

**BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS  
SIERRA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

TUESDAY

10:00 a.m.

APRIL 26, 2011

PRESENT:

**John Breternitz, Chairman**  
**Bonnie Weber, Vice Chairperson**  
**Robert Larkin, Commissioner**  
**Kitty Jung, Commissioner**  
**David Humke, Commissioner**

**Amy Harvey, County Clerk**  
**Katy Simon, County Manager**  
**Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel**  
**Michael Greene, Fire Chief**

The Board convened at 3:45 p.m. in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

**11-45SF      AGENDA ITEM 11**

**Agenda Subject:** “Possible closed session for the purpose of discussion negotiations with Employee Organizations per NRS 288.220.”

During the Board of County Commissioners meeting, on motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the meeting be recessed to a closed session for the purpose of discussing negotiations with Employee Organizations per NRS 288.220.

*The following item (Agenda Item No. 3) will be heard by the Washoe County Board of Commissioners who will convene as the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District, the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Sierra Fire Protection District and the Washoe County Board of Commissioners.*

**11-46SF      AGENDA ITEM 3**

**Agenda Subject:** “Discussion and direction to staff regarding possible agreements between SFPD and TMFPD for partial funding of the Arrowcreek station and/or staffing/operations support between the Districts, and between SFPD and Washoe County for station construction management, management services including but not limited to; budget development and oversight, contract administration and consolidation/regionalization matters, and other administrative services, and discussion and possible direction to either include the City of Reno in the possible

**agreements or consider alternatives to the TMFPD-Reno Fire services Interlocal Agreement. (Requested by Commissioner Larkin).”**

Kurt Latipow, Fire Services Coordinator, reviewed the staff report and outlined the three recommendations provided on page 3. He noted Recommendation 1 would transfer funding for an administrative secretary from the Sierra Fire Protection District (SFPD) to the County’s Management Services Department. He clarified the staff proposal under Recommendation 2 was to consider having the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) share in the funding of construction for the Arrowcreek station, but not in the ongoing operational costs of the new station.

Commissioner Jung questioned whether the salary of an administrative secretary represented the true cost for Management Services to take over budget oversight, fire commissioner support, and other administrative functions. If Board direction was given to move forward, Chief Latipow said the next step would be to sit down with Human Resources to identify what position was needed and whether or not it was the true cost. He indicated his job description already encompassed much of the support for the SFPD. He said he believed it was pretty close to the true cost of handling the extra workload. Commissioner Jung asked if financial analysts would provide a truing up at the end of each fiscal year so the Board could see who owed who. Chief Latipow agreed it was a good idea to include that in an Interlocal Agreement between the SFPD and Washoe County.

In response to the call for public comment, Thomas Daly talked about Recommendation 3 and the work being done on amendments to the Interlocal Agreement for fire services between Washoe County and the City of Reno. He indicated generalizations had been provided to the public and to the Joint Fire Advisory Board (JFAB), but there were no details available as to what amendments were agreed to by staff. He asked the Board to direct staff to post amendments on the County’s website for which there was staff consensus.

Gary Pestello complimented the forward progress that had been made in bringing the TMFPD and the SFPD together. He said he was in favor of combining the two districts but thought it was premature to bring the City of Reno into any agreements until their fiscal problems had been aired out.

Jane Countryman agreed there were shared benefits and the TMFPD should help with the Arrowcreek station. She observed the same was true in West Washoe Valley. She hoped more work would be done to merge the two districts together.

Commissioner Jung clarified that every single issue concerning amendments to the Interlocal Agreement between Reno and Washoe County was to be expedited and brought to the JFAB at its next meeting, whether there was staff agreement or not. She noted the upcoming Joint meeting between the City of Reno and Washoe County would include discussion of the Standards of Cover (SOC) but not the Interlocal Agreement for fire services.

