

APPROVED APRIL 20, 2017

The Special Meeting of the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners was held on March 21, 2017 in the meeting room of the County Administration Building, 1616 8th Street, Minden, NV, beginning at 3:00 PM.

Call to Order

Commissioners Present:

Barry Penzel, Chairman
Steve Thaler, Vice Chairman
Nancy McDermid, Board Member
Larry Walsh, Board Member
Dave Nelson, Board Member

Staff Present:

Larry Werner, County Manager
Laure Penny, Clerk to the Board
Mark B. Jackson, District Attorney
Mimi Moss, Community Development Director
Sherri McGee, Chief Technology Officer
Vicki Moore, Interim CFO
Vicky Derner, Tahoe Chief Deputy Clerk
Zachary Wadlé, Deputy District Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Larry Walsh led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT (No Action)

Robert Pohlman stated he had an interesting proposition for the Board on how to put money away for the roads. He proposed putting away 25 percent of the budget. He commented the Legislature has a Bill before it to increase residential property tax to 3 percent. If the bill passes, he suggested taking the difference between the two and putting it in a reserve and you will eventually have enough money to fix the roads.

Dave Brady commented he thought it was interesting, at the last meeting, when the Board had a discussion on the Strategic Plan and what it should look like. He believed the priorities should be put in ranked order with Financial Stability being number one; look at number two as being Safe Community but that would also include Infrastructure; and then the third would be Organizational Sustainability. However, he is more concerned about what the Board is doing to identify the leadership of tomorrow. He remarked it's time for the Board to starting having conversations about looking for a new County Manager and Assistant County Manager. This organization needs leadership that they can identify into the future.

Public comment closed.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION to approve the agenda; carried

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Nancy McDermid, Board Member
SECONDER:	Larry Walsh, Board Member
AYES:	Penzel, Thaler, McDermid, Walsh, Nelson

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

The Administrative Calendar will be handled as follows:

- (1.) The Chairman will read the agenda title into the public record.
- (2.) Staff will introduce the item and provide a report, if any.
- (3.) The applicant, if any, will have an opportunity to address the Board.
- (4.) The Board will then discuss the item. Once the Board has concluded their discussion, public comment will be allowed.
- (5.) Public comment will be allowed and is limited to three minutes per speaker.
- (6.) Once public comment is completed, the Board will then ask any follow-up questions and take action.

On agenda items that are agendized as a “presentation” with no action listed, public comment is not legally required and must be made at the beginning of the meeting.

1. For possible action. Discussion and direction on Vacation Home Rentals in Douglas County, including short-term, on-line rental companies such as Airbnb. (Mimi Moss)

Mimi Moss, Community Development Director discussed that the permit application for Vacation Home Rentals, the code section and the City of South Lake Tahoe code section are part of the packet. She provided some history on the Code. It was adopted in 2005 and modified in 2012. The current Code only allows Vacation Home Rentals permits within the Tahoe Township. She went on to discuss the permit fee is \$100.00 and the renewal fee is \$75.00. Approximately 400 Vacation Home Rentals permits have been issued for the County for the last year. She mentioned that eight Vacation Rental Homes are currently in violation. She reported the yearly Transient Occupancy Tax that is collected is over \$2 million for non-casino lodging. Ms. Moss then explained the application process for an owner. She commented staff approves it based on standard conditions they apply; they do not do a site inspection; and the permit is issued based on the owner answering questions. Applications have been denied over the years mainly to inadequate parking. The County does have a problem with repeat offenders for Vacation Home Rentals. Staff sends out a Letter to the owner or Property Management Company; sometimes Deputies need to be called out. The violations staff has set up are: a warning, a fine, permit suspended, or permit revoked. Ms.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Moss confirmed there are portions of the Code that could be improved; the bottom line is enforcement of the current Code and they only have one code Enforcement Officer for all of Douglas County. She stated the City of South Lake Tahoe has contact people 24 hours a day; seven days a week.

Commissioner McDermid noted only owner occupied residences are subject to the 3 percent property tax; everything else is considered commercial. She asked Ms. Moss if the 400 Vacation Home Rentals are identified as commercial versus residential. Ms. Moss responded Vacation Rentals are assessed like any other rental property and they are not valued as commercial as it is not a commercial use. The difference is they do not receive the 3 percent abatement cap; they are subject to the 8 percent general abatement cap.

Doug Sonnemann, Assessor clarified residential is residential it is not treated as commercial. It is subject to the 8 percent cap if it does not qualify as owner-occupied or a low cost rental. If you rent your house for 30 days or more you do not qualify as owner-occupied you do not get the 3 percent cap.

Commissioner McDermid asked Ms. Moss when they inspect do they issue a permit number? Ms. Moss responded they do issue a permit number with a certificate and that is supposed to be posted on the property. She wanted to clarify the County does not inspect the property; we do not have the manpower or resources to inspect. Commissioner McDermid remarked the City of South Lake Tahoe spent about 18 months doing a thorough analysis of the Vacation Rental and Airbnbs before they came up with their new Code. She believed we need to revisit our Code and bring it up-to-date. Commissioner McDermid asked Ms. Moss if there were in residences in the Tahoe Township being leased as Airbnb or Vacation Rentals that have not gone through Douglas County. Ms. Moss responded she is not aware of what the number might be. On the Airbnb website they list over 300 properties in Douglas County but the majority is in the Tahoe Township. Ms. Moss asked if there is a need to look at this and what criteria or standard needs to be applied; beefed up; or intensified. Ms. Moss mentioned that is what is good about the City of South Lake, they have an inspection before they issue the permit; they inspect before the renewal every year and if there is a complaint the owner has to sign off an authority to allow the City to re-inspect. Commissioner McDermid reported there is a residence in the Valley that has been rented out as an Airbnb or Vacation Rentals. The neighbor of this residence has called numerous times and complained but because it's in the Valley there is no enforcement. She suggested we look countywide and create a level playing field. We need to look at what the City of South Lake Tahoe did for Tahoe.

