1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL [Non-action item]

Chair Rogers called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. A quorum was established.

PRESENT: Bill Ames, Aaron Kenneston, Robert Larson, Jim Reid, Suzy Rogers and Teresa Wiley. Duane Meyer joined the meeting by teleconference.

ABSENT: None.

Jen Gustafson – Deputy District Attorney, was also present.

Chair Rogers stated that agenda item 3 Approval of the December 12, 2016, minutes would be addressed at the regular meeting on January 19, 2017. Today’s special meeting is to receive additional information on the 2017-2018 911 budget only.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS [Non-action item]

There were no public comments.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [For possible action] – December 12, 2016

Continued to the January 19, 2017, meeting.

4. FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 BUDGET [For possible action] – A continuing review, discussion and possible action to direct staff to amend or modify the proposed FY 2017-2018 budget. This review will include an informational presentation and discussion focused on the following topics: Washoe County’s budget process as it relates to the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee Budget; the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee Budget including discussion of revenue, budget history and establishment of the contingency level [$500,000]; the current status of the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee Budget; and discussion of possible 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee Budget scenarios.

Quinn Korbulic – Washoe County Technology Services, introduced Mark Mathers – Budget Manager of the Washoe County Comptroller’s Office.

Shawn Tayler joined the meeting to 1:32 p.m.

Mr. Mathers outlined the parameters that Washoe County works with in developing the County’s budgets, including the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee. Additionally, there are specific State of Nevada regulations governing the process and deadline for local government budget filing with the State. The final budgets are due no later than June 1 with Washoe County requiring
that departmental budgets be submitted by the third week of February. Mr. Mathers pointed out that budgets generally cannot be increased once adopted and submitted to the State unless there are unanticipated revenues. The exception to that rule is grant, gifts or other donations that then much be brought to the BCC (Board of County Commissioners) for acceptance and approval.

Quinn Korbulic – Washoe County Technology Services, narrated the PowerPoint presentation (copy on file) and audio of the full meeting can be found on the Washoe County website:

https://www.washoecounty.us/technology/board_committees/911_response/index.php

Mr. Korbulic noted that the basic process is intended to carry forward revenues from the previous fiscal year with a rounding down but may change in the future. Mr. Korbulic explained that the bulk of the budget is the West (Intrado) contract with a significant portion covering FTE (Full Time Equivalent) costs for GIS (Geographical Information System) services provided by the Cities of Reno and Sparks. Other expenses include travel training and the desire to maintain a $500,000.00 minimum balance to cover potential emergency expenditures. Over the past few years the practice of expending more than incoming revenues (e.g. revenue of $1.634-million with expenses of $1.878-million). Based on current revenues the current and planned expenditures will drop the ending fund balance below the minimum $500,000.00. Mr. Korbulic noted that since FY 2012 through 2016, the fund balance has declined and indicate spending in excess of revenues. Mr. Korbulic outlined the expenditures over that timeline that included a large number of radios in FY 2012, and consoles in the current fiscal year. Essentially, non-recurring costs are not reflected in budget proposal as an expense. The intent of the minimum fund balance was to maintain a reserve to cover unanticipated expenses in the event of a system failure and to cover operating expenses as there is a lag in revenue. The only discretionay expenditure is the travel/training budget as all other items are included as part of the budget requirements. Historically, the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Board has refrained from reducing the ending fund balance. Mr. Korbulic explained that the minimum fund balance was a requirement set forth by the 911 Board.

Shawn Tayler noted that cost incurred due to lightning strikes was covered by insurance and other sources without any funding from the 911 fund.

Clay Griffin noted that the minimum fund balance had been implemented to avoid a reduction in the surcharge, should the fund exceed the maximum $1-million fund cap imposed by the legislature. Currently the rate is at the maximum of $0.25 per line.

