and the performance measurement program, which laid out the groundwork for decision making. Commissioner Breternitz suggested the Board should be very clear and provide specific questions for the department heads to answer. Further discussion produced the following questions: (1) What programs and services are not mandated? (2) What are the consequences if mandates are not met? (3) How many people are using the program or service? (4) What thoughts do the department heads have for areas that can be modified to create greater efficiency? (5) Do we need all of the departments we have today? (6) How can we consolidate programs?

Commissioner Larkin asked the County Assessor to comment regarding Mr. Sherman's observation that future property tax revenues were expected to perform at decreased levels. Josh Wilson, County Assessor, said he believed Mr. Sherman was referring to the effect of the property tax cap abatement enacted by the 2005 Legislature. For example, he stated there was a base of roughly \$15 billion in assessed value for Washoe County for the current fiscal year, which was reduced by approximately \$1.75 billion due to the tax cap abatement. He noted the Treasurer had a new tax program that allowed calculations to be done based on the established assessed values. On running numbers through that billing engine, assuming no rate changes and taking the tax cap into consideration, he said it looked as though revenues would remain flat or possibly increase a little bit. He commented the tax cap produced a level of predictability for taxpayers to understand what their bill would be and also kept local governments from over-budgeting

based on property values. Mr. Sherman pointed out he was meeting with Mr. Wilson and the Treasurer’s technical staff to go over more details, and would try to incorporate the information into the Board’s presentation on January 27th. He noted that the analysis would be related to the 2010/11 fiscal year. Commissioner Larkin indicated there were other jurisdictions interested in the information. Mr. Sherman agreed to provide information to the other jurisdictions in the region as soon as reliable estimates were available.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**09-08            AGENDA ITEM 3**

**Agenda Subject: “Washoe County Strategic Plan: Review and possible direction to staff on Washoe County’s 2009-11 Strategic Priorities and Key Outcomes.”**

Katy Simon, County Manager, explained the purpose of the discussion was to review events since the Board’s October 2008 Retreat and to present revisions and enhancements to the Strategic Plan.

John Slaughter, Management Services Director, conducted a PowerPoint presentation that was placed on file with the Clerk. He reviewed key meetings and community events that had taken place in recent months. He displayed the pyramid used to model the major components of the Washoe County Strategic Plan, listed the six strategic priorities established for 2009-2011, and discussed the key outcomes established for each priority. He noted the strategic priorities for *Excellent Service* and *Develop Our Workforce* had been combined to one item. He summarized the work done by the following task forces to develop key outcomes and supporting goals for each strategic priority:

<b>Strategic Priority</b>	<b>Task Force Chair</b>
Protect and Improve Public Safety, Preparedness and Health	Michael Haley, Sheriff
Preserve and Enhance Our Quality of Life	Lynda Nelson, Planning Manager
Improve Regional Collaboration	Katy Simon, County Manager
Support a Healthy Economy	John Berkich, Assistant County Manager Adrian Freund, Community Development Director
Promote Financial Accountability of Washoe County	John Sherman, Finance Director Cory Casazza, Chief Information Management Officer
Provide Excellent Services and Develop Our Workforce	Kathy Carter, Community Relations Director Dave Childs, Assistant County Manager

A handout containing a summary of key outcomes and supporting goals for each strategic priority was placed on file with the Clerk. Mr. Slaughter noted the intent was to provide an overview of the information and collect input from the Board, so the completed Strategic Plan could be brought to them for approval and adoption at a future Commission meeting.

Vice Chairperson Weber referenced the key outcome entitled *Clean, Safe and Healthy Neighborhood Communities* and suggested it needed more emphasis on safety and security. Sheriff Mike Haley pointed out the supporting goals under the item addressed specific safety concerns. Vice Chairperson Weber said it might be better to have *Safe Neighborhood Communities* as a separate key outcome. She also wondered whether the performance measurement program should be included as a supporting goal under *Financial Accountability*.

Commissioner Breternitz asked if there had been a concerted effort to take reduced revenues into account while developing the Strategic Plan. Mr. Slaughter indicated there had been some discussion of the impact of budget reductions, but the issues needed to be addressed more formally. He requested direction from the Board to return to each of the task forces and discuss the scalability of specific items in the Plan. He stated the next step prior to adoption of the Plan would be for each task force to recommend the higher priorities within each strategic priority. Mr. Slaughter commented the budget situation made strategic planning all the more important. Commissioner Larkin asked whether more prioritization could be done in time for the Commission meeting on January 27, 2009. Ms. Simon pointed out there would be decisions made at the meeting that would impact staffing levels and priorities going forward. She proposed the Board undertake its rigorous budget discussion on January 27th before proceeding with more strategic planning. She noted the strategic priorities would be used to inform budget planning for the 2009/10 fiscal year. Commissioner Breternitz agreed the Board should determine how much money was available and then work backwards to prioritizing programs and services. He suggested it would be necessary for the Board to have frequent ongoing discussions about its strategic planning priorities.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**10:55 a.m.** Vice Chairperson Weber declared a brief recess.

