

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

WEDNESDAY

02:00 P.M.

JUNE 25, 2025

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair
Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair
Michael Clark, Commissioner
Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner
Clara Andriola, Commissioner

Catherine Smith, Chief Deputy County Clerk
Kate Thomas, Assistant County Manager
Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 02:00 p.m. in special session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

25-0478 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Ms. Nicol Herris expressed excitement for the Raftelis report and said that the information contained long-term public concerns. She indicated that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and the public must work together and speculated that the same results would occur if the County continued with the same processes. She noted that she had provided public comments at previous BCC meetings and wondered if the Board was willing to work with the public to rebuild trust, respect, and collaboration. She thought that restructuring would be tough due to political views but felt there were budget concerns that needed to be addressed. She thought that staff wages were interesting and wished to know the pay metrics. She recalled that she had previously asked for town hall meetings to ensure that the BCC heard from the citizens they represented. She said that changes affected everyone and not a single district, and wondered how the BCC could conduct business differently, perform outreach to veterans, help the homeless population, and hear from younger generations. She mentioned that home prices were astronomical and wondered how the BCC could track the needs of the community and unique strategies. She applauded the BCC and staff for their work.

Mr. DeAndre Burleson explained that he attended his court hearing and spoke with Human Services Supervisor Christopher Toles, who introduced him to shallow subsidy and tenancy support opportunities. Mr. Burleson noted that his next court date was July 9. He mentioned that he was homeless and displayed documents regarding two assault incidents that he was involved in and recent expenditures. No copy was submitted for the public record. He said he had not been provided with food, money, or shelter assistance.

Chair Hill stated she was glad that Mr. Burleson was researching shallow subsidy opportunities.

Ms. Trista Gomez noted that the public felt mistrust and disconnect from the Office of the County Manager (OCM) and the BCC. She thought that the BCC did not respond to the public's comments and said Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman were the only Commissioners who addressed public concerns. She recalled that Chair Hill and Commissioner Andriola made appreciative comments in the past; however, the BCC's votes caused a decrease in the residents' quality of life. She mentioned that Chair Hill referred to the BCC as her Board, and Ms. Gomez wondered how County Manager (CM) Eric Brown received excellent reviews and pay raises when there were ongoing issues and concerns at the County under his management. She wondered how the BCC did not know that CM Brown's salary increases would cause a budgetary issue in the future, because she felt the impact was obvious. She appreciated Commissioner Andriola for requesting the Raftelis study and looked forward to the detailed report.

Ms. Penny Brock thought that the Raftelis report was interesting and believed that the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs) were mentioned. She noted that she read in the report that Raftelis thought the CABs were a problem; however, she expressed confusion because no one interviewed her about the CABs. She explained that the Washoe County Leadership Academy (WCLA) was not required per Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). She mentioned that she could not locate the total funding allocation for the WCLA or CABs and felt like it was being kept a secret. She said that the last South Valleys CAB meeting had 85 attendees because the CAB decided on an agenda that contained topics the community was concerned about. She appreciated that Commissioner Clark wished for the Virginia Range Fencing Project to be placed on an agenda for discussion. She asked the BCC to overlook any mention of the CABs in the Raftelis report because she did not know how an outside consultant group learned about the CABs. She felt the CABs were the voice of the people and were being attacked. She communicated that the CABs taught the citizens about government and made them feel comfortable speaking to the BCC. She asked the BCC not to disband the CABs.

25-0479 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Clark recalled that he spoke with the Carson City Mayor Lori Bagwell, the Carson City Planning Division, and Nevada Realtors Government Affairs Director Jamie Rodriguez at a recent Carson City town hall meeting. He indicated that the meeting was refreshing because he heard other communities' management perspectives. He referred to Ms. Trista Gomez's comments and said that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) should not be surprised when budgetary concerns occur. He speculated that someone knew the County was going to have a budget deficit and wondered why County Manager (CM) Eric Brown received a large bonus and salary raise. He asked why his fellow Commissioners rated CM Brown's performance as outstanding and noted he did not agree. He believed that the record showed that CM Brown made mistakes that did not warrant a pay raise or bonus and felt that no one should receive a large pay increase during economic struggles.

Commissioner Andriola indicated that the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) traffic signals would be discussed at the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meeting on July 2 at the Spanish Springs Library. She was proud of the Spanish Springs CAB and expected a large turnout at the meeting. She believed that the CABs were the closest way to provide information relevant to specific communities. She noted that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) would also be in attendance for any questions or concerns.

Commissioner Garcia explained that there was a joint meeting with the City of Reno Recreation and Parks Commission, City of Sparks Parks and Recreation Commission, and the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC) on June 26 at the City of Reno Chambers for anyone who would like to learn more about the parks district service plan. She thanked the BCC for approving the Free Swim Day at the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID) pool on July 5.

Vice Chair Herman asked if the Raftelis report cost the County \$30,000 and expressed concern about the budget.

25-0480 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Presentation by Jonathan Ingram, Vice President of Raftelis regarding Organization Assessment Report for Washoe County. Raftelis is a private management consulting firm that specializes in working with local governments and utilities. Raftelis was hired by the county to conduct an assessment of the Manager's Office including operations, communications, and structure. The goal of the assessment is to identify key areas for improvement and outline steps to be taken to achieve those improvements. Topics to be discussed include but are not limited to: 1. Scope of engagement and Office of the County Manager organizational assessment with Raftelis. 2. Debrief of the final report recommendations. 3. Debrief of the initial implementation steps as determined by the OCM Executive Team. (All Commission Districts.)

Organizational Effectiveness Manager Elizabeth Jourdin provided an overview of the background and events that led to Agenda Item 5. She recounted that during the annual evaluation of the County Manager (CM) in December 2024, there was a recommendation to engage an outside consultant to perform an organizational assessment of the Office of the County Manager (OCM). The request prompted Human Resources (HR) to explore outside resources and consultants. Raftelis was identified, interviewed, and engaged for the project. The work commenced in February 2025 and culminated in the report presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) that day. She introduced Raftelis Vice President Jonathan Ingram, who provided an overview of the findings and recommendations. Ms. Jourdin advised that Mr. Ingram would be available for questions.

