

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

TUESDAY

4:00 P.M.

AUGUST 20, 2013

PRESENT:

David Humke, Chairman*
Bonnie Weber, Vice Chairperson
Marsha Berkgigler, Commissioner
Vaughn Hartung, Commissioner
Kitty Jung, Commissioner

Nancy Parent, County Clerk
John Berkich, Interim County Manager
Paul Lipparelli, Legal Counsel
David Vial-Watts, Legal Counsel

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 4:06 p.m. in regular 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:

13-727 AGENDA ITEM 3 – PUBLIC COMMENT

Agenda Subject: “Public Comment. Comment heard under this item will be limited to three minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the Commission agenda. The Commission will also hear public comment during individual action items, with comment limited to three minutes per person. Comments are to be made to the Commission as a whole.”

Cathy Brandhorst discussed debit cards and how easy they were to steal.

***4:13 p.m.** Chairman Humke participated in the meeting via telephone.

The Washoe County School Board of Trustees and Superintendent Pedro Martinez introduced themselves to the public.

Assemblyman Pat Hickey indicated that he was a member of the Legislature that ushered AB 46 to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He felt the three upcoming meetings to discuss the bill would be “government at its best” and would produce a public dialogue. He explained that the Nevada Legislature only received about one hour of testimony on this issue, but now there would be many hours of testimony and discussions. Assemblyman Hickey reviewed several questions that could be considered by the BCC and hoped that a compromise could be reached.

Aaron West, Government Affairs Chairman for NAIOP (Commercial Real Estate Development Association), remarked that the commercial real estate sector considered themselves the front line for economic development in the community and identified education as a primary component toward that economic development effort. As companies looked to relocate to the area, he said decent schools were often considered. He acknowledged that maintenance funding was imperative, but there were questions that needed to be raised and he appreciated the Board's diligence. Mr. West voiced the support of the NAIOP for AB 46.

Todd "Taxpayer" Bailey stated his strong opposition to AB 46. He felt there was a lack of transparency in the process and the decision making. During a recent Washoe County School Board meeting, he said he made a public information request to obtain a copy of the Capital Construction Projects completed in 2013 and permission to visit those sites. Mr. Bailey noted that he had made this same request for the past seven years. He submitted documents stating his remarks that were placed on file with the Clerk.

Gary Schmidt discussed openness and transparency in government and a citizen-friendly public records law.

Margaret Martini commented that the BCC should issue a directive to their respective districts to initiate strict trash ordinances and a definitive timeline to create and execute strong ordinances about trash issues. She felt the BCC had "passed the buck" on this issue by waiting for other entities to make decisions.

13-728 AGENDA ITEM 4 – ANNOUNCEMENTS

Agenda Subject: "Commissioners'/Manager's Announcements, Requests for Information, Topics for Future Agendas, Statements Relating to Items Not on the Agenda and any ideas and suggestions for greater efficiency, cost effectiveness and innovation in County government. (No discussion among Commissioners will take place on this item.)"

John Berkich, Interim County Manager, explained that this meeting was the first of three scheduled meetings to discuss AB 46. The next meetings were scheduled for September 17th and October 15th at 4:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers.

13-729 AGENDA ITEM 5

Agenda Subject: "Discussion and possible direction to staff on AB 46 of the 2013 Nevada Legislative Session, including but not limited to: An overview and discussion of School Funding in Nevada and the Washoe County School District; An overview and discussion on accountability for capital funding at the Washoe County School District; An overview and discussion on the Council of the Great City Schools Report. (AB 46 authorizes the imposition of a new sales and use tax, and ad

valorem tax in Washoe County for capital projects of the Washoe County School District.)”

Vice Chairperson Weber commented that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had received materials from the Washoe County School Board (WCSD) just prior to the beginning of this meeting and were not privy to reviewing those documents or familiar with the contents. She indicated that the BCC preferred to have any materials for a meeting distributed to them in a timely manner allowing time to review. In the future, she asked the Washoe County School Board of Trustees (BOT's) to distribute their material in a timely manner to the BCC.

John Slaughter, Acting Assistant County Manager, explained that members from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) would discuss the overview of school funding in Nevada, and then the WCSD would provide their overview for various funding processes.

