

**MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 22, 2016
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OVERCROWDING &
REPAIR NEEDS COMMITTEE MEETING**

1. Opening Items

1.01 Call to Order

The meeting of the Public Schools Overcrowding & Repair Needs Committee was called to order at 9:03 a.m. at the Washoe County Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Caucus Room, Reno, Nevada.

1.02 Roll Call & Introductions

Chairman Shaun Carey and Committee Members Bridget Burckhard, Mike Cate, Dana Galvin, Josh Hicks, Mike Kazmierski, Todd Koch, Greg Peek, Dylan Shaver, Kevin Sigstad, and Len Stevens were present. Committee Members Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson and Commissioner Marsha Berkbigler were not present at the time of roll call. Committee Members Anthony Carano and Senator Debbie Smith were absent from the meeting. Superintendent Traci Davis and District staff were also present.

1.03 Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

2. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

2.01 Approval of the minutes of the December 18, 2015 meeting of the Public Schools Overcrowding & Repair Needs Committee

Mr. Peek requested page 7 of the draft minutes be amended to show the current system for funding schools was "broken."

It was moved by Mr. Hicks and seconded by Mr. Shaver that **the Public Schools Overcrowding & Repair Needs Committee approves the minutes of the December 18, 2015 Meeting as amended.** The result of the vote was Unanimous. Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

2.02 Discussion regarding the applicability of the single subject issue for ballot measures, Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 295.009, to Senate Bill (SB) 411

Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, Washoe County School District, presented a memo to the Committee offering a detailed explanation of why the single subject rule did not

apply to the formation of the ballot question by the Committee.

Committee Member Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson arrived at 9:05 a.m.

2.03 Presentation and discussion of public opinion polling done by The Chamber regarding voter sentiment on school construction and funding

Tray Abney, Government Affairs Director, The Chamber, presented a public opinion poll conducted by SGS, Inc. and commissioned by The Chamber. The poll indicated a large educational piece would need to accompany any ballot question related to school capital funding because the public did not understand how capital funding for school districts was received and where the \$1.1 billion tax increases that came out of the 2015 Nevada Legislature went. A path to victory was possible since over 60% of those polled felt that the Washoe County School District did not receive enough funding and about 70% were willing or somewhat willing to provide additional funding. He did caution that there would be strong opposition to any proposed tax increases and about 30% of the population would not vote for any kind of tax increase at all. According to the polling, an increase to the sales tax was the preferred option from the community, but there was still the possibility of passage with a property tax option. He reiterated that it would be important to provide a strong educational piece with any ballot question since those mid-voters (ones who somewhat supported, somewhat opposed, or were unsure) could be moved by either side of the argument.

Mr. Peek highlighted the demographics of the polling, with over 50% of those polled being 50 years old or older. He felt that information was important to consider because many on the Committee and supporters in the community had expressed concern about the "age-gap" being a factor in the approval of a question.

Chairman Carey thanked The Chamber for conducting the poll. It was important to note that no public dollars were used to finance the poll.

2.04 Presentation, discussion, and possible action to consider combinations of school construction projects and the revenue sources needed to fund the school overcrowding and repair needs of the Washoe County School District for a ballot initiative, per Senate Bill (SB) 411

Chairman Carey explained the Committee had previously decided to move forward with a ballot measure utilizing sales tax, property tax, or a combination of the two. The agenda item was designed to show the various ways the two taxes would be able to fund the shown \$600 – 800 million need of the District. He believed it was important the Committee have a full discussion on the options prior to any motion on a possible question being proposed.

Committee Member Commissioner Marsha Berkgigler arrived at 9:08 a.m.

Pete Etchart, Chief Operations Officer, Washoe County School District, provided a presentation on the funding scenarios based on the Committee's prior motion related to a funding range of \$600 – 800 million. In order for the District to determine the funding scenarios, a hypothetical construction project schedule was created. The intent of the hypothetical project schedule was to reduce the amount of any proposed tax increase and have projects built as quickly as possible. The funding was needed 3-years in advance of opening a high school, 2-years for a middle school, and 1-year for an elementary school; based on 20-year bond terms; and about 50% of the funds would be allocated in the first 3 years and 80% in the first 5 years. An \$843.4 million plan was presented, while outside of the proposed range by the Committee, was considered the ideal plan and projects would be reduced from that plan in the different scenarios. The plan would repair and renovate older schools; provide the ultimate avoidance of "double session" school calendars; provide the ultimate elimination of the "multi-track, year-round" school calendar at elementary schools; provide a long-term plan to eliminate the dependence on portable classrooms; and allow for the expansion of the Nutrition Services Central Kitchen and Transportation Yard to accommodate student growth. The \$843.4 million scenario was different from the Ideal Plan previously presented in that the Administrative Facilities Master Plan and additional funding to reduce the school repairs backlog were not included in the list of funded projects. The different rate increases, based on sales tax only, property tax only, and combinations of sales and property taxes, were presented to show how each of the different scenarios could be financed.

Mr. Etchart presented a \$781 million scenario. The scenario included the same items as the previous plan; however, it did remove the long-term plan to eliminate dependence on dry portable classrooms outside of the urban core.

Mr. Peek requested clarification on the meaning of "the ultimate avoidance of double sessions and ultimate eliminate of multi-track." Mr. Etchart explained that the District would be required to utilize a multi-track, year-round calendar at certain elementary schools because of the time it took to start receiving the funding and the time it would take to build the actual schools. The District was committed to doing everything they possibly could to avoid double sessions, but could not guarantee it would not be used before new middle and high schools could be built. Once the schools were construction, the District would be able to get off of double-session schedules and multi-track, year-round calendars. He cautioned that if growth rates continued, the District would have to react and some schools could be placed on alternative calendars or schedules.

Mr. Sigstad asked what the "lifespan" of a portable was and what happened once the District was done with them. Mr. Etchart remarked that, if possible, the portables would

be moved to another location for use elsewhere. The way portables were intended to be used by school districts was that the portables were installed until a new school could be constructed and then the portables would be moved to a different school that needed them. It was important to note that the District had many portables that could not be salvaged because they were 30 – 40 years old and held no value.

Mr. Etchart reviewed the \$682.4 million scenario, which eliminated the ultimate avoidance of multi-track, year-round school calendars at elementary schools but did include a long-term plan to eliminate the dependence on dry portable classrooms. The removal of the avoidance of multi-track, year-round would mean that seven new elementary schools would not be constructed. New elementary schools in the South Meadows and North Valleys/Spanish Springs areas would still be constructed in the \$682.4 million plan to avoid double session schedules at elementary schools in those areas. Additional information was presented on how schools would be converted to multi-track, year-round calendars based on the District's Administrative Regulation 6111.

Mr. Etchart explained the \$610 million scenario, which was aligned with the District's Strategic Blueprint. The items eliminated from the scenario were the ultimate elimination of the multi-track, year-round school calendar at elementary schools, long-term plan to eliminate dependence on dry portable classrooms, and the expansion of Nutrition Services Central Kitchen and Transportation Yard to accommodate student growth. The District considered the two remaining items, repair and renovate older schools and the ultimate avoidance of double session school calendars, as the most important items for any new funding opportunities. Finally, a \$0 million in new revenue was presented because the District had to consider all options. Under the \$0 million in new revenue scenario the District would only be able to repair older schools and build new schools as funding became available. The District would not be able to renovate older schools; double session schedules would be implemented; multi-track, year-round school calendars would be in place at most elementary schools; portable classrooms would be required at almost all schools; and the expansion of Nutrition Services Central Kitchen and Transportation Yard would not occur. The new schools on the list would still be needed, but it would take the District longer than 9 years to be able to construct them.

Mr. Sigstad clarified that the \$0 million in new revenue scenario would be what would occur if a ballot question, created by the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee, was voted down by the community. Mr. Etchart stated that was correct.

Mr. Hicks wondered when any new funds would be available to the District if a tax increase were approved by the voters. Marty Johnson, JNA Consulting, mentioned that the property taxes were levied in July of any given year, so if a change to that particular tax was made, it would be towards the end of July before the District was able to see any funding. Generally, changes to the sales tax were made at the beginning of a quarter,

so the District could begin to see revenue around April, but it would more likely be July 2017 because of new ordinances that would need to be enacted.

Mr. Shaver noticed the amount of the sales tax increase appeared to decrease with each meeting of the Committee. Mr. Etchart remarked that the District wanted to be able to present the smallest possible increase to the taxes as possible to receive the amount of funding necessary for the different scenarios so they continued to review the information. The District also delayed the project schedule so that affected the amount of the increase because the funds would not be needed as soon. The longer the project schedules were delayed the lower the amount of a possible increase; however, that would also extend the overcrowding at the schools. The District could also look at using different bond timeframes which could reduce the proposed rates slightly as well. However, the impact of any changes the District made on timing would not significantly affect the rate increases.

Mr. Etchart presented a summary of the funding scenarios. The summary allowed the Committee to review the various tax increase options for the different scenarios on one sheet, as well as the broad overview of what the District would be able to provide or not provide based on the different funding amounts.

Commissioner Berkbigler requested clarification on the Clark County sales tax rate. Mr. Etchart noted the Clark County rate was at 8.15%. Additional information was included in the meeting packet on the sales and property tax rates for each county.

Mr. Peek wondered if there were implications to the abatement rules for property tax the Committee should consider. Mr. Johnson mentioned the legislation authorizing the Committee, Senate Bill (SB) 411, allowed that any property tax placed on the ballot by the Committee would be outside the current \$3.64 cap and the abatement cap.

Mr. Stevens remarked that he wanted to see the District receive the proper amount of funding so additional committees would not be needed to consider the same problem or the voters would not have to consider another question in the future. He appreciated the information provided, but felt it would also be important for the figures to be broken down into an approximate cost for the average family of four. For example, if one scenario cost a family \$94 annually, but for \$105 annually they would ultimately be able to avoid multi-track, year-round calendars at elementary schools. He urged the Committee to consider the different impacts on costs to individuals or families because that was how the question would pass. The large amounts presented were "scary" for most people and the actual costs to families would be more palatable.

Mr. Kazmierski agreed with Mr. Stevens' comments. He felt any of the scenarios below \$781 million would leave the District in a tough position and were not smart for the

Committee to consider. The Committee had to show the community that the solution decided upon was the smart choice and would help to solve most of the overcrowding problems in the District. If the cost was about \$100 annually for a family, the benefits would outweigh the costs for most people.

Mr. Sigstad indicated that it would be up to the persons involved in campaigning for the question to "sell" the voters on passage and present them with the information on the real costs to individuals and families. He expressed concern that there were already people and groups in the community working against the Committee, including the *Reno Gazette-Journal*. After the last Committee meeting, the paper reported the financial information not in annual terms, not in per family terms, but in gross terms, which was scary to many in the community. The reporting that the Committee was considering an \$800 million tax package for schools was not painted in a good light. He cautioned against the Committee picking a scenario that was too high because the downside was the District would receive no additional funding at all.

Mr. Koch understood the point Mr. Sigstad was making; however, he felt the Committee could not vote to fund less than the \$781 million scenario because anything less would present to the voters that there was not a real commitment to solving the problem.

Chairman Carey commented that the structure for funding capital projects in Nevada was based on voter approval, so bonds did have to be approved by the majority. There was not a structural solution to pay for schools that the Committee could fix, so it would be important for the Committee to pick the best scenario and develop a ballot question to fund the scenario. He agreed that it would also be important to not have another committee work on the same problem a few years down the line.

Mr. Shaver asked if there was a negative educational outcome to multi-track, year-round school calendars. Superintendent Traci Davis stated that there was research that supported both types of calendaring, year-round and traditional. However, when the District looked at the number of instructional days and the testing calendar, the Balanced Calendar currently in use was preferred because it allowed for the students to receive the same amount of instruction time prior to testing.

Mr. Shaver remarked that it would be important to show the community that the Committee took all ideas into consideration and attempted to minimize to burden to everyone in terms of tax increases. Mr. Etchart added that it was also important for the Committee to consider the impact on the buildings with the multi-track, year-round calendars. Schools on the multi-track, year-round calendars had less time for any renovations or construction projects and even deep cleaning because students were always in the buildings.

Committee Member Josh Hicks left the meeting at 9:49 a.m. and was present through phone conference.

Chairman Carey requested clarification on the additional costs, if any, of moving a school to a multi-track, year-round calendar. Mr. Etchart explained that it cost about an additional \$250,000 per school annually to operate on a multi-track, year-round calendar, plus an additional \$50,000 per school for up-front costs.

Mr. Peek remarked that even if the Committee agreed to the \$781 million scenario, not everything the District wanted to do in terms of capital projects related to overcrowding would be covered. The multi-track, year-round calendar was a major impact on families, especially if there were other children on a different calendar. He wanted to make sure the Committee did everything it could to reduce the impact on families and, while not ideal, the \$781 million scenario would eliminate the long-term need for multi-track, year-round and double sessions. It was critical for the Committee to make sure they did the best ballot question possible because the current funding system for school district capital projects in Nevada was broken.

Mr. Stevens felt there was an appetite in the community to solve the problem. The District had been able to present information to the Committee that there was a need and the Committee agreed to that need. If the Committee was not able to articulate the need then an opportunity would be lost.

Mr. Sigstad expressed concern over the arguments on negative impacts to schools and students on multi-track, year-round calendars. Many schools across the country were able to make the calendar type work and, aside from convenience, the District had mentioned that testing was their only issue with moving the schools to the multi-track, year-round calendar. Also, the difference in the cost per student, per year was 20-25% less on the multi-track, year-round calendar than on the Balanced Calendar. It would be important to communicate to the voters a responsible message, but he did not believe that it should include negativity about the multi-track, year-round calendar.

Superintendent Davis clarified that there was no definitive research available on if multi-track, year-round calendars were either good or bad, so at some point, the change to that calendar was a choice by the individual school district. The District had conducted many community meetings where the comments received from the families was that multi-track, year-round was a large disruption to families. Additionally, the guiding principles of the District wanted to assure as little disruption to the families as possible. The District would keep siblings on the same track in elementary school; however, those tracks did not follow into middle school or high school so there would be a disruption for families with students in different grade levels. The District would educate children no matter what calendar or schedule they were on, but ideally all schools would be on the

same calendar based on the desires of the community.

Ms. Burckhard remarked that, in general, the multi-track, year-round calendars were not popular with families in the area. Her concern was going to voters asking for a certain amount, but still having to deal with overcrowding issues and concerns, such as the multi-track, year-round calendar. She felt that the Committee had to look at the \$781 million scenario as the least amount the District needed.

Mr. Etchart noted that the information received from The Cuningham Group had reported that the multi-track, year-round school calendars were primarily used in the southeast, Nevada, and California because of growth and funding issues. Multi-track, year-round was not really used in the northeast or Midwest because they generally received the proper funding for capital projects for the school districts.

Commissioner Berkbigler reminded the Committee that not all voters would be families with school-aged children. Many of those who participated in the political process were seniors so it would also be important to consider their perspectives and make any possible increase palatable to all voters.

Mr. Sigstad clarified that there were some schools already preparing to move to a multi-track, year-round calendar. Superintendent Davis stated that there were some elementary schools that had to move to multi-track, year-round because the District did not have any other options to deal with overcrowding at those schools. The intent was the ultimate avoidance of multi-track, year-round in the long-term. Some schools might be placed on multi-track, year-round calendars or double session schedules for a year or two while a new school was under construction.

It was moved by Mr. Kazmierski and seconded by Mr. Peek that **the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee supports the amount of \$781 million as the need of the Washoe County School District for repairs, renovations, and new construction.**

Chairman Carey opened the motion for discussion.

Mr. Koch recalled that a report from the Council for Greater City Schools had indicated one possible way of reducing construction costs was to not condense the construction or repairs of buildings into a two week period for schools on multi-track, year-round, but spread would the construction timeframe for 2 – 3 months. Mr. Etchart agreed with the information. The fact that some of the work had to occur at night was a concern because it did end up costing the District additional money. The asbestos abatement work was the larger concern because the District could not have students in the school when that type of abatement was occurring.

The result of the vote was 13 – 1: Pass. Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

It was moved by Mr. Kazmierski and seconded by Mr. Sigstad that **the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee utilizes an increase in the sales tax only of 0.54% to fund the \$781 million in need on the ballot initiative.**

Chairman Carey opened the motion for discussion.

Mr. Kazmierski cautioned the Committee in any comparisons with Clark County. In his opinion, Clark County was irrelevant because the property taxes were already 40% higher in Clark County with the additional revenue going towards school capital construction. He did not believe the proposed increase to the sales tax in Washoe County was a good comparison because it would only be slightly higher and Clark County had additional options for funding school construction. Additionally, based on the polling presented by The Chamber, there were more people strongly supportive of a sales tax only option instead of increases to both sales and property taxes.

Mr. Sigstad indicated any question the Committee put forth would have an uphill battle with the voters, even though the majority felt the funds were needed. The reason there would be a battle was because the money would be coming out of their own pockets. The polling showed a single-source tax would be more supported by the voters than a multi-source tax.

Mr. Hicks urged caution on the motion. He was concerned about moving the sales tax above that in Clark County because it would make Washoe County's sales tax the highest in Nevada, which was a ready-made talking point for anyone in opposition to the question. The Committee should also look at the sales tax rates in the neighboring counties since there should not be a significant difference between the counties otherwise consumers would purchase high-ticket items elsewhere.

Mr. Peek agreed with Mr. Hicks. He did not believe the polling was clear enough and was interested in delaying the vote until the Committee had an opportunity to receive additional information from the community and an in-depth analysis on both tax options the Committee was considering to fund the \$781 million scenario.

Mr. Cate urged that if the Committee chose to include an increase to the property tax, then those funds should be dedicated to a maintenance fund. He was continually asked by members of the community why there was no maintenance fund for the District and by dedicating the property tax portion to maintenance only, the District would be able to do something only a few other school districts in the country had done as a means to pay for continue repairs. He was interested in seeing around \$20 million from that revenue

stream alone dedicated to maintenance projects in the District.

Chairman Carey wondered what the required amount would be in property taxes the District would need moving forward to provide continued maintenance for the schools. Mr. Etchart explained there were a variety of ways to fund the \$20 million the District currently used to for maintenance projects. For sales tax, a .25% increase would fund Pay as You Go or maintenance projects. For property tax, the cost would be about \$0.10 per \$100 of assessed value. A discussion was held on different ways the Committee could configure the amounts to allow for a dedicated maintenance fund utilizing property tax.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson indicated she was not ready to say yes to the sales tax only option at the present time. She would like to see the community provide additional comments on their thoughts prior to making a final decision on which method the Committee should use to fund the need. While she agreed in theory with Mr. Cate's comments, she was unsure how the Committee could word the ballot question to make sure the community knew the intention of creating a dedicated fund.

Committee Member Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson left the meeting but was present through phone conference at 10:20 a.m.

Mr. Sigstad felt that the Committee could first decide which funding mechanism they wanted to use and then use language in the question that would restrict some of the funding for maintenance. He noted that if the Committee chose to increase the property tax, then Washoe County would have the highest property tax in Nevada. Even if the Committee decided to use both property and sales taxes to fund the capital needs of the District, and a lesser increase to the sales tax were proposed, Washoe County would still have a higher sales tax rate than the surrounding counties.

Commissioner Berkbigler remarked that one of the arguments that came out of the previous discussion related to Assembly Bill (AB) 46 of the 2013 Nevada Legislative Session was that people were not necessarily opposed to additional funding for the District, as long as that funding was dedicated to improving schools. She wondered if there would be a way to include language in the question dedicating some of the funds for on-going maintenance and the remainder would be dedicated for new school construction and new school repairs only. The question would have a better chance of success if people knew the money would not be used for anything else, such as District salaries.

Mr. Kazmierski agreed that any ballot question had to be specific and show where the funding would go. He did not want to see the Board of Trustees change where schools had to be built because of comments received from people in their specific districts. The

situation in the entire District had to be considered when projects were scheduled.

Mr. Cate cautioned on having any question too specific because the District had to be able to be flexible on where and when projects would began. He liked the idea of having general items, such as 2 new high schools or 3 middle schools, but the locations and times of construction should not be included because there was no guarantee of where and when growth would occur.

Committee Member Josh Hicks was no longer present through phone conference at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Shaver commented that while the District did need to be flexible, he would like to see locations included in the question to maintain some level of voter confidence in what would occur. If there had to be a change in locations, then the process the Board and District would have to go through should be public. It should be a big deal if changes had to occur and the Board and District should publically explain the reasons for the changes.

Mr. Peek asked what the Committee's authority was to restrict any of the revenue raised with the new taxes. Chairman Carey explained the Committee did not have the authority to change existing statutes, so he did not believe the Committee could change any powers of the Board of Trustees through the ballot measure which were not addressed in the original legislation or create an additional body to oversee the revenue. However, the Committee did have the authority to shape the ballot question and stating a list of specific improvements would be part of the purview of the Committee. He cautioned that the Committee should not impair the District's ability to bond or pay bonds. The Board could enter into an intergovernmental agreement, similar to what the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) had, to review capital projects. Though any agreements not written into statutes were only as good as the next election because Board members could change.

Mr. Shaver stated that the District would not be able to campaign in support of any ballot question. He wondered what the District would be able to do to communicate the importance of the question and if their communication would change. Superintendent Davis remarked that the District had reworked their communication strategy with parents earlier in the School Year. Part of that new communication effort was working with principals on getting the correct information out to parents or others on how the District was funded because many in the community struggled to understand general and categorical funding versus brick and mortar funding. The District could also present what the needs were at the various schools and what the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee did. District Leadership Team members would be speaking with various community groups on how the District was funded and the needs, without

expressing support or opposition for the question. Riley Sutton, Capital Projects Communication Specialist, Washoe County School District, added that the District could present information on what could happen if the District received additional revenue for capital projects and what could happen if the District did not receive additional funding. The District's Communications Department was interested in scheduling at least six large community meetings to provide information and receive feedback from the community on what the "best guess" of the professionals was, which would include the growth rate and where growth was likely to occur. The District would then take the input received from the community and determine if changes should be made to the Strategic Blueprint.

Chairman Carey suggested the Committee could utilize a manner used by government agencies when approving policies and regulations that of taking preliminary action on the motion, then conduct a public hearing to allow for community input prior to the final vote. The Committee had one chance to get the question correct and he felt it would be critical to hold a noticed public hearing on the potential tax increases and the implications of an increase to either.

Mr. Peek agreed the Committee should conduct a public hearing, but wanted to see the current motion amended to allow for discussion and public hearing on both the sales tax only option and the sales and property tax options. A discussion was held on the wording of a possible amendment or if the current motion should be withdrawn and a new motion presented.

Mr. Kazmierski remarked that he would be willing to amend the current motion to allow for a public hearing on both a sales tax only option or sales and property tax option for the ballot question. It was important to remember that much of the funds collected from sales tax was paid for by visitors to the area. He agreed that some type of oversight committee should be included in the ballot question which would allow for long-term flexibility and oversight of the revenue. Mr. Rombardo stated the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee did not have the authority to create a committee to oversee the revenue. The Committee would have to present their interest to the Board of Trustees, who would then be able to create the type of body the Committee was seeking if they desired.

Commissioner Berkbigler clarified that while the Committee could not create an oversight body, they could indicate where the revenue would be spent. Chairman Carey confirmed the statement.

An amendment was made by Mr. Kazmierski and seconded by Mr. Shaver that **the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee conducts a public hearing on either a sales tax increase only or an increase to both the sales tax and property tax as the source of revenue to be used on a ballot initiative.**

Chairman Carey opened the amended to public comment.

Fred Boyd urged the Committee to seriously consider the issue of overcrowding in certain schools in the District. He felt the ballot question would have a better chance for success if the projects related to overcrowding in certain areas were included in the question.

The result of the vote on the amendment was Unanimous. Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

The original motion was restated to include the amendment as: **the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee will conduct a public hearing on either utilizing only an increase to sales tax or utilizing increases to both sales tax and property tax to fund the \$781 million in need on the ballot initiative.** The result of the vote was Unanimous. Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

2.05 Requests for future agenda items

Mr. Peek requested a public hearing on the proposed tax increases occur prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Committee if possible.

3. Closing Items

3.01 Announcement of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Public Schools Overcrowding and Repair Needs Committee would be held on February 12, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the Washoe County Complex.

3.02 Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

3.03 Adjourn Meeting

There being no further business to come before the members of the committee, Chairman Carey declared the meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Shaun Carey, Chair