Mr. Ingram conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Office of the County Manager Assessment; Agenda; Project Goals; Project Approach; Findings and Recommendations; General Observations

& Context; Recommendation Areas; Communication and Board Effectiveness; Roles and Responsibilities (two slides); Board Effectiveness; Communication and Engagement; Board Support; Commissioner Orientation; Strategic Direction and Management Systems; Strategic Planning; Management Systems; Engagement with Elected Officials; Agendas and Board Meetings; Organizational Structure and Board Support; OCM Structure (two slides); Commissioner Initiatives; Special Project Capacity; Implementation & Next Steps; Implementation Timeline for OCM Recommendations; Q&A; Thank You.

Mr. Ingram informed that Raftelis was a consulting firm for local government utilities. He said they worked with organizations in many locations in the United States (US), including Nevada, California, and other states in the West. He reported that Raftelis primarily focused on organizational assessment. He described that they evaluated staffing, processes, management systems, and strategic planning to help governing bodies and staff work well together towards community goals and strategic objectives, and to optimize service delivery to the public. He reported that he had been doing that work for about 20 years. He revealed his background in city and budget management and clarified that he had spent most of his career in consultancy.

Mr. Ingram showed his *Agenda* slide and outlined the questions the County asked Raftelis to address, along with the project scope, goals, and approach. He summarized that the report provided to the Commissioners offered 12 recommendations. He advised that he would review each recommendation, provide context for the findings, and then offer considerations for implementation. He noted that, partly due to his background in local government, the report focused on practical recommendations that could be carried forward rather than idealistic suggestions.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Project Goals* slide, which provided a high-level outline of what the County asked Raftelis to do. He said they first looked at the structure and programming within the OCM. He stated that the organization needed to reflect the intent of the CM, and he added that it should balance the strengths and weaknesses of an individual executive leader and provide appropriate levels of control. He described that the organizational structure needed to align programs that regularly worked together and enable them to engage with one another consistently. He established that Raftelis was asked to evaluate the existing organizational structure and identify any meaningful changes that could solve or address challenges shared by Board members or revealed as part of the assessment. Raftelis also considered opportunities for optimizing the OCM to meet future service delivery needs. He emphasized that the commitment needed from Board members and staff to deliver high-quality services to the public was evident, but he identified that questions remained about how to best work together to realize County goals. He also sought to better integrate the County's Strategic Plan into the daily work of the organization.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Project Approach* slide and described the three primary elements. The first was engagement. He said Raftelis aimed to start the process without any judgment, preconceived conclusions, or notions about what the outcomes should be. His team talked to the OCM staff and spent several days on site conducting one-on-one interviews and focus groups. He reported that they spoke to approximately 37 staff

in addition to the Commissioners and other elected officials. He said that work helped his team develop an understanding of the organization, including what people perceived as working well and what the challenges were. He summarized that baseline informed his team's analytical phase, which focused on best practice research. He reported that because Raftelis conducted similar work all over the Country, they saw the ways many boards worked and how various boards worked with staff. He added that they specifically researched areas that were particularly applicable to challenges in the County. He noted that it was not a particularly data-heavy assessment, but they did look at organizational charts and job descriptions to understand how the County was organized. He observed that although the structures might not currently serve the County well, there were reasons why they developed as they did; usually in response to specific challenges and with the goal of serving the public. He explained that after the analytical phase, they identified major themes and areas where they expected to make recommendations, then started testing. He said they evaluated those areas with the leadership team and individual Commissioners. He stated that his team conducted one-on-one conversations with most Commissioners but added that there were some scheduling challenges. He communicated that those meetings were an opportunity for feedback and to check the direction Raftelis was moving in and adjust if needed. He revealed that those conversations provided some affirmation, and his team was able to address questions from the Commissioners. Subsequently, Raftelis finalized their recommendations and started conversations with staff about the recommendations and the most effective implementation approach. He said that helped them get to the point where they could offer a project report and a baseline implementation plan, from which Commissioners could develop reasonable expectations about immediate actions, phases, and deadlines.

Mr. Ingram showed his *General Observations & Context* slide. He determined that it was evident that the Board and staff had the same interests in mind; they wanted to serve the citizens of the County. He said there were clear hopes and expectations from both the Board and the staff about how to do that effectively, but some fundamental challenges got in the way. He emphasized that the staff and the BCC had to work together closely to deliver services to the public. He noted that the BCC had to work together effectively as a Board to do that. He revealed that the Raftelis report focused on how relationships could be strengthened in the way the BCC governed, how Commissioners related to each other, and ways that staff supported Commissioner efforts. He cautioned that if the BCC was not functioning at the highest possible level, staff were unclear about direction and had to adopt a reactive posture. Mr. Ingram advocated for an environment where everyone worked together. He stipulated that it did not mean removing conflict. He felt that conflict was healthy and appropriate, provided the organization could move forward in the same direction.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Recommendation Areas* slide and explained his three key recommendation areas. He revealed that there were some relatively small process and procedural changes that the organization could make to strengthen relationships and improve the service to the public, several of which he said he would highlight in his presentation. He believed that some structural changes were warranted. He related that a review of the organizational structure exposed some capacity gaps, which he thought could

be addressed with reorganization and shifting of responsibilities. He theorized that those changes would provide an opportunity to significantly improve relationships and the support provided to the BCC and the public. He emphasized the need for mutual commitment from the BCC and staff to realize the changes. He disclosed that several of the recommendations did not have any staff roles and were fully within the authority of the BCC to implement. There were also many things that the staff could do. He explained that in organizing the recommendations, he prioritized three major buckets. The first addressed communication improvements and BCC effectiveness. He wanted to ensure that the Board worked together as well as possible and had the necessary information and staff relationships to make good decisions. He emphasized the importance of relationships but added that Raftelis also considered the strategic direction and management systems of the County. He wanted to know how the Strategic Plan currently served the Board and wondered if there were opportunities to adjust the approach to create a more long-term vision and integrate that with the daily management systems in the organization. He explained that a daily management system connected the broader vision of the Strategic Plan to the daily work of the organization to ensure that staff leadership continued to make progress on those goals.