Julie Waller, LCB Sr. Program Analyst, provided a high level overview on State funding for K-12 education. The funding that supported the State's public elementary and secondary schools was a shared responsibility between State, local and federal sources contributing to the school districts and charged school operating funds for the 2013-2015 biennium. She said the Legislature approved approximately \$3.1 billion of State funding in support of K-12 education, and she noted that the State did not provide funding for capital purposes since that was considered a local responsibility. Ms. Waller explained through a formula known as the "*Nevada Plan*" the Legislature determined a level of State aid for operating purposes for items such as salaries and benefits, utilities, travel insurance and textbooks. The goal of the Nevada Plan was to ensure educational opportunities for all students regardless of the wealth of their school district. A guaranteed amount of basic support was calculated for each school district and was established in law during each Legislative session. Ms. Waller indicated that special education funding was distributed as a unit allocation in addition to the Nevada Plan formula funding. She said the current biennium contained 3,049 units at \$41,632 per unit for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 and \$42,923 per unit for FY 2015. The process to develop the State-wide average guaranteed basic support per pupil for a biennium began with the submission of a statutory required revenue and expenditure report by each school district and charter school. The report was then submitted to the Nevada Department of Education in the even or base year, which this past session was 2011/12. The Department of Education compiled the information into a State-wide report, and then adjustments were made to fund increases for projected enrollment, certain inflationary increases, and a 2 percent increment for step and column increases for school personnel. She said non-guaranteed, locally generated revenues available to fund general operating expenditures were deducted to determine the total basic support. Ms. Waller explained that the non-guaranteed, locally generated revenues included the two-thirds portion of the public school operating property tax, governmental services tax, interest income and franchise taxes. In total, those revenues amounted to approximately \$606 million for FY 2014 and \$621 million for FY 2015. The total basic support funding was then divided by the projected estimated State-wide weighted enrollment to arrive at a State-wide average

basic support per pupil, which was \$5,590 per pupil for FY 2014 and \$5,676 per pupil for FY 2015. From the State-wide average basic support per pupil, the Nevada Department of Education calculated a separate basic support per pupil for each school district, which could be found in SB 522, by using a formula that considered the economic and geographic characteristics of each district. She explained that the dollar amount for basic support differed across different school districts due to variations in the cost of living, differences in the cost of providing education based on school size, and the cost per pupil for administration and support services. The guaranteed basic support for the WCSD for school year 2013/14 was \$5,504 per pupil and was estimated to be \$5,585 per pupil for 2014/15.

Ms. Waller said through the Local Schools Support Tax (LSST), a sales tax currently at 2.6 percent in addition to one-third of the public school operating property tax, State and school districts shared the responsibility for providing the money needed to fund the guaranteed basic support per pupil. It was important to note that the LSST and the one-third property tax were guaranteed by the State. If budgeted amounts were not collected, she explained that the State funded the difference to that level, conversely, if the revenue sources exceeded the budgeted amounts that were projected, the amount of State general funds were reduced. She said the estimated LSST and the one-third property tax amount, which were the guaranteed revenue sources, were subtracted from the total basic support to determine the State share of the funding. The total LSST and property tax amount estimated to fund the total basic support amount in the 2013-2015 biennium totaled approximately \$1.29 billion for FY 2014 and \$1.36 billion for FY 2015. She said on-going revenue sources used to fund the State share of basic support, which were distributed through a budget account known as the Distributive School Account (DSA), included State general funds, a slot tax, permanent school fund earnings, federal mineral lease revenue and any LSST that could not be attributed to a specific county. The State sources estimated to fund the total basic support amount in the current biennium totaled \$1.42 billion for FY 2014 and \$1.40 billion for FY 2015. In addition to the revenue guaranteed through the Nevada Plan, school districts and charter schools also received categorical funding from the State, from the federal government, and other private organizations that could only be expended for designated purposes such as all day kindergarten, current technical education programs, and early childhood education. The federally funded programs included Title I funding for the disadvantaged and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or special education funding. She indicated that categorical funds must be accounted for separately in special revenue funds, as was funding for capital purposes.

4:45 p.m. Chairman Humke left the meeting.

