

Form Name:	RDA and City Council Comments
Submission Time:	July 17, 2023 8:13 pm
Browser:	Chrome 114.0.0.0 / OS X
IP Address:	98.160.155.148
Unique ID:	1122135357
Location:	36.175, -115.1372

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Wednesday, July 19, 2023
---------------------	--------------------------

<b>Meeting Type</b>	City Council
---------------------	--------------

<b>Agenda Item Number</b>	56
---------------------------	----

<b>Project Number</b>	R-32-2023
-----------------------	-----------

<b>Position</b>	I OPPOSE the project and all related applications.
-----------------	--

<b>Name</b>	Brittany Brussell
-------------	-------------------

<b>Residential or Business Address</b>	6451 Brown Eagle St. Las Vegas , NV 89131
--	--

Submitted after final agenda

Item 56

## Comments

When reviewing Agenda Item #56 for possible action to approve Resolution No. R-32-2023 for TAF of \$224,379 on July 19, 2023, the words "may" vs. "shall" catch my eye. At first glance, they appear to be interchangeable. However their respective definitions of legislative intent are not, per NRS 0.025. "May" confers a right, privilege or power. "Shall" imposes a duty to act. I say this in reference to one but many statements in the Resolution denoting the City's cleverly lenient conditions and limitations in holding TAF accountable with regard to its desire to allocate up to \$224,379 dollars to the organization. For example, "The City may in its sole and absolute discretion withhold or decrease payments." Or, "The City may suspend or revoke this resolution." This voluntary permissive choice by the City to act or never act suggests a lack of urgency of retribution for unfulfilled trust or violated obligations. Including "shall," in a statement, which is an command indicating actions are mandatory are no less impactful. For example, "TAF shall provide written monthly Program reports to the City," is rendered ineffective without the presence of explicit consequences of failure to meet time-sensitive deadlines.

If you still can't spot the difference, listen to these two statements.

I shall vote for you for re-election.

I may vote for you for re-election.

Ask yourself, which one denotes to you a firm and actionable commitment?

Moreover, the term of the Resolution begins August 1, 2023 through July 31, 2024. No later than 60 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance, so respectively September/October 2024, TAF shall provide the City with cumulative accomplishments, financial reports, etc. The Resolution does not address non-compliance or events of default in relation to their specific goals of the Pet Support Initiative Program goals. From my interpretation, the City has not stipulated any evaluation methods i.e. 30, 60, 90-day performance periods, to determine if program goal statistics are steadily trending upwards, challenges if any are addressed and given a deadline for improvement, etc. Therefore, if failures are consistent, taxpayer dollars will continue to flow to TAF without consideration? I have professionally managed strategic plans with budgetary concerns with local public agencies, and question the 1 year+ free-reign to continue with a program that does not have strict oversight and consequences for under performance.

In the June 20, 2023 Clark County Commissioner's Board Meeting, TAF CEO Hilarie Grey said in response to a question posed about a Plan B if hiring needs are not met for the Call Center, that TAF would have to "dedicate more current staff and assign overtime...figure out a way with more volunteers, learn how we can be more proactive with our resources." Grey unintentionally solved part of many TAF organizational problems. Dig deep and exhaust all options internally. TAF helmed by Grey could do that, but if she already hasn't mandated and acted on internal ingenuity mentioned above, there is clearly no incentive or drive to do so. It's much easier for those lacking true tenacity and character

to revert back to their former public relations tactics of controlling the rhetoric to plea for others to fill in the gaps financially.

TAF CEO Hilarie Grey and its Board of Directors resist acceptance of understanding how frequently the problems they continue to have are of their own making, their struggles self-inflicted. If they did, they wouldn't be asking for a bail out, but practicing fiscal creativity, taking voluntary administrative salary cuts, sacrificing personal time and energy to assist in community program work and so forth. For inspiration, they need only look to local non-profit animal rescues who exude selflessness and determination, steadfast through relentless obstacles. The message the City should be sending to TAF leadership is either to be resourceful or resign.

Some more food for thought prior to the City Council Meeting on July 19, 2023...

Do you have clear, consistent and measurable data that directly illustrates specific actions that prove without a doubt that under TAF CEO Hilarie Grey has and is expending every single viable option possible before soliciting an advancement of \$224,379 from the City, and up to \$535,000, on top of \$4.7 million annually from Southern Nevada taxpayers?

Is this Resolution the equivalent of a Band-Aid, knowing that it can fester and scar but is a quick and dirty method to cover an unsightly wound from your field of vision?

Accountability Above All,

Brittany Brussell, native Las Vegas