Mr. Ingram reviewed his first *Roles and Responsibilities* slide. He remarked on the importance of establishing baseline commitments to understand the roles of the BCC and the staff and how they could most effectively work together to meet the needs of the public and deliver high-quality service. He stated that it was critical and permeated the report. He explained that the Board, as elected officials, had a different role from staff. He articulated that the Commissioners were elected to be the voice of the people and represent constituents in their community. He said the connection and conduit from citizens to the people who did the work was important. He observed that the systems used by staff needed to facilitate that conversation and translate what happened in the public sphere into action. He summarized that the Board was tasked with hearing and representing the community, setting the vision for the County, and creating appropriate frameworks for the organization. He conveyed that the Commissioners needed to define the purpose and scope of services in the County. He discerned that the job of the staff was to analyze trends and communicate the administrative impact of carrying forward the BCC's vision to help inform the work of the Commissioners. He outlined that the job of Commissioners was to pass ordinances and laws and evaluate broader projects, like budgets, that determined where the County spent its time and energy. He specified that the role of staff was to give Commissioners the technical expertise needed to make good decisions on those broad projects. He described staff as an analytical clearinghouse to assist the Board in making good decisions. On the administrative side, he explained that the structure was such that the chief executive, the CM, was responsible for carrying out that vision. He said that included hiring and firing staff, and providing specific staff direction, which effectively controlled the informational resources of the organization through employees. He commented that it was critical for the CM to have the ability to do that without encumbrance and without interference from the Board. He added that, in order to do that, the Board and the CM had to have a good relationship. He summarized that many of the recommendations Raftelis offered addressed how to ensure that the relationship was intact and strong, and that the Board members got what they needed from the relationship so that the CM and their staff had the ability to run

the organization effectively.

Mr. Ingram showed his second *Roles and Responsibilities* slide and explained that his first key recommendation fell entirely within the responsibilities of the Commissioners. He commented that Commissioners needed to reinforce their policy and governance roles and empower the CM to lead the organization effectively. He acknowledged that it could be challenging, but he conveyed that the role of the Board and individual Commissioners was to focus on the vision, the policy, and the mission. He said Commissioners were responsible for determining where the organization should flow, and for holding the CM accountable for that action and direction. He cautioned that the Board had to function well together to be able to provide that direction, and he speculated that without that direction, it was hard for the CM to act. He said the CM needed to lead the day-to-day operations, which needed to be emphasized to whoever was hired for the position. Mr. Ingram showed the *Board Effectiveness* slide and spoke about strategies to strengthen how the Board members worked together. He mentioned past Board relationship challenges and did not think the findings would surprise anyone. He recalled that one of the reasons Raftelis was engaged was to help figure out how to bridge some of those gaps. He noted that it was not particularly helpful to describe historical instances where a specific Commissioner said or did something, but it was important to set a baseline and move forward. For practical reasons, he advocated for resetting relationships to help the Board be as effective as possible. He stated that BCC members had all committed to the Rules of Procedure and a Code of Conduct. He said it was up to Board members to enforce that, and he added that it was critically important to do so. He clarified that staff had no ability to enforce the Code of Conduct, and it was the responsibility of Board members to hold each other accountable in that area. He related that Raftelis recommended that the Board prioritize building some governance retreats, which were meetings convened separately from the daily decision-making responsibilities of the BCC. He encouraged the BCC to spend time as a Board focusing on roles, relational norms, how they worked together, and how they could be as effective as possible as a group. He thought they should consider how to give space for people to elevate their concerns, and how they could specifically address those concerns as a Board. He said that it could be approached in good faith and was done in many places throughout the US. He added that it was extremely effective in building an excellent team at the dais and was an important part of the work.

Mr. Ingram reviewed the *Communication and Engagement* slide and described the recommendations for improvement of communication and connection between staff and the BCC. He suggested that weekly one-on-one meetings be held consistently between the interim County Manager (ICM) and each Commissioner. He mentioned that similar meetings had happened historically, but they became less frequent over time. He added that some Commissioners had continued regular meetings with the CM, which he thought was good, but other Commissioners chose to exit that process and not engage with the CM. Mr. Ingram emphasized the importance of maintaining a consistent touchpoint because the CM was the employee of the BCC and its primary connection to the organization. He believed that the relationships between the CM and each Commissioner, and the Board as a whole, were the most critical set of relationships to drive the success of the organization. He understood that conversations were already underway

about setting up those meetings with the ICM, which he thought would be effective. He also recommended developing some simple tools to communicate what was going on in the County to the entire Board on a consistent, weekly basis. He observed that an individual Commissioner might request and receive an update on an item, but the rest of the Commission did not necessarily get the same update and might instead hear about something from the public. He wanted systems in place that enabled everyone to maintain a baseline understanding of events. Raftelis recommended that staff develop and distribute a weekly memo to highlight what was happening in the County, including updates on budgets, major projects, and any important employee information that needed to be communicated. He said that would help ensure everyone could operate from the same place, especially for items the community would hear and ask the Commissioners questions about. He suggested that the governing retreats he mentioned could address how to implement regular weekly communication and focus on roles. He advocated for governing retreats to become a regular part of how Commissioners worked together. He recommended stepping away from the conflict that could sometimes occur when making decisions and instead work to build good relationships over time. He emphasized that staff had already identified several areas where they could move forward with implementation. He thought the recommendations could generate some improvement in communications if paired with commitment from Commissioners to participate in weekly one-on-one meetings and follow up as needed.