Vice Chairman Thaler agreed with Commissioner McDermid this bears looking at. In 2005 an Ordinance was created allowing you to have a Vacation Rental in the Tahoe Township; where does it say you can't have a Vacation Rental in the rest of the County. Ms. Moss responded if it's not identified it's not allowed that is under State Law. Zachary Wadlé, Deputy District Attorney also advised there is a land

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

use component to it as to whether or not that use would be allowed on a particular property. Vice Chairman Thaler remarked if you put in Airbnb or VRBO in the Carson Valley you will find rooms or houses for rent and he guessed we aren't collecting any Room Tax on them. Ms. Moss replied that is correct we are not collecting any tax and there is no permitting process for properties outside the Tahoe Township. Vice Chairman Thaler asked Ms. Moss if she had an estimate on the Room Tax we are losing by not collecting for properties outside the Tahoe Township. Ms. Moss responded there are maybe a dozen residential properties outside of the Tahoe Township. Vice Chairman Thaler wanted to know now that we have a better understanding of how Airbnb and VRBOs work should we be looking at when it comes to commercial versus residential how they are taxed. Ms. Moss remarked she believed the Assessor has a handle on that.

Vice Chairman Thaler asked if Community Development had received any correspondence stating residents did want them in the Valley and should we start considering changing the Ordinance to allow them in the Valley. Ms. Moss stated she has received no correspondence or calls on this item. Based on the number under Airbnb she doesn't know that it is such an issue in the Valley. She is comparing it to what happened in Lake Tahoe. They are not hearing those complaints in the Valley. Vice Chairman Thaler asked if there was a property owner in the Valley that paid Room Tax and we didn't even know we needed to collect it. Ms. Moss responded that is correct, we were unaware the property owner was paying TOT. This property owner applied for a special use permit and was denied, but we were collecting room taxes. Vice Chairman Thaler asked where the "miss" was. Ms. Moss remarked if they don't come in with a permit or we don't receive any complaints then we aren't going to know what's going on at that property. If they elect to pay the TOT then the question is what is checked when someone does pay that and how it is related back to the permit that was issued. Vice Chairman Thaler wanted to know what Ms. Moss would suggest to protect that from happening again. Ms. Moss responded she agreed a fix is needed.

Commissioner Nelson stated he was concerned about one thing he just found and that was when you apply you do a Notice that people are applying for this within 300 feet so the neighbors know. Ms. Moss responded that is what the City of South Lake Tahoe does. Commissioner Nelson commented when we do ours we should definitely have something similar to that in it.

Commissioner McDermid wanted to know if the application for a Vacation Rental is different than an Airbnb. Ms. Moss explained Airbnb is a corporation, a company that lists the property online. Commissioner McDermid asked if we revised our Ordinance and application and we include all of those companies, do we notify those companies that we have an Ordinance and that we permit? Her understanding is we can do a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with an Airbnb company and they will collect the TOT and submitted it to the County. Ms. Moss commented she is not aware of what their process is when they work with a

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

property owner. The responsibility for a Vacation Rental permit is with the property owner. The property owner needs to know what the Code provisions are, what the limitations are and abide by that. The issue over the years is not all property owners do that. Commissioner McDermid stated since we don't do an inspection, she assumes Tahoe-Douglas Fire doesn't do an inspection either for meeting Fire Code requirement. Ms. Moss responded she is not aware that they do that. She explained the application calls out what the limitations are for bedroom size, windows, exiting and that type of thing. When the property owner signs the application they are recognizing and stating that the house meets all the criteria. The County decided to do it that way because it is an enforcement issue and a staffing resource issue. Commissioner McDermid stated when she lived in Skyland and vacation rentals came into Skyland they practically wrecked the neighborhood. She is glad to see that we are addressing the issues.

Commissioner Walsh acknowledged that Ms. Moss hit the nail on the head this is an enforcement issue, this is a staffing issue and we need to be careful on how we deal with this. We may be running into an expensive problem as far as staffing is concerned. He also wanted to know if we issue a permit and there is a problem is there any liability for the County. Mr. Wadlé responded conceivably there might be some liability but if the homeowner misrepresented what was going on the homeowner would have the primary liability.

Chairman Penzel asked Ms. Moss if there have been any health or safety issues associated with any of the rentals primarily the ones in the Valley but also at the lake. Ms. Moss responded she is not aware of any. She explained the issue for compliance is parking, after hour noise, traffic, and people partying all night. Chairman Penzel commented there are basically 400 permits and less than 100 apply in Valley. Ms. Moss replied there are 400 permits and there are probably about a dozen in the Carson Valley under Airbnb. They are mostly room rentals versus home rentals. Chairman Penzel remarked in the regulation we currently have it talks about the property owner having to apply. How do you know if you have all the property owners and how do you know if they are going to rent it out? Ms. Moss responded we don't we take them at their word. Chairman Penzel asked why does staff notify the General Improvement District (GID). Ms. Moss explained they notify the GIDs is in the event there are problems in the neighborhood, sometimes neighbors will contact the GID, so they want to make the GIDs aware of how many Vacation Rentals are in their boundaries. Chairman Penzel responded unless that home is in a GID there would be no notification. Ms. Moss remarked that is correct. Chairman Penzel stated if there have been no health or safety issues what is the necessity? Ms. Moss explained because we have violations, if we can tighten up the parking or the occupancy, it's still an enforcement issue but that alone may help alleviate some of the problems down the line. Some of the problems they have had with these properties is the owners don't limit the occupancy. Chairman Penzel believes this goes to the enforcement issue that Commissioner Walsh addressed. Do we need to hire more people, should the permit be more expensive to help cover that cost. Ms. Moss responded

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

that's a go segway into the City of South Lakes Tahoe's Codes for Vacation Rentals. She went on to explain City of South Lake Tahoe's codes.

Commissioner McDermid asked about hot tubs on the property in City of South Lake Tahoe. Ms. Moss responded there can be hot tubs but they cannot be used after hours.

Vice Chairman Thaler asked, hypothetically, if he was renting out one of his rooms, in the Valley and nobody knew, what would happen to him. Ms. Moss responded you would continue to rent it out unless somebody complained and then staff would look into it. If staff finds you are renting out a room we will send a letter stating there is no provision in this area of the county for lodging uses in a residential area and require you to cease. If no response to the letter then staff would start the fine process. Vice Chairman Thaler asked were the fine process would be listed. Ms. Moss explained that is in the Public Nuisance section of the code regarding fines. Vice Chairman Thaler asked if Ms. Moss knew of any instances where they have done that. Ms. Moss responded there has been fines for other code issues but not for Vacation Rentals that she is aware of.