**09-09**      **AGENDA ITEM 4**

**Agenda Subject:** “Federal Economic Stimulus Package: Discussion, identification of issues and possible direction to staff regarding possible Washoe County projects proposed for inclusion in a Federal Economic Stimulus Package.”

**11:10 a.m.** The Board reconvened with Chairman Humke and Commissioner Jung still absent.

Katy Simon, County Manager, provided a five-page handout that was placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated there was a desire to develop a regional list of possible projects for the Stimulus Package. Vice Chairperson Weber asked whether staff had worked with the National Association of Counties or the League of Cities. Ms. Simon stated the list had been provided to the National Association of Counties, as well as to the Nevada Association of Counties.

Dave Childs, Assistant County Manager, said the proposals for a Federal Stimulus Package were very fluid and it was uncertain what would come out of Congress. He outlined key points related to what types of projects might receive funding, including an emphasis on “shovel ready” projects. He suggested the County needed to be prepared with a list of doable projects that could be implemented in a short period of time. He referenced three lists in the handout, containing possible stimulus projects that were categorized by Public Works/Parks, Water/Wastewater and Flood Control. He indicated the approach of staff was to remain flexible with the lists and expectations, to have a broad array of types of projects, and to work actively toward getting agreement on possible regional priorities. He emphasized it was not necessary to have a Washoe County project approved in order to benefit the region, and that it was an important goal to employ as many people as possible.

Vice Chairperson Weber wondered whether evaluation had been done to determine whether the projects on the three lists were viable and would actually result in job production. Mr. Childs indicated the projects on each list were organized into two groups – those that could get through the bidding process and underway in three months or less, and those that would require additional design. He indicated all of the projects on the list would produce jobs and meet federal priorities. Ms. Simon pointed out the project list was prioritized and most of the projects were not currently funded by the County.

Commissioner Breternitz questioned whether the definition of “shovel ready” could include projects that were not ready to begin immediate construction, but for which a contract could be awarded within 60 days to include some design work. He pointed out such an approach could allow more flexibility for projects with a high priority. Mr. Childs indicated the Sparks Justice Court was a great example of a project that incorporated sort of a “pre-award” contract. He stated an accelerated process might allow a project to break ground in less than 6 months, although that was not likely to be done unless it was known beforehand that funding was available. He commented the whole idea of stimulus was to get projects out there and get them done quickly, but also to establish controls so dollars were not wasted. Commissioner Breternitz asked whether a regional approach appeared likely. Mr. Childs replied he had a meeting scheduled with City of Reno staff, and was working to get the County, the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, the Regional Transportation Commission, and the Washoe County School District together to discuss a plan. Ms. Simon pointed out there was an item on the agenda for the January 26, 2009 Joint Meeting.

Vice Chairperson Weber asked whether the subject was on any upcoming Board agendas. Ms. Simon agreed it could be brought back as a formal item to allow more discussion by all five commissioners.

Commissioner Larkin remarked he and Commissioner Jung originally intended to prioritize categories of projects rather than individual projects. He suggested columns be added to the lists indicating what public sources of funding each project would most likely be eligible for or already had experience in qualifying for. He recommended such analysis be done for regional projects as well as County projects. Commissioner Larkin stated it would be important to thoroughly identify what building trades would be pulled into each project. Vice Chairperson Weber advised estimating how many people would be employed as well as how many trades. Commissioner Larkin wondered whether there was a litmus test for producing such an estimate. Commissioner Breternitz commented that more people would be positively impacted by projects with bigger dollar volumes. Ms. Simon indicated the Truckee River Flood Project had gone through a rigorous analysis of how many jobs could be estimated for each million dollars of investment, although the numbers could change depending on the type of project. Commissioner Larkin cautioned that the kind of projects placed on the list should have maximum credibility.

Vice Chairperson Weber said it would be a mistake to place parks projects on the list. She referenced the Sun Valley Fifth Avenue sidewalk project and suggested it would be more appropriate to look at school sidewalks in general rather than one specific school, or to look at projects that affected an entire community such as drainage improvement in Sun Valley.

Commissioner Breternitz stated the chances of success were stronger if the local government entities were unified. He indicated it would be smart to distill the list into a manageable number of projects so those making decisions could look at it and say ‘these guys have their act together, these are all doable and they certainly are priorities.’

Mr. Childs agreed to refine the list based on the Board’s comments. Ms. Simon summarized the Board’s intent was for staff to bring the lists together, find commonalities of funding mechanisms among lists from the various entities, look for potential job creation opportunities and look for priorities among the agency lists.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**09-10            AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Agenda Subject: “Legislative Issues: Discussion, identification of issues and possible direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by Legislators, by Washoe County or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues as may be deemed by the Chair or the Board to be of critical significance to Washoe County.”**

Discussion was deferred to the Board's regularly scheduled meeting on January 13, 2008.