Mr. Ingram displayed the *Board Support* slide and explained that Raftelis recommended reorganizing some Board support functions in the OCM. He described that Board support and agenda support functions were in different places in the organization. He recommended consolidating those roles under one Assistant County Manager (ACM), along with the Government Affairs Liaison and communications with the Clerk's Office. He predicted that those adjustments would elevate the commission support program within the organization. He also suggested reframing some of the roles and responsibilities of the ACM to focus on special projects and work that involved significant community impact, which often included multiple departments and divisions. He envisioned the ACM running and managing much of the commission support process and being an initial point of contact for Commissioners. He specified that the role would not replace the CM, who would continue to be the primary point of contact for the Commissioners. He theorized that having someone at a higher level who could explain issues and initiatives for the Commissioners and drive processes would add significant value.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Commissioner Orientation* slide and informed that Raftelis provided a number of recommendations to enhance the Commissioner orientation program, which County staff had already started to build. He said there were many best practices to draw upon, and it was critical to ensure that new Commissioners participated in a robust orientation program to help them understand roles and responsibilities, how they fit within the organizational structure of the County, and how to get things done. He added that Commissioners should develop an understanding of what each department did and what their strengths and challenges were. He advocated for building a Commissioner orientation program that could outlive whoever happened to be in any given position. He noted that the County was not likely to have any new Commissioners soon, so the

implementation of the new program could be delayed. He advised that attention to Commissioner roles could be used as a baseline in the governance retreats he spoke about earlier.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Strategic Planning* slide and summarized that every year, the BCC convened in a caucus meeting and identified projects and priorities that they called the Strategic Plan. He suggested a fundamental redesign of the strategic planning process. He explained that the current approach tended to focus on one-year efforts, and there was very little community engagement in the process. He added that there was not broad engagement from the BCC to identify projects and priorities. Raftelis recommended that the approach be revised to create a 5-year Strategic Plan instead, and he noted that a multi-year Strategic Plan aligned with best practices. He said the change would allow Commissioners to think more broadly about the input process. He stated that the BCC had to be critically involved in the process from the start, and ultimately, they were the body that would approve the final Strategic Plan. He conveyed that significant community engagement was also needed, and Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs), individual gatekeepers, and key voices in the community should be involved. He specified that staff were the technical experts in the organization and should be involved in identifying trends and factors within the community that required a response. He discerned three categories for local government services: core services, value-added services, and discretionary services. He explained that core services were things the agency had to do, and value-added services were things they liked to do. He determined that most of the work of an organization was on core services, which constrained the ability to adjust. He recommended using the strategic planning process to identify how the County would prioritize and where it would spend its energy, cognizant of limited resources and the need to make decisions. He opined that if everything was a priority, nothing was a priority. He theorized that process established the basis to empower staff to build their annual work plans. He noted that the work plans should include what staff planned to do weekly, monthly, and annually to integrate the Strategic Plan and priorities. He said the Strategic Plan became a guidepost that staff could use to internally prioritize their decisions, and it gave Commissioners the ability to request consistent progress reports and dashboards.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Management Systems* slide and conveyed that improvements to the strategic planning process would lead to and strengthen efforts to improve management systems. He informed that it was not something that had to wait until a new Strategic Plan was in place, but he said it was important to define a functional one-on-one meeting structure between supervisors and subordinates within OCM and throughout the organization. He recommended codifying the work of the organization. He observed that there were many talented, strong employees in the County who had been doing the work for a long time and had vast institutional knowledge that could be lost if it was not preserved. He wanted to translate that knowledge into plans that outlined the work and how it integrated with broader strategic goals. He expected that it would help staff and Commissioners understand the connection between not just capital improvement projects (CIPs), but also the individual programs that the Commissioners and staff implemented on a regular basis. He showed the *Engagement with Elected Officials* slide and reviewed recommendations for relationship management adjustments with non-BCC elected

officials. He outlined that the Commissioners were not the only elected officials in the County. He said the current arrangement, which he thought was strong and consistent with best practices, was for ACMs to serve as liaisons to those individual elected officials. Raftelis also recommended consistent one-on-one meetings between those elected officials and the ICM and the CM. He described that the liaison relationship was important because it was the avenue to address things that arose day-to-day. He theorized that by ensuring all elected officials had consistent contact and a voice with the CM, the administrative representative would be an important and useful element. He shared that Raftelis provided recommendations to strengthen that relationship and create consistent meeting protocols.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Agendas and Board Meetings* slide and expanded on the recommendations listed for the BCC meeting agenda process. He summarized that there were three meetings per month, and the current structure did not provide adequate time for Commissioners to prepare effectively. He added that mechanisms were not in place for individual Commissioners, and the Board as a whole, to consider items that required extensive discussion and might not be ready for an immediate vote. He explained that a review of the County's agenda process as compared to the best practices revealed an opportunity to improve the structure. He observed that the BCC generally held three meetings each month, and he recommended that they instead hold two regular BCC meetings each month and convert the third meeting into a caucus or work session format. He said that it would provide opportunities for staff to present more detailed findings on projects and allow Commissioners to discuss items for future placement on an agenda. He added that it would create a consistent forum for Commissioners to engage in detailed discussions and provide a venue for Strategic Plan reports. He noted that staff sometimes needed to bring something to the BCC to share information in a detailed way and initiate Commissioner consideration before the item was ready for a vote. He stated that there needed to be consistent ways to do that, and he offered that the approach worked well in many other organizations. He explained that it would give Commissioners the ability to adjust the strategy for how they articulated what would be on the agenda, not only for the following week, but for the next few months. They could build a three-month agenda calendar outlining what to expect and how Commissioners could prepare. He said that was how the work sessions supported future voting actions, and he thought it could add value to how the Commissioners worked together.

Mr. Ingram showed the first of his *OCM Structure* slides and reviewed the recommendations Raftelis made about structure and Board support. He said the changes related to the revised ACM role and that there were additional adjustments that could augment executive capacity. He explained that the Community Services Director position was reorganized across multiple operating departments to save money during the last major recession. As a result, that position effectively ran multiple operating departments. He suggested that by creating a direct reporting relationship between that position and the new CM, some capacity could be freed up for the reworked ACM position to manage special projects and oversee governing relationships. He described that Raftelis also provided recommendations for reassigning portfolio relationships. Mr. Ingram showed the second of his *OCM Structure* slides and explained that it depicted a summary of the recommended organizational structure. He said the changes primarily addressed organizing the liaison