Chairman Penzel commented if we total up the fees: a 33 percent fee for Vacation Rentals charged by the rental company; an 8 percent fee that goes to the State; 15 percent fee that goes to Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) that is about 56 percent of the rental fee, at what point do we say that discourages people from renting. Ms. Moss responded she does not have an answer. Chairman Penzel stated this is specific to Vacation Home Rentals what happens if the word "Vacation" was dropped. Does this cover home rentals? Ms. Moss explained any rental less than 28 days is transient and it would fall under Vacation Home Rentals if you are in the Tahoe Township. If you're outside the Tahoe Township it's illegal or prohibited. Chairman Penzel asked what about somebody renting their home for a year while they go out of the country. Ms. Moss explained that is long term rental and it is separate from what we are doing here today, this is just Transient Lodging. Chairman Penzel wanted to clarify they wouldn't rewrite the Ordinance to include long term rentals. Ms. Moss responded there is no need to do that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tracey Nelson, a resident of the Johnson Lane area and an Airbnb host would like to seek sensible regulations and fair treatment for short term rentals. She believed they would protect the local community and businesses that help improve the local economy. There are Airbnbs in 191 countries and there are more than 3 million people that open their homes as hosts. She commented they have additional protections that hotels and motels do not have. Airbnb vets guests and hosts prior to their using the system. She provided some information she believed would help approach this in Carson Valley. Hospitality and Leisure provided the following statistics: 42 percent of Airbnb guests spend their day and money in the community where they are staying; it benefits local hosts and members of the

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

community because they make on average \$7,500 per year from the rental of their homes; Airbnb guests stay 2.1 times longer and spend two times more money in the area. She encouraged Airbnbs to be accepted and part of the community. (Ms. Nelson's statement is included in the Supplemental Material for March 21, 2017)

Volker Soffel expressed his support for allowing short term vacation rentals in Douglas County. He commented listening to the presentation it appears noise complaints are the number one concern voiced by those that are opposed to it. If you look at the actual number of documented noise complaints you will find it is a very small percentage. He felt those few issues could be dealt with effectively at an administrative level and shouldn't be used against vacation rentals. He believed if TOT is being paid it should help with paying for people to enforce the Code. He stated that most of the noise complaints that have been filed are on properties where the actual owner does not live there. He commented Airbnbs are offering rooms like a roommate, short term roommates. He encouraged the commission to allow vacation rentals in all of Douglas County, but make it as easy as possible for people to get permits and help improve the public's perceptions of short term rentals.

Chandra Sewharack stated she supports short term vacation rentals. She commented she does not like the idea of having to go to a public hearing to get a permit. Why make people jump through hoops for short term rentals when they do not for long term rentals? Vacation Rentals benefits the county and will create more job opportunities.

Steve Teshara, resident of Round Hill. His purpose for addressing the Board today was to say what less chaos they have in Round Hill since the adoption of the Ordinance. It's not perfect and leaves a lot to be desired especially from the enforcement perspective. He lives on the street that includes the famous "Michelson Party House". Prior to the Ordinance they had buses dropping people off and it negatively impacted the neighborhood; property values; and lifestyle. With respect to the fees charged; the people renting out the houses are making plenty of money. He believed inspecting a property prior to issuing a permit is a good idea. With respect to collecting TOT, it's becoming very popular for a local government to hire a company to go online to find vacation rentals that don't have a permit or aren't paying fees. He commented the Ordinance is helpful but can be improved.

Helen Zeisloft stated she frequently uses Airbnbs. She loves meeting the locals and learning about the area. She commented most rentals are very short term. She believed it's a wonderful thing and she supports them.

Public comment closed.

Commissioner McDermid commented there are two different types of rentals. One is strictly a vacation rental property, for which the Ordinance in the Tahoe

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Township applies. But then you have individual homeowners who are renting out via Airbnb a room or a home. She doesn't know what other communities are doing about these homes that are renting one or two rooms and are still owner occupied. But if Airbnb is the organization that helps to collect the money owed to local a government that is something else.

Vice Chairman Thaler asked Ms. Moss a follow up question. If the Board adopted a new ordinance would a Town or a GID be able to say no not in my town, not in my GID. Ms. Moss responded she doesn't believe so. She knows we have one GID up at the Lake that prohibits Vacation Home Rentals within their boundary but the County doesn't recognize that because we believe they don't have that enforcement power. Vice Chairman Thaler commented it is important to reach out to the Towns and GIDs to get their opinions. He is in support of moving forward in the Valley. If short term rentals are going on we should catch up and start collecting Room Tax.

Commissioner Nelson commented in doing a lot of traveling in Europe he stayed in what was traditionally called a Bed and Breakfast and it was great because you got a chance to meet the people, talk to them, see what was going on in their life and they were interested in what was going on in your life and that's a great thing. Like Chairman Penzel he doesn't like to see government getting involved in every single thing that happens out there but he thinks if you are going to do this you really have to be careful and if there are any complaints from neighbors or whatever then you might have to have a problem. But he thinks as long as no one is complaining about he doesn't see why we want to get involved in this particular issue. He thinks the rental issue is another issue where you don't have somebody in the home, you are renting your home and you aren't there. He thinks that is a totally different issue than the traditional Bed & Breakfast.

Commissioner Walsh commented typically Lake Tahoe has been in the top 10 or 20 vacation resort areas in the world and he thought people who have bought a home up there recognize that fact and probably don't care about having a vacation rental next to them. He stated he likes his peace and comfort in the Valley and he isn't interested in collecting revenue to the detriment of his security and comfort. He would not like having a Vacation Rental near his home. On the other hand Airbnbs are a different story. Airbnb and those types of services they vet people; the owners of the home would be there when they had guests and he does not have a problem with that. But Vacation Rentals in the Valley he does have a problem with.

Chairman Penzel stated it looks like we are looking at two different kinds of regulations; the regulation for Owner Occupied Renting and one for Vacation Rentals. Since we are looking at redoing this that is the direction he's hearing from the Board. Ms. Moss responded that is not what she is hearing. The provisions in the Code require it to be owner occupied essentially. But some properties aren't owner occupied; the owner only lives there a couple times during

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

the year. They are in the business of lodging and that's what impacts a residential neighborhood. When a property owner isn't there they essentially don't care how their renters are acting and how that is being portrayed in the neighborhood. You can look at them separately but you are going to have to apply across the board the same because it would be an enforcement issue.

Vice Chairman Thaler commented he felt they were talking about short stays, less than 28 days. He believed there are going to be more and more short stay properties that are going to be used, especially if we aren't collecting any revenue from them. At least at the Lake we are collecting a Room Tax and it is being reinvested back into the community. He supports looking into it.