Commissioner Larkin stated the SFPD gained some cost efficiencies under Recommendation 2, but it was not clear what advantage was achieved for the TMFPD taxpayers. Chief Latipow replied the TMFPD citizens would benefit from improved service once the Arrowcreek station was open. He indicated moving forward with a connection to Thomas Creek would also improve service to the other side of Thomas Creek Road. He said the number of citizens who would see improved service had been identified, but the controls that should be put into an Interlocal Agreement to subsidize construction were still being discussed. Commissioner Larkin commented that Recommendation 2 was based on the Standards of Cover (SOC). He noted the joint bodies were scheduled to take the SOC under consideration and would hopefully get some agreement for the region. He agreed there was a logical argument to move forward with discussions about Recommendation 2, but he was not yet comfortable in moving forward with an actual dollar amount until the Board saw the terms of an Interlocal Agreement between the SFPD and the TMFPD. He suggested there were two conflicting ideologies as to how cost sharing should occur. Chief Latipow stated the dollar amount in the staff report was based on input from staff, the Districts' financial consultant, and Assistant Public Works Director Dave Solaro. He acknowledged it was fair to ask whether estimated construction costs would hold so that it did not become necessary to revise the Interlocal Agreement. He asked for direction to work with the District Attorney's office on a clause that would revisit the TMFPD contribution if construction came in under budget.

Commissioner Larkin observed that Recommendation 3 requested staff direction to either include the City of Reno in agreements between the SFPD and the TMFPD or to consider alternatives to the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Reno for fire services in the TMFPD. He asked Michael Hernandez, Fire Chief for the Reno Fire Department and the TMFPD, if he had an opinion. Chief Hernandez said building the Arrowcreek fire station was a positive step in the right direction. He noted the SOC indicated the station was warranted. He stated any Interlocal Agreement between the TMFPD and the SFPD would depend on how the language was crafted, and he was not prepared to comment on any specific terms of an agreement.

Commissioner Larkin commented that the issues placed an additional wrinkle in the negotiation process with the City of Reno, with respect to the deployment of assets. Under the current agreement, he asked if Chief Hernandez could authorize the temporary relocation of assets to an Arrowcreek fire station if the need arose. Chief Hernandez replied he would probably be given such latitude under emergency circumstances. He noted there were automatic aid and mutual response agreements already in place. He pointed out his primary responsibility under the current Interlocal Agreement was to the citizens of the TMFPD and the citizens of Reno. He stated he would have to come before the Board for direction and it was clearly outside the scope of his authority to permanently relocate assets from a TMFPD station that would be housed within the SFPD. Commissioner Larkin wondered about a combined TMFPD and SFPD station. Chief Hernandez suggested the articles of an Interlocal Agreement between the TMFPD and the SFPD would likely cover such an arrangement. If that were the case, he said it would be within his realm of responsibility to make such recommendations.

Chairman Breternitz said there had been a brief discussion at the Shared Services Elected Officials Committee meeting about what entity might look at the regionalization of fire services. He stated regionalization that included Reno was one option that would ultimately have to be discussed, along with other possibilities.

In response to the call for any more public comment, Robert Parker identified himself as a resident of Galena Forest. He indicated a new fire station would improve response to both the SFPD and the TMFPD taxpayers, and would save lives and property. He observed the population in the area had expanded since 2000 after the authorization of many new developments, but there had been no new fire stations. He said he and his wife had donated \$1,000 to the Galena Volunteer Fire Department to help fund construction of the Arrowcreek fire station.

Tom Motherway stated the Galena Volunteer Firemen had undertaken fundraising efforts to make up for shortfalls in construction of the Arrowcreek station. He said he had brought \$4,500 with him in checks that had been collected so far and an additional \$8,000 had been committed. He noted 11 taxpayers had agreed to underwrite the difference between what was collected in fundraising and \$50,000 to make up an anticipated shortfall. He remarked that the citizens obviously wanted the station built.

Cliff Low discussed Recommendation 2. He said it had been clearly established that an Arrowcreek station would end up servicing a lot of the TMFPD citizens. He suggested it was appropriate for people to get what they were paying for and for each district to pay for the services they were getting.

Please see below for the motion that was passed concerning Recommendation 1.