relationships under different ACMs to optimize programmatic alignment. He advised that he would not go through each change during his presentation, but he noted that Commissioners had the opportunity to engage with the changes one-on-one. He acknowledged that it was a starting point that might need adjustment. Mr. Ingram emphasized that structure, especially within the OCM, needed to reflect the capacity, skills, expertise, and gaps of the new CM. He advocated flexibility to adapt to the needs and preferences of the new CM. He supposed that person might want to elevate some positions or change the structure of others to create the management team that most complemented their particular skill set.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Commissioner Initiatives* slide and explained that Raftelis recommended adjusting the process by which Commissioners requested studies, projects, or information on issues. He viewed such requests as belonging to two categories: basic requests for information and larger-scale staff efforts. Basic requests included requests for updates on specific issues and could be sent to staff who would gather the information and send it to the requester by email. Mr. Ingram revealed that staff had already begun on improvements to that process. He viewed larger-scale staff efforts as a more important priority. He stated the importance of Commissioners having a clear path to share their requests for projects or ideas about initiatives they wanted the County to engage in. He stipulated that after discussion among Commissioners, it was important for staff direction to come from a unified Board voice derived from a majority of Commissioners. He described that there were two ways the process could be adjusted to ensure that the priorities and direction communicated to staff were clear. The first avenue was for Commissioners to express their desire for a study, project, or information during a caucus meeting. He said staff could then develop an outline for a project plan that would estimate staff time, the communication process, who needed to be involved, and a project timeline to give Commissioners something to thoughtfully respond to. He noted that everyone had full-time jobs and many other projects that had previously been prioritized. After discussion, the BCC could provide direction to staff if there was a desire to do things differently or deprioritize other work in the near term to be able to allocate resources to the new request. Mr. Ingram conveyed that the job of staff was to bring an outline back to the BCC in a timely way to allow them to discuss it as a Board, then vote during a regular BCC meeting and provide direction to staff. He wanted to establish a process to quickly get detailed information to Commissioners so they could understand the scale of their request, and he wanted to make sure that the BCC provided cohesive direction rather than individual Commissioners providing direction. He mentioned that the leadership team was already working on process adjustments.

Mr. Ingram showed the *Special Project Capacity* slide and explained that Raftelis recommended restructuring the role of the Assistant to the CM position. He said the position had primarily been responsible for managing the budget process but also provided executive assistant services for the OCM. He clarified that those were two very distinct kinds of roles and responsibilities. Raftelis understood the need for executive support capacity and wanted to reframe the existing position to focus on that need. In looking at the Commissioner support program, special projects, and the need to strengthen governance, Mr. Ingram determined there was likely a need to add another assistant to the

CM. He theorized that the position could be filled by someone with a Masters of Public Administration (MPA) or a former County planner who was on the CM track. He thought someone with an analytical background could provide project management support to bolster Commissioner support and help with the CABs. He recognized that it was an additional position, which was a challenge, but he pointed out the additional capacity the new position would generate. He disclosed that he was concerned about capacity, given that the County was working with an ICM. He said there was a lot of work to do, and the ACMs were doing their best to devote resources to the effort. He encouraged everyone to be cognizant of capacity concerns as they moved forward.

Mr. Ingram reviewed the *Implementation & Next Steps* slide and expressed his desire to provide good context for the Commissioners. He recounted that he spent time with the senior leadership team of the County earlier that month to go through the recommendations. He said that he advised them to think about what recommendations staff could take a lead on and implement immediately. He shared that they spent a lot of time on project planning, and he referred to the Gantt chart shown on his *Implementation Timeline for OCM Recommendations* slide. He said that the chart contained highlights of target completion dates, and there was an attachment in the report with an implementation plan that specified timelines and stakeholders for each recommendation. He acknowledged that there were many items in the timeline to be completed by September and December, and he reported that staff were really focused and had a lot of great energy around the recommendations. He discerned that staff welcomed the opportunity to improve relationships within the County for the benefit of the public. There were some things that he thought could be addressed in the future, including the Strategic Plan. He stated that the CM needed to be established in their role before that process could start in earnest, but he offered that a lot of preparation could be done to get everything in position in advance. He summarized that governance roles and communication efforts between the Board and staff were all important, but those things were all procedural and structural and would only go so far. He added that there were a couple of recommendations that were fully within the Board's authority to implement. He said staff had no real ability to compel Commissioners to move forward with respecting and clarifying the distinct roles of the BCC and staff, or to drive congenial behavior in the deliberation process on the Board. He said those matters were solely the responsibility of the Board, and their commitment was essential.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Ingram for his presentation. She expressed her appreciation to him for his time and investment in the process of helping Commissioners understand constructive ways they could move forward as a Board in collaboration with the County staff. She agreed with Mr. Ingram's observation about the high caliber of the OCM team, and she understood that some structural change was needed to improve how the BCC and staff worked together. She commended Commissioner Andriola for initiating the conversations that led to the Raftelis study. She opined that an outside expert perspective was sometimes necessary to identify, highlight, respect, and understand issues.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. Ingram for his presentation. He disclosed that he did not expect much from the Raftelis study but ultimately felt that the BCC got a lot from the process. He recalled prior audits the County conducted itself in which no