**09-11**            **AGENDA ITEM 6**

**Agenda Subject:** "Boards and Commissions: Discussion with regard to County Commissioners serving on various boards/commissions."

Vice Chairperson Weber reviewed each Commissioner's current list of boards and commissions, and discussion took place regarding any possible interest in making changes to the list. It was agreed that all five commissioners should be present for a more in depth discussion at the regularly scheduled Board meeting on January 13, 2009. Vice Chairperson Weber requested that staff prepare a brief description for each board/committee prior to the January 13th meeting.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**09-12**            **AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Agenda Subject:** "County Commission Meeting Structure: Discussion, identification of issues and possible direction to staff regarding the structure of Board of County Commissioner Meetings, including, but not limited to agendas, meeting times, frequency of meetings, and Commission workshops."

County Manager Katy Simon indicated there had been a lot of discussion about the possibility of restructuring the middle meeting of the month and reserving it for workshops rather than a regular meeting agenda. She requested possible staff direction as to the Board's wishes.

Commissioner Larkin asked what the cost savings would be if meetings were reduced from three to two per month. Ms. Simon indicated staff had not quantified a specific amount, but a lot of staff time went into compiling, reviewing and posting agendas, as well as conducting agenda signing meetings and managing the minutes.

Commissioner Larkin suggested changes to the 2:00 p.m. start time and criteria for placing items on the consent agenda could be discussed. Ms. Simon pointed out there was currently a financial guideline of \$100,000 or more for placing items on the consent agenda, but the Board could establish other guidelines. Commissioner Larkin commented that Clark County had million dollar items on their consent agendas. Vice Chairperson Weber stated the block votes had been effective at handling such items.

Vice Chairperson Weber said she did not believe it would be a positive step to reduce the number of meetings at a time when the County Commission needed to stand up as leaders to face economic issues. She agreed it would be more efficient for staff to start meetings in the morning. She commented it did not look good for the general public to see staff sitting in the audience for long periods of time.

Commissioner Breternitz proposed holding two meetings per month for action items and reserving the middle meeting of the month for discussion and information gathering. Vice Chairperson Weber pointed out Mondays had previously been reserved for workshops and retreats. Ms. Simon stated Chairman Humke had an employment obligation and was unable to attend on Mondays. She suggested staff could help the Board to manage regular agenda items as described by Commissioner Breternitz, while reserving special topics for the third Tuesday of each month. She stated it would decrease staff waiting time to have guidelines that allowed additional items to be shifted to the consent agenda. Commissioner Breternitz commented it would make sense to have an agenda item at an upcoming meeting to consider the criteria for what constituted a consent item. Ms. Simon pointed out the Board could give staff guidance, allow them to play with the idea and bring it back for more consideration. Commissioner Larkin said all five commissioners should be present. He reiterated he was in favor of moving to two meetings per month and requested an estimate of the average cost per meeting.

Vice Chairperson Weber stated the meetings were already very full. She advised staying with three meetings per month but starting at 10 a.m. on a trial basis, with a break for meals before the public hearings held on the second and fourth Tuesday of the month. She also recommended looking at the Citizen Advisory Board schedules again. Commissioner Larkin commented the workload would not be cut down, but time could be more efficiently allocated. He acknowledged it was not feasible to drop one meeting per month until after budget preparations and full Board discussion. Ms. Simon indicated the budget hearings were scheduled for March and the Board could use its middle meetings to start hearing from department heads. Vice Chairperson Weber pointed out some commissioners would be out of town for a National Association of Counties' Legislative Conference in March that would require cancellation of the first meeting of the month. Commissioner Larkin suggested moving the meeting up to the previous week. Vice Chairperson Weber stated there was also a fifth Tuesday available in March.

Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel, reminded the Board they were statutorily required to establish their meeting dates by ordinance and said changes to the schedule would require some lead time. She said the Board could experiment by canceling a few meetings to see what worked. Commissioner Breternitz agreed it would be beneficial to experiment and move incrementally through the process. Commissioner Larkin added that extra budget meetings could be published as well. Vice Chairperson Weber wondered if it would be helpful to reduce the number of televised meetings. Ms. Simon encouraged the Board not to reduce the number of publicized discussions. She stated it was important for people to see the Board was engaged, informed and aware. Kathy Carter, Community Relations Director, pointed out there was a contract to film the meetings based on the Board's current schedule.

Ms. Simon agreed to place the discussion of earlier meeting times on a future Board agenda. She commented there was no budget for additional meals and the commissioners might have to provide their own lunches if they opted to start at 10:00 a.m.

There was no public comment on this item.

\* \* \* \* \*

**12:20 p.m.** There being no further business to be conducted, upon motion by Commissioner Breternitz, seconded by Commissioner Larkin, which motion duly carried with Chairman Humke and Commissioner Jung absent, the retreat was adjourned.

The foregoing minutes represent the understanding of the Washoe County Clerk's Office of the discussions held during this meeting.

---

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

*Minutes Prepared by  
Lisa McNeill,  
Deputy County Clerk*