Pedro Martinez, WCSD Superintendent, explained that a PowerPoint presentation would be conducted to highlight the overview of the WCSD's operating funds, accountability and the Council of Greater City Schools report. He confirmed that any documents submitted by the WCSD in the future would be provided to the Board in a timely manner. He also submitted a binder explaining the *School Capital Needs Initiative*, but he noted that the binder would not be used during this meeting; however, would be

covered in future sessions. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation and the binder were placed on file with the Clerk.

Tom Slazinski, WCSD Business and Investment Services Executive Director, conducted the PowerPoint presentation that highlighted the FY 2013/14 General Fund estimated revenues, FY 2013/14 General Fund expenditures, expenditure descriptions, FY 2013/14 General Fund expenditures by type, General Fund Revenues versus Expenses, an overview of reserves, the structural deficit for FY 2015, Operating versus Capital Funding, other District funds, graduation and proficiency rates (2004 through 2012), special student program population in the WCSD, administrators defined, administrative functions, layoffs versus employee concessions, and a 2002 Rollover Bond summary.

Commissioner Jung inquired on the percentage of the ending fund balance for the operating budget. Mr. Slazinski replied that the percentage for the ending fund balance was about 8 percent. Commissioner Jung questioned if money derived from AB 46 would only be for capital funding and would not be used for collective bargaining. Mr. Slazinski stated that was correct. Commissioner Jung commented that she was often asked why the WCSD did not sell excess property if they needed money. Superintendent Martinez explained the only property the WCSD had of any real value was located in Incline Village; however, even that property value had decreased. He noted that over 98 percent of the WCSD schools were either full or close to full, which was a concern for the future. He indicated that the 2013 data for the graduation rate would soon be disclosed and would be the highest rate ever seen in the region.

WCSD President Barbara Clark indicated that the WCSD was 48th in the nation in regard to funding. In spite of that, Commissioner Jung said Washoe County recently had begun to be competitive at the national average and demonstrated some fiscal conservatism. Superintendent Martinez explained much pride would be expressed when the community saw the recent data for graduation rates.

Commissioner Berkbigler asked if the BCC approved moving forward with AB 46, would it go into the Capital Fund, and if the existing capital monies or the way that money was now allocated would change. Superintendent Martinez replied that the WCSD could not change how the money was allocated. Per State law, he said monies raised for capital expenditures could not be used for anything except capital expenditures for buildings. He indicated that the new money had the same restrictions and could not be used for anything except capital expenditures.

Vice Chairperson Weber inquired if a freeze had been placed on the amount remaining from the 2002 Rollover Bonds. Superintendent Martinez replied there was approximately \$94 million remaining from the 2002 Rollover Bonds. He acknowledged that the BOT's had placed a hold on those funds in order to review capital renewal, revitalization and safety projects. Superintendent Martinez clarified that those funds had to be restricted for capital improvements and could not be used for salaries or operating needs. He said the District was being proactive and was managing the funds

from the 2002 Rollover Bonds; however, a sustainable source was needed to support the school buildings.

Commissioner Berkbigler asked if it were possible to move students from one school site to another while repairs were being completed. Superintendent Martinez stated that would not be possible.

5:42 p.m. The Board recessed.

5:55 p.m. The Board reconvened with Commissioner Berkbigler and Chairman Humke absent.

WCSD President Clark explained that in 2008, the District took a different direction. At that time, the BOT's decided to move boldly into reform in order to make a difference in the graduation rate because the graduation rate of 55 percent was unsatisfactory. A new superintendent was hired in 2008 to bring those new reforms forward and to bring the County current with other urban school districts. To receive those types of results, the District needed teachers and administrators suited to bring those reforms about and noted that time was spent in professional development to ensure what was being brought into this community was working. President Clark said a strategic plan had been established to lead the path toward reform enabling every child, by name and face, to graduation. She said meetings were held with the community, parents and teachers to build that strategic plan and to build the reforms to place the District on a path of success. Within the strategic plan were four "A's" accountability, accessibility, achievement and alignment. The BOT's were interested in seeing reforms come in, but were also interested in measuring those reforms. She clarified that everything that came before the BOT's including capital campaigns or graduation initiatives indicated how the District would be accountable and how it would be evaluated to determine whether the reforms were working. She said the BOT's was committed to every child by name and face crossing the graduation stage.