problems were identified. He said that it was hard to believe, but it happened. He spoke about the findings outlined on page 23 of Mr. Ingram's presentation, which detailed the high volume of requests and insufficient prioritization of the current approach. Commissioner Clark acknowledged his role in the high volume of requests because he asked a lot of questions. He recalled other experiences in his life where questions were encouraged, but he felt that when he asked questions as a Commissioner, it seemed to be an irritant. He clarified that he did not ask questions for himself, but rather, asked on behalf of the County residents he represented. He said he was asked by constituents to bring issues up to get them on the record. He added that he read the staff reports, but he believed that some people did not have access to the staff reports and could not review them, so he liked to get things on the public record. He advocated transparency, which he theorized freed up staff time and reduced animosity. Regarding the high volume of requests for information, he observed that the County had the Washoe 311 system. He spoke about the knowledge of the County he developed during his tenure, which he disclosed exceeded ten years. He said that when he was a department head, he and his staff directly answered questions about their department. He thought that approach could free up some staff time, because Washoe 311 operators were not subject matter experts. He believed it was better for elected officials and their respective departments to answer their own questions, not the County public information officer (PIO) or Washoe 311. He expressed his preference for requests for information and public records requests (PRR) to be handled internally rather than outsourced to the District Attorney (DA). He was concerned that some individuals were overly protective of information and blocked access, which he surmised caused distrust in the community. He advocated increasing transparency and letting people see what took place. He commended the ACM for directly answering a comment made by a public commenter. He said that had never happened before, but he reasoned that it diffused distrust and frustration. He recognized that there was a problem, and he divulged that, prior to the report being announced, he asked the DA if they could find a mediator and plan some sessions with him and some fellow Commissioners. He recounted that he did something similar with the former CM. He revealed that he and the former CM met individually with the arbitrator over six or seven hour-long sessions, but the arbitrator determined there was not a productive path forward in that relationship. Commissioner Clark hoped for better results in the future. He expressed his willingness to work with people and said his constituents wanted answers. He was concerned about trustworthiness and access to information, even at the highest levels in the County.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Ingram for the time he spent with stakeholders in the County, including the Commissioners. She appreciated the analysis conducted by Raftelis and said that it was a lot to digest. She commended the clear outlines provided of the roles and responsibilities of the Board, CM, and staff. She thought those needed to be clearly understood by everyone. She observed that transparency and accountability were built into the report. She advised that she had experienced caucus work sessions. She remarked that work sessions created more transparency for everyone, provided an opportunity for discussion, and allowed staff to do the work that was sometimes needed. She thought the clear direction in the Raftelis study allowed everybody to understand their roles and responsibilities, including their legal roles and responsibilities as Commissioners. She looked forward to BCC orientations that would reiterate that. She

theorized that the framework Commissioners were required to work in as elected officials was not always understood. She supported comprehensively preparing Commissioners for the responsibility of the position and the work they were required to do to prepare for meetings. She noted the need for fact-based information. She thought having a system and structure in place would improve capacity concerns. She mentioned the need for awareness of the time it would take to create and implement plans for the changes, but she thought the fact that planning had already started was a commitment to staff. She said she understood strategic planning and roles and responsibilities because she had an MBA, studied organization, and was an adjunct professor for seven years. She noted that there were differences between operations and Board governance, and she thought those needed to be clarified regularly. She said it was important to work with respect and collegiality. She added that differences of opinion were welcome and enhanced the work, but respect was the key. She advocated for a deep commitment to listening and being civil.

Commissioner Andriola supported the work being done to improve communications and implement new processes with the Board and staff so that when the new CM started, attention could be directed to that work. She pointed out that the reduction in the number of monthly BCC meetings did not equate to a reduction in information. She predicted that the third meeting, whether it was called a caucus or a work session, would allow the community to hear even more than they had ever heard. She expected that it would allow questions to be answered and deliberated on, which she noted was very limited in the structured environment of a BCC meeting. She welcomed that opportunity. She thought the report helped solidify observations and allowed everyone to understand expectations, be accountable for their communication, and appropriately address their roles and responsibilities. She said good communication was essential for progress and thought prioritizing projects would be helpful. She recalled that some related work was done during the last strategic planning session, and she looked forward to those meetings being restructured to better align with what she viewed as a true strategic planning meeting. She remarked that it was an exciting time for Washoe County to embrace best practices for meetings. She spoke about a book called *Good to Great*, which she explained identified considerations of people, positions, and responsibilities. She supposed that if the new CM wanted to adjust some of the recommendations from the Raftelis report, that would be under their purview. She felt that working on the recommendations immediately allowed the BCC to have some of the new procedures in place even as recruitment for the new CM happened. She thought there was room for improvement in evaluating the performance of the CM. She recognized capacity restrictions and the need for patience, and she complimented Mr. Ingram and his team for exceeding the expectations of the request.

Commissioner Andriola asked to have regular status reports and updates on progress related to the Raftelis study. She said that most studies were requested, done, and unfortunately put on a shelf, and she wanted to avoid that by having regular status updates. She understood that something might slip, and some priorities might get adjusted, but she asked that regular updates be agendaized, regardless of how much there was to report during any given period. She cautioned about the tendency to become desensitized to reports where things looked the same. She wanted to make sure changes were highlighted for full transparency, even if plans got off track and needed to be adjusted. She thanked everyone,

including the staff and the leadership, for a big change that she believed put Washoe County in the best position to be successful in serving the community. She observed that there was a lot of misinformation, and she believed the work sessions created an opportunity to recalibrate. She concluded that the cost of the study was money well spent. She thanked Chair Hill, former CM Eric Brown, Ms. Jourdin, HR Director Patricia Hurley, and the HR staff for their response to her original request on December 17, 2024. She noted that the report highlighted opportunities for improvement but also talked about all the things the County was doing well, like embracing the CABs. She pointed out for the record that nothing in the report disparaged the CABs, and she thought Commissioners were united in their support of the CABs as the best way to provide their constituents with information and feedback. She summarized that she was excited to establish a baseline and look at moving forward. She noted that BCC meetings were public and welcomed Mr. Ingram to attend in the future and observe the implementation of recommendations from the Raftelis study. She thanked him for including reports from work they did Nationwide to contextualize the County and avoid duplicating efforts unnecessarily. She thought the findings were an opportunity for Washoe County to go from good to great, as author Tom Collins encouraged.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Ingram for his excellent work. She noted his credentials, his expertise, and his experience working with local governments, all of which she said shone through in the final product. She extended her gratitude to everybody who participated in the focus groups and interviews and took time out of their busy schedules to engage in the process. She thought it was critical that 49 individuals stepped forward and were involved. She appreciated how thorough Raftelis was in soliciting feedback from a variety of stakeholders. She revealed that even on her hardest days in Chambers, she remembered that she and her colleagues all cared deeply about their constituents. She related that all Commissioners wanted a high quality of life for all members of the County, whether they were newborn or elderly. She disclosed that investment and care grounded her in the work. She acknowledged that there were tough conversations, and the Commissioners wrestled with many regional challenges, but she emphasized that care for the community was the common thread between them. She observed that not much had changed between the briefing she received from Mr. Ingram on May 7, 2025, and the final product presented that day. She said if she were to put the issue into one sentence, she would say that management issues were more process and behavior-based than structural. She commented that her primary interest was to talk about what the Commissioners were responsible for. She loved that the Raftelis report included a whole section addressing that, which she advised was on page 31. She asked to have the *Implementation Timeline for OCM Recommendations* slide displayed. She wanted to focus her comments on process, procedural recommendations, and behavioral recommendations.