Larry Werner, County Manager commented from what he is hearing the Board would like to apply the same regulations in the Valley that is up at the Tahoe Township. Then, are there also further conditions that the Board would like to put in regulations; like noticing and inspections? We can take a look at that and develop an ordinance and we can also look at our application fee and see how that covers the cost of doing those items. We might need to increase our application fee to an amount that would cover the inspections. You have an initially application fee and a \$75.00 annual fee to maintain the permit that is for the administration. They can look at the fee to see what it should be if the County wants annual inspections. They could price the application fee that way.

Commissioner McDermid wanted to add to Mr. Werner's suggestions to investigate how Airbnb operates and their relationship with the local government. She referred everybody to packet page 20, where it lists about Transient Lodging. She reads into record. She also wanted to encourage looking at how other communities deal with owner occupied residences in which they do transient lodging.

Commissioner Walsh asked if they could also look at setting up a fine if they don't adhere to the application permit requirements. Mr. Werner responded he believed that was already in the current ordinance. He thought what they needed to look at, overall, how we enforce the Code to get compliance. Right now it is the same Nuisance Law that applies to any violation of the Code that isn't specifically addressed as a misdemeanor. Mr. Wadlé responded there is a provision under the existing Vacation Rental Ordinance that any violations are punishable as misdemeanors.

Chairman Penzel asked if they were keeping it under Title 20. Mr. Werner responded it is Title 20, Chapter 5.40.

Vice Chairman Thaler asked if we would get more money back by making it an Ordinance fine rather than a misdemeanor fine. Mr. Werner responded it is one in the same. Vice Chairman Thaler wanted to know if the money came to us instead of go back to the State if it's a violation of an Ordinance fine. Mr. Wadlé responded

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

violations of County Code fines for that come back to the county. Vice Chairman Thaler commented he'd personally like to see a fine in there instead of just a misdemeanor. Mr. Werner remarked it's a misdemeanor under the County Code. It's already in the Code. Vice Chairman Thaler stated there is not a dollar amount to that. Mr. Wadlé responded there is a general fine that's applicable to misdemeanors under County Code up to \$1000, that can be imposed by a Judge.

Chairman Penzel mentioned he received four (4) letters relating to this agenda item and confirmed they will be part of the record.

Ms. Moss stated she believed she had the direction the Board wants to go but the question is the timeline. She mentioned we are in the middle of a Master Plan Update process so she can't guarantee to bring anything forward within the next 30 or 60 days. Ms. Moss discussed the mention of getting input from the Towns and the GIDs, we are going to have to go to the public and get comments on it because some areas may not want to see this happen.

The Commissioners discussed timelines and how to reach out to the Towns, GIDs and public

RESULT: FOR DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ONLY.
--

2. For possible action. Discussion on the possible modification or dissolution of the Redevelopment Plan for Douglas County Redevelopment Area No. 1 and Area No. 2. (Larry Werner)

Chairman Penzel stated he had been asked to divide the two areas into two separate items. We will have: 2A - RDA #1 and 2B -RDA #2.

2A- Redevelopment Area #1 (RDA #1)

Larry Werner, County Manager explained Redevelopment Area #1 (RDA #1) and what it covers. The RDA was adopted in 1998 and the area at that time was in conformance with all State laws on forming a RDA. The definition of "blight" during those timeframes was not as strict back then as it is today. The RDA is generating about \$2 million per year. The money has been used for infrastructure. It has a 30 year life if it stays as it is currently written. There are proposed projects to be constructed for the proceeds from the RDA. The proposed projects are: extension of Vista Grande; Sewer Plant; obligation for the Riverwood area and some land improvements in Genoa. There is no debt associated with RDA 1 and the only other costs are operational costs and they are budgeted at approximately \$151,000 a year.

Commissioner Nelson stated he was disappointed in the packet because it didn't provide any information other than here's the documents that created it. He asked Mr. Werner what has been done with this money for the past ten years. Mr.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Werner responded it was used for infrastructure; roadway construction; constructing part of Vista Grande; and water, sewer and storm drainage infrastructure. Commissioner Nelson commented he had done research on this and in the last ten years the RDA has collected a little over \$21 million. The way that would break down if it hadn't been redevelopment is the schools would have gotten \$4.9 million; the General Fund would have gotten \$5.035 million; and East Fork Fire would have gotten \$2.8 million. His question is, I think these organizations could have used that money a lot smarter than what we did in redevelopment and looking forward we need to rescind this particular RDA because it really isn't providing to the County what we really expect to get from this money.

Vice Chairman Thaler asked Mr. Werner how much is in the reserves. Mr. Werner responded we currently have in reserves \$1.7 million. Vice Chairman Thaler asked if that is after the North Valley Treatment money has been pulled out. Mr. Werner explained that amount is as it exists today without these monies coming out of it as you see here. The commitment that was made when discussing the North Valley Plant was to wait to see the final cost overruns and pick up the balance of the cost out of the RDA. Vice Chairman Thaler then asked what other commitments we have for the future; Mr. Werner responded the other commitment is with the Riverwood area through a development agreement. That development agreement may expire in December 2017. However, the property owner still has the opportunity to affect that and that potentially could cost around \$2.5 million. Zachary Wadlé, Deputy District Attorney wanted to expand on the potential Riverwood obligations. He explained the RDA settled out with Riverwood so the RDA isn't liable for anything. However, the County, as the County entity, is potential liable for those amounts, conceivably. Vice Chairman Thaler asked Mr. Werner if we were to end RDA #1 where would future revenues go. Mr. Werner explained what the amounts would be and who they would go to. These numbers are all based on annual property tax rates. Vice Chairman Thaler asked what the argument is for keeping RDA #1 in place. Mr. Werner responded he has no argument, that decision is up to the Board. However, his issue would be the North Valley Plant. that is a commitment we have, a contract underway and we are going to have to pay that bill. And there is the potential of the Riverwood area.

Commissioner McDermid commented given the Carson City freeway will be completed soon it may create a lot of interest in the North County commercial area. She believed we have some commitments that need to be met and the RDA is the area to do it. Part of the reason for Redevelopment Areas is for economic development and that was the reason RDA #1 was put in when it was. It has 11 years to go and some of the projects, over the next five to ten years, could be completed with through the Redevelopment Agency. She thinks it's premature to sunset it early. Financial Stability being our number one priority, having the North County commercial area developed is one of the things that will give us

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

financial stability. It will also help with economic vitality so she is not in favor of doing anything to RDA #1 this time.