A motion was made by Commissioner Larkin and seconded by Commissioner Jung to approve Recommendation 2. Commissioner Larkin said he wanted to expand the Board's direction to talk about operational items. He stated a discussion of operational costs would have to involve the City of Reno, but independent action could be taken to begin crafting an Interlocal Agreement between the SFPD and the TMFPD for some kind of cost share related to the Arrowcreek fire station.

Chief Latipow requested clarification about the discussion of operational components. Commissioner Larkin suggested broadening the discussion with the SFPD. He stated the Board might not accept what staff brought back, but he did not see how the Board could segment the capital costs and then wash their hands of it. He stated there was a larger community that was very interested in regionalization, and discussion of operational components at Arrowcreek might be a good place to start the process.

Commissioner Weber said she could not support the motion. She expressed concern about the timeframe for constructing the Arrowcreek station.

Commissioner Jung agreed construction of the Arrowcreek needed to be expedited, but she did not believe the motion would slow things down. She suggested it would put more options on the table for staff. She noted the staff report for Recommendation 2 included direction on shared staffing possibilities. She indicated she would support the motion, but would immediately have an agenda item before the Board to put a stop to things if there was any indication that the grant was at risk or the discussion was slowing things down.

Commissioner Humke agreed the motion was a good one. He indicated Chief Latipow could start with the capital cost sharing and treat that as a separate contract section so as not to lose the grant. He could then move on to the next step. He stated it was a difficult situation because there were disparate staffing costs between the two districts.

Chairman Breternitz said he wanted to see a station at Arrowcreek and the SOC indicated it was necessary. He indicated there were outstanding questions that had not yet been answered, including the statutory requirement to have a solid staffing plan in place. He stated there were also some questions related to construction costs and he thought it was possible to get “more bang for the buck.” He noted neither the SFPD nor the TMFPD were financially sustainable from a budget perspective. Although things were not as simple as they seemed, he said he would support the motion.

Commissioner Weber questioned whether supporting the motion for Recommendation 2 would allow the Arrowcreek station to move forward or would put it on hold again. Commissioner Larkin commented that it was not a question of whether to move forward with Arrowcreek, it was a question of timing. He indicated the motion would build a foundation for getting some questions answered. He observed the SFPD was \$640,000 short of being able to build the station and some cooperative agreements between the TMFPD and the SFPD might pave the way for the TMFPD to either loan money or pay for part of the station.

Chief Latipow clarified that SFPD Fire Chief Michael Greene would present a staff report on the balance of the Arrowcreek funding under a separate agenda item. He stated the motion had to do with the mechanics of putting together an agreement that would come back to the Board for later consideration after the green light was given to construct the Arrowcreek station.

Please see the motion below that was passed for Recommendation 2.

A motion concerning Recommendation 3 was made by Commissioner Larkin and seconded by Commissioner Humke.

Commissioner Humke wondered what the starting point would be for negotiations concerning the Interlocal Agreement with Reno. Commissioner Larkin indicated there would now be a new negotiation point with the City of Reno concerning any agreement, once ratified, between the SFPD and the TMFPD. Commissioner Humke

said he would support the motion. He indicated it was his intent to exit the Interlocal Agreement that combined the Reno Fire Department (RFD) and the TMFPD, at least temporarily. He suggested true County-wide regionalization was the proper goal, but there was a long list of problems to be solved between the RFD and the TMFPD before the entities could re-enter negotiations.

Chairman Breternitz stated language in Recommendation 3 provided enough flexibility to study and come up with the right agreement. He acknowledged the Board might not enter into the same agreement with the City of Reno, and could enter a completely different Interlocal Agreement with different parties. He asked Chief Latipow to provide a road map that identified some steps and some numbers for different alternatives.

**Recommendation 1:** On motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, staff was authorized to begin working on an Interlocal Agreement concerning administrative relationships between the SFPD and Washoe County, as outlined on page 3 of the staff report. It was further noted that the intent was to sunset two existing Interlocal Agreements between the two agencies and streamline the relationships into one agreement.