Commissioner Garcia said that she was especially pleased with Recommendation 9: Board Meeting Structure, which she predicted would effect immediate change and improvement. She theorized that Board members would feel a tremendous sense of relief with the changes, for example, publishing the agenda eight days in advance instead of three. She spoke about her efforts to effectively use the limited time between receiving the agenda and attending the meeting, which included strategically setting her

one-on-one meetings with former CM Brown on Monday mornings at 9:00 a.m. because it gave her time to read the materials over the weekend and arrive with questions that she needed to ask. She said it was not a lot of time, and if the CM needed to send her to an ACM, it was very challenging. She disclosed that she felt like she was in college again, cramming for a test almost every Thursday. She thought posting the agenda earlier would be a relief for the Commissioners and the public. She liked the recommendation to reduce the meetings from three to two per month and hone in on quarterly work sessions. She recalled a recent data-heavy presentation about homeless services in the County. She commented that it would have been a great quarterly work session because it would have given the Commissioners time to engage more deeply with the materials. She said some topics, especially regarding vulnerable people and populations, deserved that time and attention to detail from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Garcia spoke about Recommendation 4: Commissioner Collaboration, which she understood was about the Commissioners working together and holding each other accountable. She was confident that ACMs Thomas and Solaro, County staff, and other elected officials would be eager to see improvements to efficiency, collaboration, and communication. She challenged her fellow Commissioners to reflect on what was in their control, and what they owed the public and County staff. She emphasized the importance of Board members working together and holding each other accountable, and she thought that would happen if all Commissioners adhered to the Code of Conduct. She appreciated that Raftelis weaved that into the report. She disclosed that it was a document she referenced often and used to guide her choices as a Commissioner, especially during challenging days. She spoke about Commissioner roles. She acknowledged that Commissioners did not know everything, were not always the best communicators, did not always ask the best questions, and were not always prepared or proactive. She felt that they needed to continue to invest in the work and engage in professional development opportunities so they could be better versions of themselves every month. She said the Commissioners all needed to commit to growth.

Commissioner Garcia made an implementation request that contained elements from Recommendations 2, 4, and 9. She stated that she had brought up the same request in the past, and she thought it would be critical. She reviewed that the County expected to have a new CM by January 2026, and she suggested a future agenda item that could be discussed in public and voted on as a body. She wanted to see the agenda changed, in reference to the ordinary order of business outlined in Item 5.4.3 of the BCCs' Rules of Procedure, which she noted was last updated in February 2025. She said the ordinary order of business was the salute to the flag, roll call, public comment, and Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements. She proposed that, for the next six months, the BCC try something different. She felt that the Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements category was excessive because it was held at both the beginning and end of the meeting. She reasoned that the tone, productivity, and efficiency of regular BCC meetings would be improved if Commissioners held all announcements and questions until the end of the meeting. She wanted to see what effect that change would have.

Commissioner Garcia spoke about Commissioner roles and her process for

meeting preparation. She mentioned the artificial intelligence (AI) tool, Madison AI, being piloted by the County. She described that she used Madison AI to provide answers to many of her questions, thereby saving time for the ACMs. She observed that regular BCC meetings were often unproductive, and she wanted to do better. She advocated for a small, temporary adjustment to see if Commissioners could improve the tone and decorum in Chambers. She informed that she would follow up with a written request to Chair Hill and ACM Thomas for a future agenda item to discuss Item 5.4.3. Chair Hill asked if Commissioner Garcia wanted to remove Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements from the beginning of the meeting and just have it once. Commissioner Garcia affirmed her desire for Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements to only be made at the end of the meeting.

Vice Chair Herman said it had been a pleasure being around Mr. Ingram and having him listen to all of the Commissioners. She disclosed that after being a Commissioner for ten years, it might be hard for her to change many things, but she would do her best. She described that she had developed habits and had become used to operating in certain ways, and the existing processes had been in place for many years. She observed that Mr. Ingram had provided the Commissioners with some tools to improve order. She said that she knew her job, and it was serving the citizens of the County. She said that was the most important thing. She stated her responsibility to follow her oath of office and serve the people well. She could not guarantee that she could understand every change, but she thanked Mr. Ingram for his guidance.

Commissioner Clark explained that there was usually a large crowd at the start of the meeting, but only three or four people remained at the end. He expressed his concern that if Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements were moved to the end of the meetings, not many people would be present to hear them. He thought Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements should happen at the beginning of meetings, after public comment, so the Commissioners could respond to things they heard. He reasoned that transparency and the opportunity for Commissioners to vocalize things they felt needed to be addressed should be at the start of the meeting. He opined that Commissioner Garcia's suggestion exemplified efforts to stifle public comments, and he recalled times when public comment was eliminated from the start of meetings. He stated that it was unacceptable that Commissioner Garcia wanted to remove Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements from the start of meetings. He believed Commissioners needed to be able to comment when people were still in the room who had brought something to the attention of a Commissioner. He did not support talking at the end of the meeting after most people had left. He theorized that people typically attended at the beginning of meetings to conduct their business, hear votes on items of concern to them, add their comments, and then leave. Commissioner Clark preferred addressing people and getting things on record while people were still present. He surmised that part of being transparent was being able to speak about what was taking place. He said Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements at BCC meetings were some of the few times he got to speak. He said he did not have meetings with other Commissioners, although he opined that other Commissioners did. He clarified that he was not suggesting that anybody was violating Open Meeting Law (OML), but he alluded to discussion that occurred behind

the scenes, which he determined reduced the need other Commissioners felt to comment during Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements at the beginning of meetings. He restated his rejection of Commissioner Garcia's proposal.