Discussion then focused on the service and supplies budget and the employee wages and benefit expenses incurred by the 911 fund. Other discussion noted that the 5-year Master Plan update is legislative requirement. It was suggested that the board consider a reduction in the FTE reimbursements for the Cities of Reno and Sparks by reducing the reimbursement to a single FTE position for each entity. Typically travel/training budgets have been averaging about $30,000.00 for travel expenses and $15,000.00 for seminars/conferences. It was emphasized during the discussion that training is a necessary expense to assure that dispatch personnel are knowledgeable of the latest innovations and techniques. During FY 2015/2016 the actual expense for travel/training was approximately $36,000.00. It is thought that the budget can be reduced based on historical date and
past expenditures. Other discussion noted that staff had requested information on attendance at upcoming training opportunities to better forecast the budget needs. Of particular concern with the proposed reduction in GIS assistance is the potential for incomplete or inaccurate map data that can have serious consequences for first responders. Other discussion pointed out that the budget proposal did not include any provision for additional capital equipment. Discussion then turned to the 5-year update of the Master Plan and the need to identify future equipment and technology needs. However, the continued practice of spending more than incoming revenues will continue to reduce the ability to maintain the $500,000.00 minimum fund balance. As the discussion continued, it was noted that the local jurisdictions had not yet submitted a BDR (Bill Draft Request) to seek an increase in the per line cap for the 911 Surcharge. However, it is thought that some of the smaller counties may have submitted a BDR and that perhaps Washoe(45,112),(978,983)(45,112),(978,983) County could benefit by participating in that process. Legal counsel will research the ability of Washoe County to participate in another jurisdiction’s BDR process for the increase in the 911 surcharge. It was noted that to date there is no record of any BDR being filed to increase the 911 Surcharge.

Member Kenneston outlined his concerns about the budget and pointed out that, in his opinion, an increase in the surcharge or continue to explore options to recover unpaid fees being reviewed by the County Manager’s Office.

Jen Gustafson – Deputy District Attorney, commented that the focus of this meeting is to develop and submit a budget recommendation for FY 2017-2018, which is due by the end of February. Ms. Gustafson noted that further discussion of unpaid fees is outside the scope of today’s agenda.

Discussion then turned to the City of Reno request to fund the Cad-to-Cad interface. It was noted that the City had paid the 50-percent down payment to move the project forward and that perhaps the request for 911 funding should be submitted in two separate fiscal years. Other discussion noted that West (formerly Intrado) had not increased fees and that the Cad-to-Cad Interface might not qualify as a 911 expense. It was emphasized that 911 funds cannot be used by Washoe County for any other purpose and that unexpended funds remain in the 911 fund. Other discussion focused on the ProQA program that is only used by the Washoe County PSAP. As the discussion continued, it was suggested that perhaps the reduction in FTE funding might prompt local jurisdictions to submit a BDR seeking an increase in the Surcharge. It was noted that Washoe County was not pursuing that course of action. Other discussion suggested that future equipment request might be considered in multi-year budget considerations with local entities contributing to the replacement costs. Discussion then turned to a potential reduction in the minimum year-end balance. It was pointed out that retaining the minimum $500,000.00 ending fund balance provided funding for unforeseen expenditures

It was moved by Member Kenneston, seconded by Member Meyer, to retain the $500,000.00 minimum 911 fund balance and adopt the 2017-2018 911 budget as presented on Slide 10 of the presentation.

Responding to Member Wiley’s inquiry about whether the 2017-2018 budget needed to be approved at today’s (January 3, 2017) meeting, Mr. Korblic stated that a final recommendation for approval of the 2017-2018 911 budget could be done at the regular 911 meeting scheduled for January 19, 2017.
Member Kenneston withdrew the motion. Member Meyer withdrew the second.

It was moved by Chair Rogers, seconded by Member Reid, to maintain the minimum $500,000.00 fund balanced. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Rogers expressed her appreciation to Mr. Korbulic and his staff for their work on the budget projections and assistance provided to the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee.

5. 911 EMERGENCY RESPONSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER AND/OR STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS [Non-action item] – No discussion among committee members will take place on this item. The next regular meeting is scheduled at 1:30 p.m., January 19, 2017.

No new items were identified

6. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-action item]

Member Meyer commended Washoe County staff for their work on the budget presentation.

7. ADJOURNMENT [Non action item]

Chair Rogers adjourned the meeting at 3:03 p.m.