In looking at accountability, President Clark indicated that the District was mandated to have external audits and always received excellent audits showing no problems. For over 10 years, she said the District had an Internal Audit Committee with the chief auditor having over 15 years of experience. She noted that she had served on the Audit Committee every year since she had been elected to the BOT's and saw it as a key piece within the District. She commented that the BOT's were dedicated to performing operational and performance audits. In looking at the 2002 Rollover Bonds, President Clark said the promises made had been kept and the money had been spent the way it was listed when it was sent to the voters. She said the BOT's attempted to be as transparent as possible; however, there was always room for improvement.

Superintendent Martinez explained that he had commissioned the review from the Great Council of City Schools (Council) for six operating departments in the District to ensure that best practices were being followed. He said the Council was made up of large urban school districts in the country. The people that conducted the review

were Chief Operating Officers (COO's) from all over the country that could share best practices and how this District was doing with their best practices.

Michael Casserly, Council of the Great City Schools Executive Director, participated in the meeting via telephone and gave the following summary.

Mr. Casserly thanked the Board for their interest in the report. He thanked the BOT's, the Superintendent and staff for their collaboration as the review was conducted. He said the Council never received any resistance as the project was being pursued and that cooperation was critical to the understanding of the issues and challenges facing the WCSD. He remarked that it took considerable courage and openness to ask for this type of review because they were typically very tough on school districts that were not doing well. Mr. Casserly commended the Superintendent for inviting the Council to conduct the study and for his thoughtful pursuit of greater operational, financial efficiency and effectiveness for the long-term benefit of the WCSD and the children it served. He thanked the 28 individuals that contributed to the effort and indicated that most of the people participating provided their time and expertise pro bono. Those individuals included current and retired school leaders and managers from Albuquerque, New Mexico; Boston, Massachusetts; Broward County, Florida; Clark County, Nevada; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Hillsborough County, Florida; Houston, Texas; Jefferson County, Colorado; Los Angeles, California; Miami/Dade County, Florida; Norfolk, Virginia; Orange County, Florida; St. Paul, Minnesota; and, Santa Ana, California. He said their enthusiasm, commitment and generosity were central to the Council's ability to present the WCSD with the best possible observations and proposals. The Council was a membership organization of the nation's largest urban public school districts and had conducted nearly 250 reviews over the past 15 years in more than 50 major school districts across the Country. He said those reviews included studies on the organizational, instructional, financial, facilities, human capital, technology and other operating areas for some of the largest, most complex school systems in the nation. The Council's willingness to conduct this type of work was based on the reality that urban school districts, in particular, were under enormous pressure to improve their academic performance and their operational and financial effectiveness and efficiency. Mr. Casserly stated that the Council's reports could be very critical, but had been the basis for reform and improvement for many urban school districts across the Country. In other cases, the reports were positive and helped identify best practices that other school districts could replicate. The process used by the Council began with a request from a board of education and/or a superintendent. The review often fell into one of three general types: high level reviews of the overall organizational and administrative structure of the school district; assessments on how the instructional and business operations were integrated focusing on major priorities; and, addressed the needs of various student groups or distinct operating functions such as transportation, food services or security.

Mr. Casserly said the Council assembled Strategic Support Teams that were composed of highly respected senior managers from major urban school districts across the Country that had strong reputations for excellence. Before conducting each site

visit, the Teams reviewed background information and data on the district that would be examined. The Teams then conducted site visits that lasted three to five days per area. The first day included a meeting with the board of education, the superintendent or senior management to clarify the nature of the work and to set expectations for the review. The next several days were used to conduct interviews of key staff members, review additional documentation and statistical information and visit offices and schools. The final day was devoted to synthesizing the Teams findings and preparing an initial set of recommendations. The board of education, the superintendent or senior management were then debriefed at the end of each site visit. The Council then prepared a draft report, which was circulated to Team members to ensure accuracy and confirm their agreement about the findings and recommendations. A final report was then forwarded to the board of education, the superintendent or senior management. The Council used this same approach in Washoe County.