County Manager Larry Werner provided clarifying remarks regarding the ending fund balance. The ending fund balance will be 3.9 million. If we take the 2.7 million out, it leaves roughly 1.7 million left.

Commissioner Walsh asked about the County's obligations or potential liability for the Riverwood area. Mr. Wadlé doesn't have the agreement with him, but responded the County could be obligated to make certain infrastructure improvements as a result of that agreement. Whether that ever comes to pass is a very open question at this point but it's a possibility. Commissioner Walsh commented it's his understanding the agreement expires in December 2017 so why is the County required to put in infrastructure, isn't that the developer's responsibility. Mr. Wadlé responded it was part of the negotiation of that particular litigation and that is the agreement the County entered into.

Commissioner Nelson commented but that agreement does expire December 31, 2017. So if we wanted to do away with this RDA at this point but do it after the first of the year that would alleviate those fears. Mr. Wadlé responded it's an obligation of the County, RDA funds could be used to satisfy those obligations if certain findings were made so it's difficult to answer the question. It is an obligation of the County and not RDA #1 however if there were remaining redevelopment funds sitting there to be used for the purpose they conceivably could be used for that.

Vice Chairman Thaler remarked the real commitment that is out there is the Riverwood. It also leaves Vista Grande and the public grounds in Genoa and that becomes discretionary for us. Mr. Werner responded that is correct. The other thing he wanted to point out is the idea of the Redevelopment is trying to encourage economic development. When you get areas developing through the Redevelopment assistance then, theoretically, you get more Sales Tax and other revenues. Vice Chairman Thaler inquired the only future development in the area is the Riverwood area. Mr. Werner responded no there are other areas, such as Genoa Lakes area and Walley's area. Vice Chairman Thaler asked if this RDA has become a priority or is it less of a priority based upon the revenues that we are losing. An argument can be made either way.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave Brady noted that as Commissioners they are going to be called upon to make a multitude of decisions. Some decisions will require data driven information to help better understand a situation and to make appropriate decisions. This is one of those decisions. He doesn't believe the Commissioners have all the information to make an informed decision. He believed they need to bring forth the information necessary for that decision making. He suggested the Board provide direction to

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

staff recommending they do a feasibility study to either eliminate the entire RDA or portions of it. He felt the footprint of the RDA should be reduced.

Tod Carlini, East Fork Fire Chief felt somewhat responsible for all this conversation coming forward in as much as the East Fork Fire Board officially approved looking into this matter with redevelopment. The reason they approved looking into it is because of the amount of money that is involved. There are five taxing districts that compose the RDA. He believed there should be a period of time where things start slowing down; the gears start reversing; and some of that money after a certain amount of time goes back to the overlapped entities. He suggested some consideration about the boundaries and that may be a way to compromise. He declared the Sewer District is a priority and needs to be completed and could drive the potential of additional development. He suggested a work session and sitting down and finding a solution that helps everybody's needs.

Jim Slade remarked he was disappointed in the agenda packet. He doesn't see how the Board can give staff direction when there is a lack of information in it. He asked where all the money has been spent. Why is there no mention of the RDA on the east side of Highway 395? When you talk about the financial stability of the county you need to look at both sides. He agrees that redevelopment has helped with the North County Development, but you also need to look at the Genoa trail. He would have liked to have seen the old definition of blight. Read a quote from the magazine called Governing about tax increment funding.

Public comment closed.

Commissioner McDermid mentioned if you look at the four projects that are being proposed they are projects that benefit the residents of the County. The interesting thing about Genoa is they raised the bulk of their funding through volunteer activities. If they did not do that the County would be obligated to subsidize them. Being able to have them go into the redevelopment area was beneficial to Genoa, the County and the residents. She believed some of the suggestions made regarding more information are critically important to make decisions. She'd like to direct staff, with regard to RDA #1, to bring back some of the things that have been identified in public comment and in the Commissioners' comments, pros and cons, feasibility study, boundaries, what projects have been done, what the costs of those projects were, etcetera. She wanted to encourage the County Manager and Mr. Wadlé to look at the Riverwood agreement and see what the County is obligated to and to possibly reach out to the owners of the property to see what their plan is.

Chairman Penzel stated he feels this agenda item was to get the discussion going and not make a decision today.

Commissioner Nelson wanted to answer Mr. Slade's comment about blight, it is whatever redevelopment says it is. There are companies that provide guidance on

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

how to get around whatever you say you want blight to be and they will give you a certification, like we got on our two RDAs that says we are OK within the law. They get a fee but that's what they do. You tell them what you want it to be and they make it that way.

Commissioner Walsh wanted to make one comment besides the North Valley Treatment Plant, the other projects, while they are admirable and a public benefit, are not projects that are dealing with blight.

Vice Chairman Thaler suggested bringing this back in 90 days. He would like to see more information, he'd like to see this all pulled in a package and then maybe they can make a decision. Chairman Penzel expressed concerns with the timeframe since the county is going through budget now. Mr. Werner responded if you want to look at it as a feasibility study then we would need to retain a consultant to get it done. He wanted to get clarification what the Board is asking for.

Commissioner McDermid believed that any discussion regarding RDA #1 would include what projects have been approved and are pending. She asked if a feasibility study is for going forward. Mr. Werner responded yes it would be. If you want to determine what value the Redevelopment Authority has going forward you really need to look and see what is the potential for having redevelopment occur; and what is the economic impact of that redevelopment. The County has five things on the list but that doesn't address what benefit the Redevelopment Authority may have in furthering the redevelopment or the development of that area.

Commissioner Nelson wanted to reiterate that the people that are losing money because of redevelopment really need that money and he's not sure redevelopment does need the money. He thinks they need to put their money where it will do the most good and he can't see redevelopment going forward doing that much good for the County or even for the redevelopment area.

Vice Chairman Thaler commented we don't have enough information to make a decision today. He mentioned he's not opposed to getting out of the redevelopment. He commented staff probably can't get the expert level we need so we need to determine the cost of a feasibility study. County Manager Larry Werner commented the steps would be to put out an RFP for services and bring it back to the board for a potential contract.