**Recommendation 2:** On motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried, staff was authorized to begin crafting an Interlocal Agreement between the SFPD and the TMFPD concerning some kind of cost sharing related to construction of the Arrowcreek fire station, as outlined on page 3 of the staff report. It was further noted that the discussion between the SFPD and the TMFPD could be expanded to consider operational components.

**Recommendation 3:** On motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Humke, which motion duly carried, staff was authorized to include discussion of an Interlocal Agreement between the SFPD and the TMFPD in negotiations with the City of Reno related to the Interlocal Agreement to provide fire services for the TMFPD, as outlined on page 3 of the staff report. It was further noted that discussions and negotiations would take place through the JFAB.

*The following item only (Agenda Item No. 5) will be heard by the Washoe County Board of Commissioners who will convene as the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Sierra Fire Protection District and the Washoe County Board of Commissioners.*

**11-47SF      AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Agenda Subject: “Board discussion and possible approval of purchase and sale agreement for the original Arrowcreek fire station donated parcel of land (APN 152-921-02), net proceeds to be split with developer, Southwest Pointe Associates, resulting in roughly \$40,000 to the District per agreement with the developer, and authorize Chair to sign all closing documents.”**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Larkin absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5 be approved, authorized and executed.

**3:44 p.m.** Commissioner Larkin temporarily left the meeting.

**3:45 p.m.** The Board convened as the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Sierra Fire Protection District with Commissioner Larkin absent.

**11-48SF AGENDA ITEM 2A**

**Agenda Subject:** “Approval of Agenda for April 26, 2011 SFPD Fire Commissioners Meeting.”

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Larkin absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 2A be approved.

**11-49SF AGENDA ITEM 2B**

**Agenda Subject:** “Chief’s Report.”

**3:47 p.m.** Commissioner Larkin arrived.

Fire Chief Michael Greene reported that the first quarter for the “Invest in Success” volunteer program had been completed. The expectations had been outlined in December 2010 and a comprehensive evaluation was later agreed upon to measure the success of the program. He indicated that 26 volunteers had successfully completed all the elements in the evaluation process. Chief Greene announced that the next quarter would encompass wildland fire training. He stated that the Washoe Valley volunteers had elected to focus on being a “wildland only” department and would operate a wildland engine. He said they would complete that module of training, which was less demanding than the structural module.

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 2B be approved.

**11-50SF      AGENDA ITEM 4**

**Agenda Subject: “Discussion and Action on the Sierra Fire Protection District FY 11-12 Tentative Budget and Five Year Projections.”**

Mary Walker, District Financial Advisor, reported that the Sierra Fire Protection District (SFPD) was not financially viable at the current service of four-person engine companies for three fire stations due to the significant reduction in revenues the District was experiencing. From Fiscal Year 2008/09 to Fiscal Year 2011/12, the District was projected to experience an annual loss in property taxes of \$969,203, or a 17 percent reduction. She said the total annual operating revenues were projected to decline from \$8,591,338 in Fiscal Year 2008/09 to \$6,820,853 in Fiscal Year 2011/12 for a total loss of 12 percent.

Due to this significant loss in revenue, Ms. Walker said the District was analyzing various service level and budget options including three-person engine companies, early retirement buy-outs, cuts in services and supplies, and capital outlay. She said the tentative budget for Fiscal Year 2011/12 included the reduction of four-person engine companies to three-person engine companies for the current three fire stations. It also included reductions in services and supplies. Ms. Walker said the only capital outlay was related to the construction of the Arrowcreek Fire Station.

Ms. Walker said the reduction of the current four-person engine companies to three-person engine companies would require the SFPD Firefighters’ union concurrence through negotiations and would equate to an overall savings of approximately \$436,000, primarily from a decrease in overtime utilizing the existing staff. However, an additional \$643,000 in savings was required in order for the District to stay within its revenues. Therefore, District staff was reviewing the alternative of offering early retirement buy-outs and other cost saving alternatives.