Mr. Casserly said the Council had been asked to assess the District's operations in Facilities Management and Capital Projects, Nutrition Services, Purchasing, School Police and Security, Transportation and Information Technology and to make recommendations on improvement in each of those categories. In general, the Council's Team found a school system in relatively good working order. The WCSD was not broken and was not dysfunctional. In fact, it operated at a very high level, had very good staff leadership, had well-qualified personnel, for the most part, and had a strong operational capacity. He said it was a good school system striving to be great. Mr. Casserly said the Teams were often impressed by the professionalism and dedication of staff, the satisfaction that school-based personnel had with central office services, the ability of people to work above their job descriptions and pay grades, the staffs sense of propriety and ethics and the positive comments the Team heard from people that were interviewed. The following were the Teams observations:

Facilities Management: The Team saw District managers and staff delivering projects on very short turnaround timeframes, and clerical staff with unusually strong expertise in departmental processes. The overall resources allocated to maintenance and operation activities compared favorably to other large urban school systems across the Country. It was clear that the schools were often very satisfied with services provided by the Facilities Department. Mr. Casserly did not see irregularities, excesses or ineptitude here or anywhere else, just places where further improvement could be made, which was something that staff was already pursuing.

Food Services: The Team saw a culture that valued the connection between nutrition, good health and student achievement. There was strong evidence of increased meal participation, better services, more diverse menus and better quality food. He said the school principals that were interviewed were positive about the improvement the District had made to cafeterias.

Purchasing: The Purchasing Department had received the "Achievement of Excellence in Procurement Award" from the National Procurement Institute for the

past 15 years. The Team saw a Department that was strategically focused, customer-oriented and highly expert.

School Police and Security: This department received commendations from the Council's Security Team. He said departmental leadership and officers appeared concerned about the overall safety and well-being of students. He said the Team stated that the patrol officers appeared to work well with officers in other community policing agencies, and school principals were very complimentary of the officers within their buildings. All-in-all, the department received high marks from school staff on their customer service and professionalism.

Transportation: The Council gave kudos to the department for their dedication and professionalism. The employees of the department expressed a strong desire to provide safe and efficient student transportation, utilize the latest technology and to train staff in that technology. He said principals generally gave the department and their new management staff high marks.

Information Technology: This department came in for praise over important improvements made over the last several years. The Team saw the department working collaboratively with the State education department on several critical instructional technology initiatives. In addition, the Team found a department staff that was dedicated and hard-working with high customer satisfaction levels, particularly with business system users.

Overall, Mr. Casserly said the Council found substantial capacity and significant dedication amongst District staff and leadership, and a strong commitment to improve the system as it moved forward. The Council did not find any major operational problems with the District's non-instructional functions. He confirmed that they did not find any evidence of waste, fraud or mismanagement in any of the departments. He noted there were a number of tactical and technical areas that could pose problems in the future, but the District's leadership was cognizant of those areas and knew they presented opportunities for improvement. For instance, the District had a strategic plan that was developed under the previous superintendent that would be expiring in 2015. He commented that major school systems did not always have strategic plans and the Council was not always fixated on a district having them, but strategic plans were important for a school system to articulate a clear vision and theory of action around which the work of individual departments hinged. Without that, it was often easy for large school districts to default into fractured and/or silo activities that did not work in tandem to meet system-wide objectives. He noted that the WCSD had a series of action steps in pursuit of the current strategic plan that was developed by the current superintendent. This peer report was designed to help the District meet that goal. The challenge would be for the District leadership to ensure that each component rolled up in a coherent and cohesive fashion. Mr. Casserly said most of the Teams findings and recommendations were tactical or technical and were proposals that would provide smoother operations, which were currently in place. Since the Team concluded the site visit, District staff, including those leading facilities operations, had been working hard to

strengthen departmental plans and develop corrective actions that addressed the Council's recommendations and proposals. This was in keeping with a staff that was dedicated to the well-being of the District and the students. He said it would take time to implement all the proposals in the report, but the Council was confident that the WCSD had the right leadership and was well positioned for substantial progress.

Pete Etchart, WCSD Chief Operating Officer (COO), read a prepared statement highlighting his background. He said the three themes within the Peer Reviews, were: the Organizational Structure and Communication; Being a Data-Driven Organization; and, Project Management and Delivery. A copy of the entire statement was placed on file with the Clerk.

***6:34 a.m.** Chairman Humke arrived at the meeting.

Commissioner Hartung asked when the BOT's formally received the review from the Council. Mr. Etchart replied that he began working with the District on April 2, 2013 and received the review two weeks before he began. Commissioner Hartung commented that the BCC was in an unusual and unpleasant predicament and had been put in an afflictive position to publicly review the WCSD's practices, policies, procedures and budget with respect to facilities maintenance. He said the BCC had no oversight, and he had difficulty being placed in that position. Commissioner Hartung strongly supported education, but said he could not support any type of mismanagement or even the perception of mismanagement, which was what the voters were seeing. He remarked that he was receiving numerous phone calls and e-mails about mismanagement of funds. In his opinion, when the Council submitted their review in March or April, the District missed a significant opportunity to demonstrate transparency, accountability and credibility with the Legislature and the voters. He felt the District should have immediately divulged the existence of the review to the Legislature and asked for a ballot initiative during the 2014 General election. Then, over the next year and a half, make sweeping, adaptive, disruptive changes in facilities management by installing a new management system and team, promulgating a new set of values within the department and changing the District's strategy, with respect to public perception. He said the District missed an opportunity with the public, which was disheartening because the voters needed to be involved with this process.

Superintendent Martinez reiterated that he had commissioned the reviews with the support of the BOT's. He acknowledged that an area that needed improvement was marketing the District, especially when it came to operations. He said there was a great deal of misinformation being distributed and because there had not been a good job of marketing there were many questions. He indicated there was a two-day public workshop held in April where each report was presented in full detail. He felt the reason this report was not brought to the public's attention was because it did not uncover fraud or waste, but uncovered best practices and tactical issues that needed improvement. WCSD President Clark confirmed that the reviews were conducted in a public setting and were placed on the District's web page.

Commissioner Hartung noted that the overall resources allocated to maintenance and operation activities in the WCSD, as a percentage of the general fund expenditures, was 5.96 percent and compared favorably to the median of 5.54 percent among large urban school systems surveyed by the Council. He said the District was spending the right amount of money, but was not getting any maintenance done. Superintendent Martinez clarified that buildings were not falling apart; in fact when the proposal was brought forward, the District was attempting to be proactive. He stated that the WCSD was the only District in the State that did not have a separate funding source for the maintenance of buildings. If the resources could be achieved, the District could be proactive, and had become very good at reviewing the current assets.

Commissioner Hartung applauded the Superintendent for commissioning the review and he felt that showed great management skills, but he still questioned why a ballot initiative was not requested. Superintendent Martinez said large dollars were needed and, if he were going to approach the taxpayers, he would ask for a larger amount than the \$20 million requested in AB 46. Commissioner Hartung questioned why the last bond initiative failed, and did the BOT's look at the confidence level from the voters. President Clark indicated that surveys were conducted after the last election to seek input on why the initiative failed; however, that was a different school district with a different culture. The decision was made in 2008 to change the culture of the District by taking it to the next level and significant changes were being made.

In response to the call for public comment, Cathy Brandhorst stated her opinions about AB 46.

Art O'Connor stated his opposition to AB 46. He said there was nothing in the initiative that stated the money must be used for maintenance. The only specific item discussed was that the money may be pledged to the payment, principle and interest of the bonds, or other obligations issued for one or more of the purposes set forth in NRS 387. He said the District had not done the maintenance in the past and reminded the Board that the teachers union in the past had entered into arbitration, which swept that money into pay raises. He said the initiative was missing the establishment of a separate account dedicated exclusively for maintenance.

David Dehls, Education Alliance President, said a sustainable and on-going revenue stream for maintenance was missing. He commented that AB 46 was not a perfect bill, but was achievable at the time. He suggested that the Board and the public stop thinking like Republicans and Democrats and conservatives and liberals and begin thinking as northern Nevadans. He said this was not a perfect bill, but as northern Nevadans, the Board should sit down and figure out how to make the bill work in order to help the only school district in the State that did not have an on-going revenue stream for capital maintenance.