Commissioner Walsh mentioned that any consultant will need to get the basic information from the County. He asked if this is something University of Nevada – Reno (UNR) can do. Mr. Werner responded he didn't know but that might be an option. He needs to reach out and see if that's possible. As far as the money already spent, he has the budget printout but he didn't think it would help the Commissioners on what's going forward. He is concerned about how to get the

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

information for the Commissioners to evaluate what we are doing today versus what you might be able to do if RDA#1 stayed in place

Commissioner McDermid commented it was suggested we look at the nine overlapping entities that are involved in the redevelopment area and can the boundaries be changed and what is the impact of changing the boundaries. Mr. Werner responded you can do that. What you need to look at is if you are reducing it then are you trying to retain the areas that you want to encourage economic development and redevelopment and do those areas generate the funds to do that. He discussed the things they would need to look at.

Commissioner McDermid asked if you can add to the redevelopment area. Mr. Wadlé responded that is an option. You can add areas to the development area.

Chairman Penzel believed there is a reason we go forward in stages. He suggested dividing this into stages. Stage 1 is an internal evaluation that determines the size and scope of what we are trying to do. Stage 2, we could hire an economist, but each commissioner individually has to decide if the RDA#1 is worth keeping. We need to look at the size; look at further obligations; financial data; and the impact of the east side; and that we don't create further obligations until the evaluation has been completed. Mr. Werner commented they can provide the historic information. Chairman Penzel remarked provide the data and then we'll determine if we want to move forward. He also wanted to comment when the RDA was created it helped remodel Genoa and it's been a huge economic benefit. But the question is has it expired its useful life.

Commissioner Nelson commented in 2005 the number was a little over \$3 million. During the next boom, if we have one, we could see this redevelopment getting a lot more money than it's currently getting.

Chairman Penzel stated what he is hearing from the Board is they would like to entertain looking at some kind of change but we need additional data. After we received the data we can discuss moving forward on a feasibility study.

Commissioner Walsh wanted to know if the historic data would include all the new jobs that were created, all the new property tax that was collected outside the redevelopment area. Would it include any of that kind of data? Mr. Werner responded what he has is what was collected from the redevelopment area and where it was spent.

Chairman Penzel asked if they could get Sales Tax data. Mr. Werner responded since we are a guaranteed county it's almost impossible. You can only get Sales Tax information by bracket; you can't get it back by an individual owner or business.

Commissioner McDermid suggested letting them do what they can do and then bring it back and we'll decide how to proceed.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Mr. Werner remarked he would like a couple of months to bring the information back to the Board.

2B - Redevelopment Area #2 (RDA #2)

Larry Werner, County Manager provided the history of Redevelopment Area #2 (RDA #2). It was formed a little over a year ago. It is estimated to generate \$180,000 annually until you see some of the bigger developments occur then the revenues will significantly increase. To date the only things the monies are targeted to do is to help Economic Development in the redevelopment area; cover initial designs; parking studies and assist in paying for the event center's costs. The operational charges that we are charging against that are about \$64,000 a year and that covers administration, Economic Vitality and those sorts of things.

Commissioner Nelson stated one of his main reasons for objecting to RDAs in general is the way they are zoned. One of the things he really objects to is using areas that are already planned, almost in the process of starting, and including those into the RDA. Those are taxes he feels should be going to the county and not the redevelopment area. He knows it's legal and can be done but it is one of the things he really objects to.

Vice Chairman Thaler commented this RDA is very different from the first RDA. We vetted it well and he doesn't want to do anything with it yet. He explained the only reason you have the increased revenue was because redevelopment will then pay back itself. The whole theory about redevelopment is capturing that new tax and then paying it back and bringing it back into redevelopment. He believes this one will pay off in the future and what they are planning to do would never get done without redevelopment money.

Commissioner McDermid stated she has been working on this for 11 years. The private sector, which is the main employers and generators of revenue for the County, has asked for this RDA. She explained part of the reason for the RDA was to be able to put in an event center. Tahoe-Douglas Visitors Authority (TDVA) in its charter is able to put in an event center. This is being driven strictly at the Lake by the people who live, work and play at the lake.

Commissioner Nelson commented he would like to have the \$300,000 in Gas Tax money that would go up to the Lake stay in the Valley because this is a huge benefit to the Lake.

Vice Chairman Thaler stated when you look at the large amount of money that we do get from going from five cents up to nine cents. Mr. Wadlé cautioned the Board they were getting a bit far afield for what this item was agendized for and not to engage in that conversation at this time.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Commissioner Walsh stated he is in favor of the RDA up at the Lake. The loss of jobs that has happened over the last seven to ten years is incredibly devastating. We've lost revenues in the County because of it.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Slade commented the traditional way that tax increment funding is used in redevelopment areas is you knock down blighted buildings; you replace them with improved buildings and then harvest the higher taxes from the increased assessment to pay for the necessary infrastructure and associated costs. With this RDA the tax increment that appears to be poised to fund the RDA are two projects that are not the result of RDA whatsoever. The only project specifically mentioned in the packet is construction of an event center. Is there no other way to fund an event center like this? Couldn't it be bonded? He mentioned the blighted residential area was left out of RDA.

Virginia Starrett commented she is against RDAs. She recently looked into the demand for road maintenance in Douglas County and she found that roads in neighborhoods that are not part of the feeder system are never considered for repair. There are no plans on ever fixing some of the roads but yet we are granting money to casinos so they can improve their properties so they can invite tourists to have more fun here. What good is that going to do the Valley when our roads all have potholes in them?

Lew Feldman, TDVA stated casino and gaming revenue has declined at the rate of 37 percent. He believed economic development at the Lake will benefit the whole county. We are in a period of transition. Tribal gaming has completed changed the market place. The lake casinos are trying to reverse a terrifying trend. This isn't taking away from roads in the Valley if anything it will provide an opportunity to help fund improvements in the Valley and Lake. They look forward to moving forward with the County as a partner.

Steve Teshara stated not only were thousands of jobs lost during the down turn but the properties there kept coming to the County asking for their property tax rates to be reduced to reflect the business trend. The RDA will help bring those property taxes back up to benefit the entire County. The RDA is a fundamental tool to allow us to do the revitalization of the Stateline downtown.

Public comment closed.

Commissioner McDermid stated it is important to recognize that the challenge our county faces in Tahoe is from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). No one in the Valley ever saw the Edgewood or The Beach Club projects because it all went through the TRPA. Edgewood and The Beach Club had to do a lot in terms of environmental and water quality improvements. Edgewood alone is taking the 4000 acre Edgewood Creek watershed and doing that. The Beach Club is reducing

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

sediment for TMDL. She wanted to mention that California is looking again at some form of an RDA because their communities are asking for them. When we talk about our priorities we have to look at what is happening in Tahoe and be thankful the private sector is willing to redevelop. She also remarked we should be concerned about litigation. If one of the casinos was to be torn down and rebuilt the owner would be sued by either the League to Save Lake Tahoe, the Sierra Club, Friends of the West Shore or maybe some other group. That litigation could take years to reach a decision. When we discuss Tahoe you need to look at all the components and entities up there.

Vice Chairman Thaler believed the direction to staff would be to stay the course.

Chairman Penzel commented the point of this is to debate and get the information out and look at the RDAs and see if our commitment is still in the same location and the same perspective. The discussion is good for the county and for the people on both sides of the issue.

Vice Chairman Thaler felt he fully vetted RDA #2. There is a whole lot more than what is on the surface. He believed to do anything other than stay the course would send a bad message to the people that helped us form this redevelopment area.

Commissioner Nelson thought we were supposed to be representing the people of the county not just certain areas. He wishes this would have gone on a ballot some place instead of just being approved by the Board. He's going to listen to the people and do what the people tell him.

Chairman Penzel stated he voted for this and still believes it's the right thing to do at the Lake. Building the event center is important and it could potentially draw a lot of people. The casino core took a huge hit along with the revenues; Hard Rock is assessed below what was put into it. The RDA #2 was created for all the reasons including infrastructure. The other part of this is at the Lake we are talking about a very small area that's included in the RDA and there is a huge area outside of it all the way to Glenbrook. Those properties are not getting cheaper. We don't have enough information at this time to make any changes to this RDA.

RESULT: FOR DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ONLY.
--

3. For possible action. Discussion on the adoption of a priority list for new budget requests for the FY 2017/18 Tentative Budget. (Larry Werner)

Larry Werner, County Manager explained this item is about creating a priority list for any excess revenue found while preparing the tentative budget. Also, if we have a reduction in the revenue how do we prioritize that? He wanted to clarify the only thing they are discussing today is if there is any excess revenues how should it be spent. He explained the Department Directors went ahead and prioritized the list

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

as presented. He then met with the Interim CFO and they made some policy decisions about how to deal with the list and one thing they looked at is if it is mandated and we have no control over it we have no choice but to try and fund it. So they pulled the mandated programs out and put them in the budget. The second thing they did is those that were on the list that are existing contracts with an increase are already included in the tentative budget. He stated the only thing they are really discussing today is what is numbered Priority one to 23; everything else has already been placed in the budget. Mr. Werner mentioned he is recommending to the Board for their consideration this list and then explained he would like the Commissioners to prioritize the list. He then discussed how he has handled it in the past. He stated by the end of the night he'd like to have the Board's priorities in order from one to 23 that they then approve and adopt and it becomes part of the tentative budget.

Chairman Penzel commented that a way to do this might be with an email to the County Manager with their list with a general discussion on what the Commissioners see as top priorities.

Vice Chairman Thaler stated we are not talking about balancing the budget but agrees with the County Manager that the Commissioners need to prioritize the list.

County Manager Larry Werner stated he is looking for a prioritized list. He will use this list to balance the budget. If there are excess funds, his intention is to go down the line until he has a balanced budget.

Commissioner McDermid stated she is concerned that she doesn't know what the programs are.

Chairman Penzel feels it would be appropriate to hear from Department Heads and Elected Officials before they get started.

Vicki Moore, Interim CFO wanted to reiterate what Mr. Werner said. She explained they prioritized these as Department Heads; they went through and vetted each priority and came up with the spreadsheet provided to the Board.

Mark Jackson, District Attorney stated first he wanted to caution the Board about sending emails to the County Manager. He wanted to make sure there was no serial communications going on that would be deliberation and the Board should not engage in the practice of sending emails on this item that you are taking action on. He then discussed the email he received, as well as a memo, was received by all Department Heads and Elected Officials. He stated the majority of the elected officials went to this meeting. He explained there were a lot of discussions about the frustration of going through this budget cycle. Judge Young, as an elected official, stated it was not his job to make decisions on somebody else's budget. Mr. Jackson commented his number one on the list was for an Assistant County Manager, but it is number 14 on the list. He reiterated

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

that his job was not to prioritize as the Elected District Attorney. He also shared a frustration of his which was the deadline for submitting and preparing the Supplemental Request was due February 24, 2017. Since that deadline he has received allocation costs to him from other departments that have to become part of his budget and part of his services and supplies item but the budget directive is he cannot increase a service and supply item without getting approval and that is part of what the Supplemental Request is. Mr. Jackson stated he is very proud of how fiscally responsible he has been since becoming the District Attorney. He commented his service and supplies are lower now than they have been since 2009 through 2016.

Mr. Werner outlined the process of how we got here and what he saw the Board doing in terms of priorities, as well as policies.

Chairman Penzel commented normally they would start with a policy discussion about which policies need to be changed or amended for this budget cycle; then talk about what the budgets are; and end with the priorities they would fund with additional funds.

After some discussion about the process, policies and procedures, Vice Chairman Thaler suggested a process that they set an arbitrary number of \$2 million and the Commissioners give their priorities for that \$2 million. Then as the budget is being developed, the County Manager can determine if the commissioners need to revise their list for the \$2 million by reducing it or adding to it. The Commissioners provided their top picks.

Vice Chairman Thaler provided his top picks. See attached list.

Commissioner McDermid provided her top picks. See attached list.

Commissioner Walsh provided his top picks. See attached list. He asked why they can't hire an Assistant County Manager at the lower range instead of the mid-range. Mr. Werner explained why they don't budget at the lower range.

Commissioner Nelson provided his top picks. See attached list.

Captain Dan Britton provided a comparison between the Carson City Sheriff's Office (CCSO) and the Douglas County Sheriff's Office (DCSO). He discussed the work CCOS does is comparable to the work DCSO does. He stated they have never had an increase in personnel for an Evidence Technician; Carson City does it with 3 people while we do it with one person.

Sherri McGee, Chief Technology Officer discussed her items on the list. She explained some are compliance issues that came up during the audit. She then discussed the position she's requesting and the relocation of the Data Center and staff.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Vicky Derner, Tahoe Chief Deputy Clerk discussed Item 15 on the Priority List. She explained it could potentially be mandated through the DMV office and it will affect the Clerk-Treasurer's Office with both personnel and supplies. Currently the total budget for Elections for personnel and supplies is \$100,000, so this is a 20 percent increase.

Mike Avila, DCEA President spoke on the COLA and merit increases along with the Assistant County Manager position. He believed there is a major moral issue with both of these things. He commented it is important for the employees to see the Board does care and they see the issues.

Ron Pierini, DCSO Sheriff stated he would like to see the COLA and merit increases move forward. He believed it was very important.

Vice Chairman Thaler asked Ms. Moore if the Departments know what their FTE count is. Ms. Moore responded yes they do. Vice Chairman Thaler commented there are a couple of departments that don't plan on filling all their positions so that will lower their expenses. Ms. Moore responded from a stand point on vacant positions those are put into the budget but they are put into the budget at mid-point. Vice Chairman Thaler remarked if a Department has a vacant position and isn't recruiting to fill that position it should be pulled. Mr. Werner responded they have discussed that.

Vice Chairman Thaler continued with his list.
Commissioner McDermid finished her list.

Vice Chairman Thaler finished his list.

Commissioner Walsh wanted to add a caveat to his second priority - COLA/merit increases. He'd like to see a multiyear contract. He then finished his list.

Commissioner Nelson finished his list.

Chairman Penzel commented he believed they don't have enough information to do this correctly. He felt this is not a good system. He'd like to see what they did with Strategic Planning; they came up with what we thought as policy makers was the right emphasis to be had. We only have one item on the list for infrastructure. We are not going after what we put down as our priorities. He didn't know how important it was, given the Legislature's focus on the Public Guardian, whether we need to have an Assistant Public Guardian right now. We need more of a definitive criteria.

Mr. Werner explained if the Board agrees to the Prioritized List then those numbers get put into every budget. In the end it will be up to the Board where the money goes.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

Vice Chairman Thaler believed this gave them the framework. What they do next week will then free up money.

Mr. Werner commented if the Board could provide him with a list that the Board can concur on it will go in the tentative budget. He needs direction from the Board on the priorities.

Chairman Penzel provided his top picks. See attached list. He stated once the budget is approved they need to have quarterly updates.

Ms. Moore and the Commissioners supplied the top five priorities on the list. See attached list. Mr. Werner commented this really helps.

Mr. Werner commented as we finish up the Departments' presentations that's when we start actually building the tentative budget. Ms. Moore responded we have the tentative budget built right now so we could take this list back between the tentative and final and vet it through all of the budgets. We will know next week where the excess revenues are.

Ms. McGee wanted to point out something in the whole process. The Supplemental Requests are additions we are asking for our services and supplies and the capital improvement requests are a whole other set of requests for infrastructure projects.

Mr. Werner explained these impact the General Fund on an ongoing basis.

RESULT: FOR DISCUSSION ONLY.
--

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT (No Action)

No public comment.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017**

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION to adjourn; carried

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Larry Walsh, Board Member
SECONDER:	Nancy McDermid, Board Member
AYES:	Penzel, Thaler, McDermid, Walsh, Nelson

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

William Penzel, Chairman
Douglas County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

Kathy Lewis, Clerk-Treasurer

General Fund New Program Requests

Priority	Commissioner	BP	SI	ND	LW	DN	Request	Department	Net Program Cost	Cumulative Costs
1	1	1	3	2	1	3	Stormwater Program	Community Development	66,817	66,817
2	2	2	3	3	2	2	COLA & Merit Increases	County Manager	1,400,000	1,466,817
14	3	3	1	1	3	1	Position Request: Deputy County Manager	County Manager	176,456	1,643,273
17	4	5	4	4	7	8	Position Request: Evidence Technician (1.00 FTE)	Sheriff's Office	78,834	1,722,107
9	5	8	5	12	11	5	Personnel FTE Increase: DAS Officer position (0.52 FTE)	Alternative Sentencing	23,663	1,745,770
5	4	6	12	9	9	6	Fees associated with P.C.I. Compliance	Judicial Services - Court I.T.	6,535	1,752,305
18	6	6	12	6	6	6	Position Request: Project Manager	System Support	97,646	1,849,951
13	7	9	8	9	6	6	Position Request: Engineering Technician or GIS Technician	Public Works	67,883	1,917,834
8	9	8	7	8	4	4	Splunk Event Management Software	Infrastructure a& Operations	13,800	1,931,634
7	10	7	8	6	8	4	Office 365 Implementation	Infrastructure a& Operations	149,850	2,081,484
16	11	11	11	6	8	4	Replacement of 6 Desktop Computers	District Attorney	6,360	2,087,844
12	12	12	10	10	12	9	Position Request: Asset Management Program Manager	Public Works	110,238	2,198,082
11	13	14	6	7	5	9	Services & Supplies Increase: Institutional Supplies	Public Works	25,000	2,223,082
6	14	6	7	5	5	11	Implementation of ClearPass	Infrastructure a& Operations	25,000	2,248,082
23	15	15	15	11	7	7	Relocation of Douglas County's Data Center and Staff	Infrastructure a& Operations	66,253	2,314,335
20	16	14	14	14	14	14	Position ReClass: Senior Computer Tech to Service Desk Supervisor	System Support	4,623	2,318,958
21	17	17	17	17	17	17	Restore Staffing: (1.00 FTE)	Animal Care & Services	57,166	2,376,124
22	18	18	18	18	18	18	Relocation of Douglas County's Data Center and Staff	System Support	40,606	2,416,730
3	19	19	19	19	19	19	Personnel FTE Increase: Case Manager	Public Guardian	25,948	2,442,678
4	20	20	20	20	20	20	Personnel FTE Increase: Office Assistant	Public Guardian	28,538	2,471,216
10	9	9	9	9	9	9	Position Request: Maintenance Specialist Senior, HVAC Certified	Public Works	81,861	2,553,077
15	10	10	5	10	10	10	Cost Increase: Automatic Voter Registration	Clerk/Treasurer - Elections	19,045	2,572,122
19	13	13	11	11	11	11	Position Request: Business Analyst	System Support	88,618	2,660,740
Total New Program Requests									2,660,740	
Cost Increase: Washoe County Crime Lab									20,278	
Cost Increase: Annual Radio User Fees									4,156	
Services & Supplies Increase: Software Program Maintenance									189,781	
Cost Increase: Digital Technologies Case Management Software									1,756	
Cost Increase: Audit Fees									14,350	
Aerial Photography GL									35,000	
Total requests relating to existing contracts (removed from priority list and included in tentative budgets)									265,321	
Grand Total									2,926,061	