Ms. Walker highlighted the proposed budget for the General Fund, the Capital Projects Fund, the Emergency Fund, Retiree Health Benefits Fund and the five year projections as included in the staff report. In order to provide the Board a longer-term view of the District’s finances, staff prepared five-year projections utilizing two different alternatives. She said the first alternative illustrated the District’s finances using the current level of service for four-person staffing at three stations while the second alternative illustrated the District’s finances using the three-person staffing at three stations. Ms. Walker noted some of the budget reduction options to eliminate the budget deficit were: status quo operating deficit; add back savings, savings from a three-person staffing; add back savings, potential five-person retiree buyout/reduction in force; and, miscellaneous cuts.

Ms. Walker concluded that the SFPD’s Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2011/12 was not financially stable as it continued to retain an operating deficit, (expenditures over revenues) of \$643,050 even after implementing a three-person engine

company and reducing expenditures. It was believed through early retirement buyouts and other budgeted reductions that the on-going operating deficit may be eliminated.

Commissioner Larkin questioned which three fire stations were incorporated within the budget. Ms. Walker explained there were no specific stations identified. She said with the proper cuts and reductions many of the future service level reductions could be minimized. Commissioner Larkin said the savings were not as significant when moving from a four-person to a three-person staffing as with the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD). Ms. Walker concurred and said that was because there were only three stations. This was basically eliminating overtime, but under the current scenario there were no retirement buyouts. Commissioner Larkin commented that some of the included cost savings may be achieved with the Interlocal Agreement. Ms. Walker stated that was correct.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Larkin questioned if an unbalanced budget could be submitted. Ms. Walker said this proposed budget ate away the fund balance; however, the legally required 4 percent in fund balance was still there. She said the final budget package would be presented during the May 16, 2011 hearing. Commissioner Larkin asked if it were possible to have one Emergency Fund between the two Fire Districts. Ms. Walker explained that was not recommended because the funds were set-up so they could not be available for any union negotiation. She indicated that the Emergency Fund was capped at \$1 million per year, per entity. Commissioner Larkin stated \$2 million could be tied up for the same fire. Ms. Walker clarified it may not be the same fire. It was based on two separate local governments and, if one fire combined both Districts, the cost was still divided based on acreage.

On motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

**11-51SF      AGENDA ITEM 6**

**Agenda Subject: “Direction to staff regarding the \$2,993,574 cost of constructing the Arrowcreek Fire Station and to address the shortfall of \$692,064 necessary to complete the construction including pursuing identified cost savings and funding sources available to address the shortfall.”**

Fire Chief Michael Greene conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the Clerk. The presentation highlighted the total cost associated with the Arrowcreek Station, the costs necessary to complete the Station, the available District funds, the immediate cost-savings, source and availability of 2009/10 excess funds, potential funding with the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) and the land sale, replenishment of Fiscal Year 2010/11 ending fund balance and the impact of Fiscal Year 2011/12 opening fund balance.

Commissioner Humke asked if the presentation had been provided to the Board before today's meeting. Chief Greene replied the presentation had not been forwarded, but the information was included in the staff report.

Commissioner Weber thanked the Chief for the explanation and presentation which highlighted all the points that were needed.

In looking at the District's General Fund tentative budget, Commissioner Larkin said the ending fund balance identified for Fiscal Year 2010/11 was \$2,183,464. He asked if that would be the starting balance for Fiscal Year 2011/12 and, if so, would the excess 2009/10 funds of \$564,715 be borrowed from the \$2,183,464. Mary Walker, District Financial Advisor, stated that was correct. With the replenishment, she said the net effect would decrease the ending fund balance next year by the \$71,000 shortfall. Commissioner Larkin asked if borrowing \$564,715 was included in the projection for Fiscal Year 2011/12. Ms. Walker noted that was in the beginning fund balance and stated that the real fund balance would be \$1.5 million less the \$71,000 in the net effect. She confirmed that she was fine borrowing the funds because all of the sources that returned them would return them quickly.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chairman Breternitz asked if the contract were awarded would the Board meet the statutory requirements for a bona fide staffing arrangement to cover the Arrowcreek Station. Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel, replied that statute required there be a plan in place. She recalled that the Board had acted on the recommendation when the grant was awarded, which satisfied the requirement. Chairman Breternitz was concerned about moving staff from one station to meet the staffing requirements of another station, and at the same time leave a station uncovered, which could have a detrimental effect.

Commissioner Larkin said Ms. Walker had identified three stations in the budget; however, specific stations had not been identified. He said the process of identifying those three stations was also within the Standard of Cover and would ultimately be part of the regionalization of fire services. Chairman Breternitz agreed, but did not know if a resolution had been reached indicating that the Board was comfortable with the staffing plan in place. Chief Greene said the original plan outlined in the grant application was for the relocation of crews which would have an impact. The additional follow-up was to divide the crews, provide two people for the Bowers Station and two people for the Arrowcreek Station. As identified in a previous staff report, Chief Greene noted that was not viable since it would require four people at each of the three stations. He said during a previous presentation, the Board gave direction regarding regionalization and returning to the reallocation plan.

Commissioner Humke was concerned about borrowing from the fund balance, but based on Ms. Walker's comments, would support a motion.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6 be approved.

**11-52SF      AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Agenda Subject: “Discussion and Action on the Sierra Fire Protection District Resolution to Augment and Amend the FY 2010-11 General Fund Budget in the amount of \$564,715.”**

Fire Chief Michael Greene explained this was the follow-up item to the passing of the Resolution to augment the budget.

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7 be approved. The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**11-53SF      AGENDA ITEM 8**

**Agenda Subject: “Discussion and action on “Sierra Fire Protection District-Station 36,” PWP-WA-2011 – Option 1: Award if Bid to the lowest responsive responsible bidder (staff recommends Al Shankle Construction in the amount of \$2,361,230.00; authorize the Chairman to execute the contract documents; and direct the Public Works Department to negotiate reductions in the scope of work by approximately \$200,000 OR Option 2: reject all bids; authorize the Public Works Department to re-design and re-bid the project OR Option 3; Reject all bids.”**

Dave Solaro, Public Works Assistant Director, said staff had spoken to Al Shankle Construction and acknowledged a letter had been received from the construction company ensuring the bid amount.

Chairman Breternitz asked if the financial calculations used for affordability included the \$249,000 in reductions from the contractor. Mr. Solaro stated that was correct. There had been an initial \$150,000 in reductions identified with the contractor, but after meeting with the District, he said additional items were also identified for further reductions.

In response to the call for public comment, Gary Pestello complimented the Board for bringing together the Fire Chiefs, the community and the citizens. He urged the Board to vote for Option No. 1 and award the bid for the Arrowcreek Station.

Bob Ackerman urged the Board to approve the bid for the Arrowcreek Station.

Chairman Breternitz said a possibility was awarding on the base bid amount and recognized that negotiations were taking place with the contractor. However, he assumed those negotiations would have been incorporated in the award of bid. In the past, Mr. Solaro explained that staff had been directed by legal counsel to not physically negotiate with the low bidder. Due to this being a public bid, he said legal counsel suggested that staff not negotiate with the low bidder since there was the chance the low bidder could negate and the County would be in the position of awarding to a second low bidder without those assurances.

Commissioner Humke asked if the motion should be conditioned upon successful negotiations. Mr. Solaro explained that the motion would target an actual amount of \$200,000 and would include successful negotiations. By awarding the bid, he said the County would enter into a contract and noted there were out-clauses, which were understood by the low bidder.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the bid for the Sierra Fire Protection District Station 36 project be awarded to the lowest, responsible, responsive bidder, Al Shankle Construction, in the amount of \$2,361,230 and the Chairman be authorized to execute the contract documents. It was further ordered that the Public Works Department be directed to negotiate reductions in the scope of work by approximately \$200,000.

**11-54SF      AGENDA ITEM 9**

**Agenda Subject: “Authorize additional design services for the Arrowcreek Fire Station for \$64,760.13 to Smith Design Group; and if approved authorize the contract administrator to execute the necessary documents.”**

Fire Chief Michael Greene said the design service amount was included in the soft cost identified in the previous presentation for the Arrowcreek Station. Chairman Breternitz asked why this was not in the original contract. Chief Greene replied several issues were reviewed including: a Special Use Permit (SUP), lead certification issues; and, the preparation of the bid documents.

Chairman Breternitz questioned if the SUP equated to \$9,000 worth of services. Dave Solaro, Public Works Assistant Director, indicated that the SUP was for wind generation on the site. He noted when the design work began a group wished to donate a wind generator to the District. He said the process then began for a SUP, including completing the design work and hearing public comments. Based on the public comments, it was decided to abandon the wind generation system. Chairman Breternitz inquired upon the total fees being paid to the architect and would there be any unexpected additional fees. Mr. Solaro said staff would suggest creating “a not to exceed” \$10,000 retainer fee for the architect in the event any questions arose during the construction process.

Chairman Breternitz asked if there was a Construction Administration (CA) included in the amount. Mr. Solaro said the contract did not include a CA. He said the original amount was \$140,000 and this request added the additional \$64,000. Since

the amount was over the Contract Administrators authority, it needed to come before the Board for approval. He said some items were identified in the grant, but \$20,000 within the \$64,000 was not identified within the grant. Chairman Breternitz thought he saw a contract that included a CA in the services. Mr. Solaro said the proposal associated with the contract did not contain any CA services. Chairman Breternitz asked if there was any liability that the County assumed by taking on the responsibility of overseeing the construction. Mr. Solaro explained that the \$10,000 retainer fee would be used in the event the Architect of Record needed to answer any questions that may arise requiring their service with the Building Department. Chairman Breternitz said the Architect of Record would be responsible and maintained liability for design elements, but the County would take on the liability associated with doing the administration of the project. Mr. Solaro stated that was correct.

Chairman Breternitz said this was an awkward system and felt that future agenda items would need to be dealt with differently.

On motion by Commissioner Weber, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried, with Chairman Breternitz voting “no,” it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be approved. It was further ordered that this process be reviewed for future items.

**11-55SF      AGENDA ITEM 10**

**Agenda Subject: “Report and possible Board direction on staff action plan to implement recommendations of Internal Audit report.”**

Fire Chief Michael Greene said the staff report outlined the recommendations from the Internal Auditor and provided a plan for each item. He believed that an Interlocal Agreement with the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) would help with the needed administrative support. He noted that an update on the recommendations would be provided during each District meeting.

Chairman Breternitz felt that the Internal Auditor report was not about continuous oversight of activities within the District. Chief Greene indicated he sought check-up status on a regular basis for the identified items.

Commissioner Jung questioned the notation about the labor agreements being modified. Chief Greene corrected the statement and said it meant that the labor agreement would be completed through the modifications.

Katy Simon, County Manager, clarified that the Internal Auditor would schedule with the Audit Committee in the work plan a review of a department’s compliance, which was typically a year after the initial review.

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be approved based on the discussion.

**AGENDA ITEM 12**

**Agenda Subject:** “Commissioner’s/Managers Announcements, Requests for Information, Topics for Future Agendas and Statements Relating to Items Not on the Agenda. (No discussion among Commissioners will take place on this item.)”

There were no Board member comments.

**11-56SF AGENDA ITEM 13**

**Agenda Subject:** “Public Comment.”

Diane Rose appreciated the Board’s effort in providing equal and fair treatment to all citizens.

Tom Motherway thanked the Board for approving the Arrowcreek Station.

Commissioner Humke read comments from Jane Countryman, which were placed on file with the Clerk.

\* \* \* \* \*

**4:55 p.m.** There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion by Commissioner Weber, seconded by Commissioner Humke, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

---

**JOHN BRETERNITZ**, Chairman  
Sierra Fire Protection District

**ATTEST:**

---

**AMY HARVEY**, Washoe County Clerk  
and Ex Officio Clerk, Sierra  
Fire Protection District

*Minutes Prepared by:  
Lisa McNeill and Stacy Gonzales  
Deputy County Clerks*