Jane Lyon felt that the BOT's had not yet earned the trust to receive more money. She stated whenever money was requested it never went to repair the buildings

and she felt that the community had lost faith. She suggested the District show there was fiscal responsibility and then place another bond issue on a ballot.

Jim Pfrommer said he was in favor of AB 46. He remarked that this was a healthy discussion about what was needed for the community and the economy. He said the School District needed to be supported and not have maintenance delayed any longer.

Charlene Bybee stated her opposition to AB 46. She distributed a handout entitled "Division of Public School Capital Construction Assistance." She reviewed the Building Excellent Schools Today (BEST) program that focused on helping all schools with a multitude of capital construction needs. A copy of the handout was placed on file with the Clerk.

As a teacher, Natha Anderson asked the Board to support AB 46 so that future students had a classroom that was safe, warm and a place where they wanted to learn. She said this bill would give a dedicated funding source for those future students.

John Ellsworth stated that he was a senior citizen on a fixed income, but he was asking the Board to raise his taxes to pay for maintenance and improvement for Washoe County schools. He encouraged the Board to make the difficult choices to ensure a stable and sustainable source of funding for maintenance and improvement of the County's public schools.

Katherine Snedigar voiced her opposition to AB 46 because there was nothing in the bill that stated it was a capital improvement program.

Todd "Taxpayer" Bailey said the District had admitted they had \$94 million remaining from the Rollover Bonds, which was enough for three or four more years. He suggested this bill return to the Legislature and the question placed on a ballot for the voters to decide.

Fred Barrie questioned why the Legislature sent this issue to the County Commissioners. He also asked why he did not have a practical way to vote on this initiative.

Gary Schmidt stated this decision was not the Board's job and he felt it was brought about by somewhat cowardly Legislators. He suggested the Board send the bill back to the Legislature.

The following individuals submitted comment cards in support of AB 46: Dana Galvin, Elaine Lancaster, Virginia Jackson, Jonathan Begley, Edward Keppelmann, Darcy Marud, Fred Boyd, Leslie Gilkey, Andrea Hughes-Baird, Richard Loring, Eloy Jarol and Denise Hedrick.

There was no action taken on this item.

13-730 AGENDA ITEM 6

Agenda Subject: “Discussion and possible action to direct staff to develop the appropriate ordinance(s) and Board of County Commission resolutions necessary to implement the provisions of AB 46 of the 2013 Nevada Legislative Session.”

There was no direction given to staff.

In response to the call for public comment, Todd “Taxpayer” Bailey did not believe any direction should be given to staff to draft an ordinance.

There was no action taken on this item.

13-731 AGENDA ITEM 7

Agenda Subject: “Reports/updates from County Commission members concerning various boards/commissions they may be a member of or liaison to.”

There were no comments from the Commissioners.

13-732 AGENDA ITEM 8

Agenda Subject: “Possible Closed Session for the purpose of discussing labor negotiations with Washoe County, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District and/or Sierra Fire Protection District per NRS 288.220.”

There was no closed session scheduled.

13-733 AGENDA ITEM 10 – PUBLIC COMMENT

Agenda Subject: “Public Comment. Comment heard under this item will be limited to three minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the Commission agenda. The Commission will also hear public comment during individual action items, with comment limited to three minutes per person. Comments are to be made to the Commission as a whole.”

Cathy Brandhorst addressed the Board.

Gary Schmidt spoke about the Open Meeting Law. He said if any documents were provided during a meeting those documents needed to be supplied to the public.

Todd “Taxpayer” Bailey questioned how many Commissioners signed the tax restraint initiative that was passed twice in this County. He felt that the process around AB 46 was automatically defunct; however, it was constitutional since both

houses of the Legislature passed the bill by a two-thirds majority and the Governor signed the bill into law.

* * * * *

7:57 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, on motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Hartung, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Berkbigler Absent, the meeting was adjourned.

DAVID E. HUMKE, Chairman
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

NANCY PARENT, County Clerk and
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners

*Minutes Prepared by:
Stacy Gonzales, Deputy County Clerk*