Commissioner Garcia refuted deliberation on her request, per Item 5.7 of the BCCs' Rules of Procedure. She stated that as a sitting County Commissioner, she was entitled to request that an item be placed on the agenda by making a request in a public meeting and following up with a written request to the CM and the presiding officer. She said that was exactly what she did and added that she was trying to model good behavior. She asserted that she was trying to be transparent, communicate, and elicit a discussion that could promote positive change in BCC proceedings. She commented that she looked forward to discussing the proposal with Commissioners as a future agenda item but affirmed that she would not deliberate anything else about her request at that time. She pointed out that Commissioner Clark's response to her was an example of how he could object to an action or request that he perceived as stifling, but then do the same to his colleague.

Commissioner Clark stated that approximately 98 percent of his requests for agenda items were rejected. He said that he supported the request of his colleague for something to be on an agenda, and he hoped it would get on an agenda. He clarified that he was not saying she should be stifled, but he contended that the Commissioners were not treated equally. He restated his claim that 98 percent of his agenda item requests were denied. He divulged that he reported his observations about unequal treatment to HR and spoke to the DA. He said it was on record, and he commented that the public records would speak for themselves. He recommended that people go back and look at instances when he had asked for agenda items during Commissioners' and County Manager's announcements, and he recalled that he had asked for an agenda item regarding wild horses earlier that month. He stated that horses were being killed, and people were running over horses. He said the City of Reno had a presentation on the matter by somebody who had been working with concerned parties for over ten years, and he asked to have that presentation shared with the BCC. He opined that it was a County-wide, non-partisan issue, and he objected to the rejection of his request. He concluded that it was an example of rules being applied unequally.

Chair Hill remarked that the amount of work needed was evident. She thanked Mr. Ingram. Mr. Ingram stated that it was a pleasure working with the BCC. He said that he was always available and noted that Raftelis did not charge for phone calls.

25-0481 AGENDA ITEM 6 Public Comment.

Ms. Valerie Fiannaca thanked the Raftelis Vice President, Jonathan Ingram, for the report, but thought that Raftelis should raise their rates because she recalled that the Washoe County School District (WCSO) Board of Trustees hired a consultant at a higher cost. She opined that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would not follow Raftelis' recommendations and noted that she had expressed concerns for three years regarding the BCC's dysfunction. She recalled that a friend of hers ran the Raftelis report

through artificial intelligence (AI), which summarized that the BCC was poorly managed. She mentioned that she was in town for a business meeting and now resided in Arizona but felt that she needed to provide public comment on the report. She speculated that the BCC wanted to pretend there were no issues with management. She said that she had continued to express concerns with the WCCSD Board of Trustees throughout the years but believed they would never change. She indicated that it was impossible to work with individuals who did not wish for change. She said that every five years, her business hosted 20 flower shops from across the Nation to evaluate and provide feedback to each other. She reported that her sons purchased her business and chose the Whitney Peak Hotel as the location for the florist gathering due to its affordability, but the florists were aghast at what they witnessed downtown. She asserted that the area was not improving.

Ms. Trista Gomez thanked Commissioner Andriola and Human Resources (HR) for requesting and organizing the Raftelis report. She explained that her key takeaway from the report was the prioritization of core programs and indicated that the required core programs were run by elected officials. She enjoyed Raftelis' recommendation that the BCC was responsible for maintaining the County Manager's (CMs) accountability. She said that she had expressed concern about community engagement before and believed that residents wanted a voice instead of a community bulletin board that was not accessible to everyone. She heard the term *value* mentioned at the June 24 BCC meeting, which she appreciated; however, she felt public comments regarding the value of the interim County Manager (ICM) appointment were dismissed during the June 17 BCC meeting. She appreciated the Raftelis presentation and hoped that the recommendations were heard.

Ms. Penny Brock introduced herself as the Chair of the South Valleys Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) and expressed concern regarding Raftelis' recommendation of two BCC meetings a month and a caucus. She believed that the BCC should keep three meetings a month, plus a caucus. She noted that the BCC meetings she attended often adjourned at 6:00 p.m. and wondered how late the BCC meetings would go with only two meetings. She mentioned that the BCC placed items in consent and block, which meant that the public could only comment once for all the combined items. She indicated that the BCC was elected by the people to represent the community and that the County staff worked for the taxpayers. She thought that the recommendation of a caucus was a great idea and felt that a Commissioner's request for items on the agenda had gone unheard in the past. She objected to Commissioner Garcia's request to only have the end of the meeting announcements and reports item because she believed that removing one of the two announcements and reports items stifled Commissioners voices and violated their First Amendment rights.

Ms. Nicol Herris suggested that the BCC start with a new system and process. She asserted that Commissioner Clark's requests needed to be on an agenda. She noted that understanding how people felt about Commissioner Garcia's request to remove the first announcements and reports item was essential. She said that waiting until the end of the meeting required her to sacrifice time that she could use to make money for her family. She challenged the BCC and those in attendance to figure out how to get Commissioner Clark's requests on an agenda and speculated that Raftelis could assist the

BCC in a new Commissioner agenda item process. She said that the meetings needed to be streamlined and that citizens could not attend the meetings because they had to work during the day. She mentioned that continued business as usual would produce the same results and that the concerns needed to be resolved. She reiterated that Commissioner Clark's requests must be discussed so that the public did not have to express their frustrations.

Ms. Val White explained that the BCC was responsible for the issues addressed in the Raftelis report. She noted that the community's roads and traffic were horrid and would continue to worsen with the growing population. She believed transparency was good and that Commissioner Garcia's recommendation decreased transparency by taking away open communication during the first announcements and reports item. She recommended that neither Assistant County Manager (ACM) Kate Thomas nor ACM David Solaro be considered for the CM's position because the County was poorly managed and an outside perspective was needed. She opined that both ACMs were underqualified and attributed that to the County's management issues. She indicated that there should be a newly elected Chair because she did not believe that one individual should hold the Chair position for multiple terms. She was tired of watching Commissioner Clark be disrespected and said that Chair Hill interrupted him constantly. She communicated that Commissioner Clark was her Commissioner, and she felt discouraged that his items were not on an agenda. She did not believe that the BCC would follow Raftelis' recommendations.

25-0482 AGENDA ITEM 7 Announcements/Reports.

There were no announcements or reports.

* * * * *

03:44 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

ALEXIS HILL, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

JANIS GALASSINI, County Clerk and
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners

Minutes Prepared by:
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk