

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 25, 2025

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair

Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair

Michael Clark, Commissioner

Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner

Clara Andriola, Commissioner

Janis Galassini, County Clerk

Eric Brown, County Manager

Mary Kandaras, Chief Deputy District Attorney

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 10:01 a.m. in regular 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:

25-0100 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Ms. Linda Vogedes noted that in 1973, Reno became her home. She graduated from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). She said she wanted a rural lifestyle and purchased her land to build a home, raise her children, and raise horses. She wanted a rural lifestyle and to raise horses. She noted that for 30 years she had worked for UNR overseeing the equestrian center and mentioned that people came to her home to watch baby horses be born and meteor showers. She asked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to consider the Master Plan values that recognized rural areas. She believed that maintaining the rural area for future generations to learn, grow, and understand agriculture was important. She said she enjoyed watching the Golden and Bald eagles flying around her property.

Ms. Jody Premock worked for the Karma Box and said that certificates were given to the Karma Box for their recent work with the homeless. She did not understand why the BCC thought the shelter should not be open 24 hours. She indicated that most of the people at the facility were elderly, handicapped, and visually impaired. She did not expect the homeless to go onto the street at night. She felt that if the facility were closed at any point, it should be during the day. She believed that the County was showing the wrong message by closing at night when the streets were the most dangerous. She noted that most of the people were not addicts but had bad circumstances happen to them. She said there was nowhere for the people to go at night that was welcoming and safe. She explained that the Karma Box helped a lot of people and was not a nine-to-five job.

Chair Hill asked County Manager Eric Brown for a presentation regarding the overflow shelter.

Ms. Maureen McElroy said she supported the public library system. She referred to her senior friend who was a lifelong reader. She reported that her friend had been diagnosed with macular degeneration, which prevented her from reading books. Ms. McElroy noted that the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) provided downloadable electronic books (eBooks) and audiobooks through Libby, allowing her friend to pursue her love of books from home. She explained that according to the Collection Development Librarian, 48 percent of the WCLS's material budget went towards downloadable books, which were expensive. She mentioned that the average wait time for downloadable books was 46 days and urged the BCC to fund the WCLS. She said she wanted the WCLS to continue to provide valuable services to vulnerable people.

Mr. Terry Brooks read an original poem regarding politics, education, and homelessness.

Mr. Howard Owens noted that he previously worked at General Motors (GM) in Detroit, Michigan, building lithium batteries. He referred to the Moss Fire in California, started by lithium batteries. He indicated that when a battery's case cracked, moisture entered, started a fire, and exploded. He noted that he took part in a lithium battery voltage test, which ended in an explosion. He mentioned that explosions usually stayed in the area unless they were large. He reported that the Reno Stead Airport was considering lithium-sulfur batteries, which, when cracked, would emit a toxic gas. He thought that putting lithium-sulfur batteries in a highly populated area was unsafe and put residents at risk.

Mr. Russ Earle wished for the BCC to uphold the Planning Commission's (PC) denial to increase density zoning in the Osage area. He noted that the County recently released updated floodplain maps which dedicated almost the entirety of the parcel to the floodplain. He explained that the developer wanted to raise the level of the parcel; however, doing so would put the existing homeowners at risk. He wondered if the County would be liable for the damage caused by floods if they approved the appeal. He knew the County was not flush with funds and did not want to contribute taxes to pay for lawsuits. He said the area was a closed hydrologic basin and requested the BCC research the new floodplain maps. He opined that the homeowners in the area would have a problem obtaining flood insurance.

Mr. Angelo Nowakowska was an avid bicyclist and had repaired, rebuilt, and maintained the trails at the Biggest Little Bike Park. He was informed that bulldozing would take place on March 3, 2025. He indicated that a meeting in 2024 was not made public to the individuals associated with the Biggest Little Bike Park. He was concerned that 90 percent of the trails would be demolished with no budget for maintenance. He said he did not understand why the permit application said the trails were not legitimized due to lack of maintenance. He wanted to know why money had not been allocated to maintaining the park when there was money to bulldoze the hard work put in by the

community. He mentioned it was interesting that the demolition was brought on by unsafe trail crossings when he had never experienced or heard about them. He noted he understood the park was not going away, only changing. He said if he could not stop the bulldozing, he wanted to be a part of the next iteration of planning.

Mr. Fernando Piper explained that there were meetings held regarding the Biggest Little Bike Park that he was not made aware of. He opined the people demolishing the park did not have the best interest of the community in mind. He felt that the budget, funds, and planning did not make sense and believed the access road only needed to be graded once to allow for emergency medical services (EMS) and the fire department. He speculated that the bike lines planned did not make sense, and he wanted to know how to become part of the process because he had been building in the park for a long time. He understood there was money allocated to the park before the pandemic; however, it was later reallocated. He indicated that KRI Architecture and Design Project Manager Jim Severt was the main builder of the park but had not been contacted. He said that builders had supposedly talked about the process with riders; however, he had fixed the mistakes made by the builders. He did not want to be pushed to the side to watch the trails be demolished.

Ms. Heidi Howe relayed she had watched her parents progressively drop their well in Lemmon Valley as water was drawn out from under their property by development. She said her realtor mother would warn people buying homes on Lemmon Drive that their property would flood. She witnessed developers provide fill for the lakeside of Lemmon Drive, and they continued to build homes that flooded in 2017. She said she experienced the same thing happening on Osage Road. Since the Reno Air Races were no longer at the Reno Stead Airport, she witnessed surveyors with intentions of putting large warehouses within 300 feet of her fence. She noted that the new homes would draw on the water she used in her well. She wondered if she would be forced to go on a water system like her parents. She informed the Board that her in-laws purchased the land on Osage Road in 1974 because they wanted a rural lifestyle. She mentioned that floods were recurring in the area. She loved the area and was concerned about the development taking place. In her retirement, she worked for the WCLS and loved the community.

Mr. Justin Davis was concerned about the changes to the Biggest Little Bike Park. He said he had first-hand experience building trails in the North Valleys that were later turned into apartment complexes or bulldozed. He indicated that the plans were made by people he had never seen at the park. He voiced his opposition to the changes and recommended involving riders in the planning.

10:32 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

11:00 a.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

25-0101 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown stated he met with the City Managers from the Cities of Reno and Sparks, per the direction received at the concurrent meeting, to follow up on the next steps in the process of fire regionalization. He mentioned that there would be another meeting with the chiefs, and he said the direction seemed to be to explore bringing in a third party to do a business plan. The business plan would include what a consolidated fire agency would look like, the cost, and the feasibility and pitfalls. He said rather than doing a study that would tell the Board what was already known, the managers felt that they should carefully determine financially what would be possible. He said he would update the Board as things progressed after future discussions with the chiefs and the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA).

Chair Hill thanked Manager Brown for the great work, and she looked forward to future updates. She stated that she understood that the region was very supportive of possible collaborations.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that last fall, she took a ride along with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), set up by Kimberly Dow, BLM Carson City District Manager. She said it was interesting to see all the different urban interface issues that affected all five of the Commissioner's districts. Ms. Dow provided Commissioner Garcia with a list of potential collaborative opportunities that the County could work with the BLM on regarding illegal dumping in Washoe County. Commissioner Garcia said she would email the list to Chair Hill and Manager Brown and stated she would love to see a presentation on how those issues were currently handled. She suggested the topic for the next legislative session, that could be put forward if it was of interest to the body.

Chair Hill said that she looked forward to that discussion.

Commissioner Andriola commented on Manager Brown's report regarding the next steps for the meetings, and she thought the third-party business plan was great. She said the terms regionalization and consolidation continued to be intertwined, and she hoped the business plan would separate what the costs were since the two terms had distinctly different meanings. She felt it was important that clarification was provided and considered as the business plan was reviewed. She wanted those distinctions to be included in the report from the independent third party.

Commissioner Andriola extended her gratitude to Michael Large, Deputy District Attorney (DDA), and the legal team for filing an amicus brief on behalf of Washoe County regarding the Baker Ranches, Inc. versus Haaland appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. She stated that the appeal included the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), along with several other counties and entities, such as Pershing County and White Pine County, Pershing County Water Conservation District, and more. She mentioned that the case addressed the lower court's grant of sovereign immunity to the federal government in cases that involved the pre-McCarran Amendment in terms of state water decrees that could have huge implications for water rights not only for Nevada but throughout the State,

potentially even the Country. She stated that the decision was anticipated sometime in the late spring or summer of 2026.

Commissioner Andriola proposed a formal request that procedures, policies, and processes be reviewed and updated for the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs). She stated that it had been a while and that there were a lot of moving parts, but her formal request and opinion was that there was nothing as close as working as a Commissioner with the CABs. She welcomed the opportunity to participate as appropriate and anticipated hard work starting the process. She mentioned she would follow the procedure and would follow up in writing with her request.

Commissioner Andriola announced that Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB) would hold a clean-up in Golden Eagle Regional Park on March 29th from 12:00 to 4:00 p.m. She said volunteers were needed, and signups were on the KTMB website.

Commissioner Andriola acknowledged Mr. Brian Beffort, Sustainability Manager, and provided two examples. She said she spoke with a business owner who told her he and his wife were retired teachers who had contributed to the community for several years by creating gardens in schools to grow fruits and vegetables; however, they had encountered barriers. She shared that Mr. Beffort helped to facilitate a continuation of that process, and she thanked him for his hard work. She said that for almost two years most of the community heard her speak about the Court of Antiquity. She thanked Mr. Beffort for collaborating with her to create an opportunity that brought all the stakeholders together to address the End of the World Camp to preserve the river and the hundreds of petroglyphs at that location. She explained that a meeting date had been set, and the invitation had gone out. She and the Tribal Chairman for the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC) wrote a letter to all the stakeholders that were invited to the meeting. She expressed her excitement and added that she would keep everyone apprised as more developed.

Commissioner Clark addressed the time that he felt was wasted by just sitting around. He said that there were over 40 people in the room, and he believed each of them had lost 30 minutes of their lives, which would total over 20-man hours. He mentioned it was unclear why the policy started, and he thought it was a waste of time to wait to conduct the rest of the meeting if public comments ended before 11:00 a.m. He mentioned it would be a long day, and there were other things to do. He felt having people wait around for 30 minutes because there were not enough public comments did not make sense, and he wanted a better explanation as to why that policy went into effect. He said he knew early public comment had been removed a year prior, and after public comment was brought back at the start of the meeting then, it was decided to have a break if public comment did not go until 11:00 a.m.

Commissioner Clark stated that This Is Reno posted an excellent opposite the editorial page (Op-ed), over the weekend that talked about the media being in a partnership with the County. He felt that the media should be the scrutineer for the people and not in a partnership arrangement with the County. He stated that the Board should be

in partnership with the citizens and the media should report on everything. He believed the media should not have a cozy relationship with the Board.

Commissioner Clark discussed Assembly Bill 51 (AB), which he believed was spearheaded by the Mayor of Sparks. He believed AB51 would limit the media and citizens from public records and would make it more difficult than it already was to get public records. He said the proponents of AB51 were in Carson City trying to convince the statewide legislators to do that and he did not think that was a good idea. He explained that he thought the public should have a right to see everything that their elected officials and county employees have been doing. He felt the public had a right to have input and notice and believed it should be easier for the public and the media to get information. He mentioned he, as a Commissioner, had to file requests for public records and did not get a lot of the information he requested. He noted that when he did get information, it was less than the whole truth. He said he felt strongly that people should have the ability to access records, so he was not in support of AB51.

Commissioner Clark discussed the agenda item regarding the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) handbook and mentioned he wanted his attorney to review it before he voted on the item. He included that if changes were made in the handbook, he felt something needed to be added that Commissioners should make substantiated representations. He referenced an article in This Is Reno and spoke about Chair Hill making statements that he felt were incorrect. He wondered how someone, using the County's information and under its name, could make incorrect statements regarding reducing homelessness by 40 percent. He noted he had not seen a 40 percent reduction and wondered if anyone had witnessed that homelessness was cut in half. He requested the handbook be changed to include an option for Commissioners to comment on incorrect statements made by other Commissioners.

Lastly, Commissioner Clark addressed the controversy concerning the Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS) Advisory Board meeting that had been hacked. He summarized that someone hacked the meeting and made racial and Nazism comments. He added the exact thing happened in a senior meeting a while back, and he believed nobody cared about the senior meetings because it was not mentioned on the news. He commented that the seniors and board staff were also offended by the offensive words and images when their meeting was Zoom bombed. He believed everyone needed to be treated equally and said he felt the need to defend the seniors.

25-0102 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Presentation by Daren Griffin, President/CEO, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority, to provide an executive airport update. (All Commission Districts.)

Daren Griffin, President and CEO of the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority (RTAA), introduced himself to the Board and thanked them for inviting him to visit, present, and inform appointing authorities and bodies on updates and developments at the Reno-Tahoe International Airport (RNO). He briefly summarized the content to be discussed during the presentation, including the state of air travel business in the region,

the RTAA capital program MoreRNO, and the RTAA's community involvement. Mr. Griffin welcomed questions and comments from the Board to be taken at the end of the presentation.

Mr. Griffin conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Commission Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority Executive Overview; Agenda; Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority Who We Are; Our Regional Economic Impact; RNO's Busiest Year in Almost 2 Decades; Service Area; Continued Growth on RTAA Property; Airway Commerce Center; New Development at RTS; 11 Airlines Connecting to 20+ Nonstop Destinations; Regional Effort to Attract New Air Service; The Future of RNO is MORE; \$1 Billion MoreRNO Infrastructure Program; MoreRNO Progress Completed Projects; MoreRNO Progress Projects Coming Soon-ish; A New Art Experience; A Sustainable Future; Project Outlook Costs ~\$1 Billion; RTAA + Reno-Tahoe Community; Strategic Community Partnerships; Community Events; Questions?.

Mr. Griffin referred to the content on the slide titled *Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority Who We Are* and briefly described the history, purpose, and governance of the RTAA. He introduced the RTAA as a quasi-municipal entity that operated simultaneously like a government and a business. He stated that the RTAA Board of Trustees was comprised of nine individuals and noted that two members of the RTAA Board of Trustees had been appointed by members of the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and had attended the presentation with him. He introduced those trustees as Mr. Adam Kramer, Secretary of the RTAA, and Ms. Cortney Young, the Treasurer of the RTAA. He stated that Ms. Young was the Chair of the Airport Finance Committee, and Mr. Kramer served as the Air Service Liaison for the RTAA. He noted that both individuals had been very active and engaged in all the RTAA's developments. Mr. Griffin thanked the BCC for providing the RTAA with great board members.

Mr. Griffin noted that the RTAA had a lot going on at RNO and a big vision for the future. He spoke of the RTAA Board of Trustees' conviction in making big decisions to push infrastructure and their vision forward. He thanked the BCC again for the appointment recommendations they had made. Mr. Griffin described the format of the RTAA Board of Trustees by noting the other governing members of the RTAA Board of Trustees and what body or authority they had been appointed by. He stated that the City of Reno appointed four members, the City of Sparks appointed two, and the Reno-Sparks Convention & Visitors Authority (RSCVA) appointed one.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *Our Regional Economic Impact*, which provided an update on statistics regarding economic growth and the impact of RTAA operations. He stated that the RTAA had been doing well and noted that in late 2023, the RTAA updated its economic impact study. He mentioned the large amount of data presented on the slide. He expressed his interest in the statistic of \$129,500 contributed to the local economy with the landing of each Boeing 737-800, which he indicated was the model of RNO's most commonly landed aircraft. He stated that the economic impact of this landing was significant. He attested that the economic impact was contributed in part

by residents of the area but primarily by those who visit the region and arrive by air. He indicated that air travel was the most common arrival method for visitors entering the area at just over 50 percent and noted that the RTAA had seen an increase in visitors arriving by air as the region grew and people realized it was the easiest and quickest method of traveling to Northern Nevada. Mr. Griffin indicated that the RTAA was constantly encouraging the growth of their economic impact and providing tremendous value to the region as an airport authority through aviation infrastructure, commercial airline partnerships, and partnerships in private industries.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *RNO's Busiest Year in Almost 2 Decades* to elaborate on the passenger traffic increases seen in RNO throughout 2024. Mr. Griffin stated that it had been almost 20 years since the RTAA had seen statistics comparable to those shown on the slide and indicated that the trends began around the summer of 2024. He stated that there had been a notable increase in the number of seats, with a 10 percent increase which equated to over 90,000 seats having been added in the summer of 2024. He elaborated on the importance of those statistics as something the RTAA looked out for and indicated that the region had done a phenomenal job of filling the available seats both for arrivals and departures. Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA identified a 4 percent increase in passenger traffic during the fall despite a typical decrease in air traffic as school sessions resumed. He expressed that the RTAA was extremely pleased with how they performed in 2024. He attested that RNO ended 2024 by serving a total of 4.8 million ticketed passengers throughout the year and described serving nearly five million total ticketed passengers as a significant achievement for RNO and the region. He noted that the mentioned 4.8 million ticketed passengers that passed through the airport only included individuals who had paid to fly in or out of the region and did not include those just doing business or working at the airport.

Mr. Griffin further elaborated on the region served by the RTAA by referring to the slide titled *Service Area*. Mr. Griffin noted the large size of the region and attested that one million individuals considered RNO to be their local airport. He acknowledged the long driving distances from the airport to different towns and cities in the region and listed Fernley, Winnemucca, Fallon, and others as examples. He stated that the RTAA acknowledged the residents of those areas as customers. He affirmed that the RTAA considered them in their airport planning, infrastructure planning, and customer service experiences. He listed additional surrounding cities served by RNO at a further distance and noted that despite the considerable size of the region, the RTAA would not lose sight of their customers and the families who made long commutes to RNO.

Mr. Griffin referred to a map shown on the slide titled *Continued Growth on RTAA Property* and stated that the map divided the land RNO was placed on into two different areas. He noted that the portion of the map highlighted in aqua or green showed the property's operating portion of the airfield, which housed runways and taxiways with extremely strict security and safety rules. Mr. Griffin elaborated that the RTAA considered that portion of its property as its own entity. He noted that the operating area was surrounded by the land the RTAA was in the process of developing, depicted in dark blue on the slide.

Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA's public safety mission was integrated into the operating airfield area and attested that the RTAA was in the process of entering into an interlocal agreement for transferring the RTAA's fire mission to the City of Reno, whose jurisdiction RNO resided entirely within. Mr. Griffin stated that the transfer was in its final stages and that their first mission in this effort was aircraft rescue and firefighting. He acknowledged that those topics had been in the news recently for what he identified as all the wrong reasons. He remarked that the news coverage served as a reminder for the RTAA of the importance of providing the fastest possible response and having the deepest set of resources available to address incidents on the airfield and save lives. He speculated that everyone had seen recent video evidence that demonstrated the importance of preparedness for saving lives and noted that they had been training all the time, both directly and in partnership with the City of Reno. He stated that the federal standards for aircraft rescue and firefighting were extremely strict. He reiterated that the RTAA was extremely excited about entering into the coming partnership not only in regard to the aircraft rescue and firefighting mission, identifying it as a constant and unchanged first priority, but also for the upcoming projects on RTAA land. He listed the RTAA's upcoming projects underway, such as the development of hotels, rental car centers, concourse upgrades, and vertical infrastructure growth. He reiterated that those development efforts further contributed to the RTAA reaching the decision to provide the best possible resources for aircraft rescue and firefighting as a part of their all-hazard mission around the airport.

Mr. Griffin referred to data on the slide titled *Airway Commerce Center* to introduce the RTAA's largest and most recent development project. Mr. Griffin stated that the Airway Commerce Center was located directly south of RNO and was developed by Tolles Development Company. Mr. Griffin described the Airway Commerce Center as a major development on airport property, featuring 890,000 square feet of offices, showrooms, distributing warehouses, and light manufacturing space. He identified it as the most difficult piece of land they have had to develop, due to its close proximity to the end of a runway, which placed strict rules on what could be developed in the location. Mr. Griffin stated that Tolles Development Company found an answer that adhered to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements that dictated what development could be placed on the available land while ensuring the safety of people and businesses in a way that puts the land to good use. Mr. Griffin stated that the Airway Commerce Center was a much better neighbor to the surrounding area than what had been previously located on the land and expressed excitement about the greenbelt placed around the structure. He noted that the greenbelt landscaping adhered to strict FAA landscaping requirements. Mr. Griffin referred to the relation between the FAA landscaping guidelines and the presence of birds, indicating that the presence of birds near active planes would not mix well, and reiterated the RTAA's excitement about the development of the Airway Commerce Center as an addition to the RNO neighborhood.

Mr. Griffin introduced several development projects at the Reno Stead Airport (RTS) shown in more detail on the slide titled *New Development at RTS*. Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA was working hard towards development efforts at RTS in collaboration with Dermody Properties as the developer. He referred to the current development efforts for the Reno AirLogistics Park located on the west side of Moana

Boulevard near RTS and stated that construction was being done by Dermody Properties as a Public-Private Partnership (P3). Mr. Griffin stated that the P3 stipulated that the RTAA would maintain ownership of the land that the property was located on, while Dermody Properties would be responsible for the development of the property and would own, manage, and become the master tenant sublessor for the building.

Mr. Griffin referred to an announcement made last October about the development and construction of the world's first lithium-sulfur battery gigafactory set to be located on the east side of RTS. He attested that this factory was a billion-dollar investment from Lyten into Northern Nevada and expressed the RTAA's excitement for their partnership. Mr. Griffin stated that this development was just an announcement at that point, and collaborative discussions between the RTAA, Dermody Properties, and Lyten were ongoing in regard to a land lease and development agreement. He remarked that the discussions were complicated and contributed to the slow pace of the discussion. He stated that while discussions were ongoing, he had no other announcements to report on the deal-making and operation logistics discussions between the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), the RTAA, Dermody Properties, and Lyten. He affirmed that Lyten had expressed intent for the development and stated that having a San Jose-based company looking to make an investment of this type in Northern Nevada was an exciting step.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *11 Airlines Connecting to 20+ Nonstop Destinations* to show RNO's air service map and identified it as an important part of the presentation. Mr. Griffin noted that the air service slide was an important part of the presentation and held significance to many within the RTAA. He stated that the map depicted on the slide showed a current roadmap of where RNO offered non-stop routes, with the blue routes showing year-round non-stop routes at RNO. He noted that the yellow routes indicated seasonal non-stop routes, which he remarked were most typically offered in the summer due to the additional demand for travel to vacation destinations. He stated that airlines typically added air service to seasonal routes for locations such as Minneapolis, John F. Kennedy Airport (JFK) in New York, and Houston. Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA was always working to recruit new air service by converting yellow seasonal route lines that were available during the ski season or summer into blue permanent routes to be available year-round. He referred to the 11 airlines listed on the right-hand side of the slide and stated that having that many airlines in a community of that size provided a tremendous amount of air service that the RTAA never took for granted. He attested that Frontier Airlines was recently added to the list of air service providers at RNO, with them beginning significant service after having left RNO a couple of years ago. He stated that Frontier Airlines would operate flights starting in the next week to Denver and Las Vegas, which he identified as two very strong markets at RNO.

On the next slide, titled *Regional Effort to Attract New Air Service*, Mr. Griffin expanded on the efforts of the RTAA to expand the air service at RNO. Mr. Griffin identified the dots depicted on the map as places of interest for the RTAA. He expressed that he hoped to see flying for the first time in areas indicated by the orange dots and remarked that the blue dots showed where the RTAA hoped to see more flying. He noted

that the RTAA hoped to retain the location services that were already available and identified Austin, Houston, and Chicago as notable examples. He reiterated the importance of not losing any air service and that all communities, including large hub airports, were competing for airlines, airplanes, and more flights. He reiterated that for RNO, the RTAA wanted to hold on to what services they already offered and add to the route map.

Mr. Griffin referred to the concept of the battery belt region in the southeastern United States and noted the connectivity of the region to Northern Nevada. He stated the zip-code-driven data the RTAA collected had suggested addressing the flight demand to travel to the southeast. He provided examples such as Nashville, Kansas City, Charleston, and Charlotte to identify locations that the RTAA would consider beneficial for RNO to provide nonstop air service for. He identified Orlando as another city of interest for non-stop air service for RNO to provide to account for the traffic demands generated by tourism to Walt Disney World. Mr. Griffin speculated that the significant demand for non-stop air service to Orlando would likely always be present and noted that the RTAA would someday add that non-stop air service at RNO. Mr. Griffin identified the Hawaiian islands as RNO's number one unserved destination and stated that every day there were enough passengers traveling from RNO to reach a destination in Hawaii that approximately every seat in a Boeing-737 could be filled. He noted that the RTAA would need to find an airline willing to operate the long route with high fuel requirements that would depart from a high-altitude airport. Mr. Griffin affirmed that progress was being made with the merger between Alaskan Airlines and Hawaiian Airlines, and indicated his belief that the merger could create new opportunities for a market RNO's size to attract nonstop service to Hawaii.

Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA closely monitored flights to Mexico and Canada. He attested that their nonstop flights to Guadalajara, Mexico, operated by Volaris five days a week, were doing fantastic with nearly every flight full. He classified these flights as typically for friends and family from the local community in Reno who traveled back and forth, and he further elaborated that these flights were not primarily utilized for tourism. Mr. Griffin mentioned that beach destinations in Mexico, such as Puerto Vallarta and Cancun, were also included in the list of cities targeted to attract new air service. He stated that Canadian cities such as Vancouver and Calgary were additional markets under consideration to be added for additional air service. He identified that clearing customs in Canada prior to boarding the plane and entering the United States was an advantage. He indicated that the RTAA had encountered a challenge in attracting customs officers to a community of this size to work at RNO. He further noted that RNO had only four total officers to manage customs for the Volaris flight. He expressed the RTAA's interest in attracting more customs officers in the interest of Volaris being enabled to operate additional flights from RNO. He reiterated that Volaris was performing well in Reno and that the airline was interested in increasing its offered flight operations at RNO.

Mr. Griffin introduced the RTAA's capital program, MoreRNO, and referred to content in the slides *The Future of RNO is MORE* and *\$1 Billion MoreRNO Infrastructure Program*. Mr. Griffin stated that the map of the RNO campus featured on the slide titled *\$1 Billion MoreRNO Infrastructure Program* was oblique, with the portions

highlighted blue outlining the parts of the property involved in the program. He stated that the involvement in the program ranged from the Ground Transportation Center on the far left to the terminal buildings and roadways elsewhere in the image.

Mr. Griffin stated that there were several MoreRNO projects that had already been completed and provided additional details on the projects as he referred to the contents of the slide titled *MoreRNO Progress Completed Projects*. Mr. Griffin stated that the RNO ticketing hall expansion was completed and that reviews following the completion of the expansion had been outstanding. He attested that the expansion created additional room for the movement of people around the ticketing hall, which he noted was a necessity to account for the presence of skis, snowboards, golf clubs, and checked bags in the market. Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA was extremely happy with the final results of the completed expansion and reiterated that the expansion had been necessary.

Mr. Griffin acknowledged the completion of the Loop Road improvements project, which consisted of the complete reconstruction of all eight lanes in the roadway that looped around RNO. He noted that the location made the reconstruction very difficult as the airport was never closed for the purpose of construction. He stated that he appreciated the patience regarding the construction zone and noted that it was ongoing for the better part of a year. He attested that the project was completed to ensure safer operations. He noted the improvements made to visibility, efforts to make the area brighter, improvements to the drop-off curbs, upgrades done to signage, and raising crosswalks to ensure people's safety. He stressed the importance of those improvements due to the high volume of people crossing the roadway used by a high volume of drivers returning rental cars. He noted that many of those returning rental vehicles could be distracted by the relevant signage rather than the pedestrians crossing the roadway in front of them. He reiterated how pleased the RTAA was with the completion of the Loop Road improvements.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *MoreRNO Progress Projects Coming Soon-ish* to provide updates on MoreRNO projects that were under construction. He introduced the Ground Transportation Center as the first P3 the RTAA had entered. He stated that the RTAA could not afford to finance a rental car center for the region alone. Mr. Griffin referred to the construction of new concourses at RNO and stated that the RTAA was investing all of its bonding capacity into that. He explained that the Ground Transportation Center development was a partnership endeavor between a developer and rental car companies to bring another entity in to finance the \$300 million rental car center and the Ground Transportation Center, which would host the operations for rideshare services such as Uber, Lyft, and cabs.

Mr. Griffin referred back to the map shown on the slide titled *\$1 Billion MoreRNO Infrastructure Program* and noted that the Ground Transportation Center was depicted on the far-left side of the map. He noted that the Ground Transportation Center was planned to be nearly the size of a full city block. Mr. Griffin stated that the enabling projects were currently underway and noted that the RTAA would need to tear down several adjacent buildings in the blue portion of the map that indicated the site of the Ground Transportation Center. He stated that those demolished buildings would be

replaced but noted that the replacement buildings were already under construction, with an expected opening in late 2025. He noted that while the rental car center itself was expected to open in late 2025, the Ground Transportation Center was expected to be completed in about two and a half years. He expressed his excitement about the future completion of the Ground Transportation Center and its ability to create much-needed parking for the airport. He acknowledged that there was a parking challenge at RNO, which he identified as a good problem to have. He noted that driving was the only way for many individuals to get to the airport due to the distance and that those individuals would always need a place to park. He noted that the need would be addressed by the completion of the project as it would enable the reclamation of 600 parking spaces from the rental car area in the current garage and create additional parking spaces. He reiterated the RTAA's enthusiasm for the project and emphasized that the developer and the P3 had performed fantastically. He attested that the developer's strong performance enabled the RTAA to focus on the development of the Police and Airport Authority Headquarters and two new concourses.

Mr. Griffin elaborated on the construction purpose of the Police and Airport Authority Headquarters and police station, which would enable the relocation of the RTAA out of the terminal building. He noted that the building had been created in 1960 for the Winter Olympics and had not been expanded significantly since that time. He stated that with Frontier Airlines resuming air service offerings at RNO, the airport was essentially out of space for airlines. Mr. Griffin mentioned that the RTAA was situated above the airlines in what he referred to as prime real estate. He noted that current tenants, such as the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and concessionaire operators, would prefer not to be located in a sterile, security-enforced area. He mentioned that those departments would be relocated to ensure that the people and tenants who were needed in the terminal buildings to serve customers would have the necessary space to do so. He affirmed that those being relocated would be moved right next door, just south of the terminal building. Mr. Griffin stated that the first floor would be reserved for the police station. He noted that there was currently no public-facing police station but emphasized the necessity of having one. He explained that policing in airports was incredibly complicated due to the various factors involved with an airport's unique environment and listed airlines, customs, and trafficking as examples. He noted that these factors made having a police presence critical to ensure the airport could continue to operate. Mr. Griffin reiterated that the establishment of a public-facing police station would be a huge addition.

Mr. Griffin acknowledged that the biggest project in progress was the development of new concourses that would replace the gates the public was used to utilizing. He stated that the current concourses, Concourse B and Concourse C, would be torn down and rebuilt outside of each of the original concourses. Mr. Griffin referred to the image on the slide titled *\$1 Billion More RNO Infrastructure Program*. He noted that outside of each concourse shown in the image on the slide, the RTAA would build wider and taller concourses which had been depicted on the slide in blue. He elaborated that the new concourses would have improved customer amenities and bigger hold rooms for larger aircraft. He stated that the new concourses would have a greater distance between them to create a wider alley for quick and easy aircraft transportation in and out of the concourse area, which would reduce wait times and improve the customer experience. Mr. Griffin

acknowledged that the project would improve the customer experience at RNO and noted that when guests fly from RNO, they often arrive at new gates in airports located in Denver, Phoenix, Las Vegas, or elsewhere, with ongoing airport construction projects everywhere. He noted that RNO's provided customer experience had fallen further behind and was the reason why the airlines have agreed to financially support the concourse development project.

Mr. Griffin remarked that the budget for the concourse construction project was set at \$650 million. He attested that the RTAA had been struggling to keep within the budget while they planned the development of 25 new gates, an entirely new customer experience, and 100 percent gate replacement. He attested that the project was rare, as no other airport of comparable size had attempted to do similar development. He attested that completing a project of that type was a challenge for the RTAA but acknowledged the support of the airlines, the FAA, the vision of the RTAA Board of Trustees, and the community. He stressed that the community needed that expansion now, but new concourses would be especially necessary in the next decade if the RTAA hoped to meet the needs of the future aircraft that would serve the region. He stated that if they did not make concourse building developments now, the community would not have them when they were needed. He stated that the development and construction of a project of that type would take five to ten years. He noted that the progress of the project was on track, with the design stage for both concourses approximately 60 percent complete. He stated that the enabling projects, such as additional ramp building and the construction of a central utility plant, were scheduled to begin in the summer of 2025. He reiterated that developments were well on their way but acknowledged that there were many difficulties when attempting to build something of the project's size. He noted that while money was the primary difficulty, economic volatility was a notable challenge as well. Mr. Griffin remarked that Southwest Airlines experienced its first-ever large reduction in its workforce the week prior, which had impacted 1,700 of the airline's employees. He noted that such economic changes were a factor that the RTAA paid close attention to, as Southwest Airlines was the largest airline at RNO and needed to stay aligned with the RTAA on the significant investment in Reno.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *A New Art Experience* to introduce MoreRNO's art program. He stated that the MoreRNO art program was a large part of the customer experience the RTAA was trying to create, especially within the concourses. He attested that the art program was well on its way and noted the creation of a one-of-a-kind art installation in the new ticketing hall. He thanked Bethany Drysdale, Washoe County Media and Communications Program Manager, for representing Washoe County on the RTAA's Art Advisory Committee, which he noted was a regional collection of experts and talented artists that helped the RTAA Board of Trustees implement their vision of contributing 1 percent of the RTAA's \$1 billion program funds for design and construction costs towards public art. He thanked Ms. Drysdale and Chair Hill for participating in the RTAA's We Love Public Art campaign video. He elaborated that the RTAA was promoting the importance of public art in an airport environment, which he noted had not been something that was understood until about 20 years prior. He stated that art was now seen in a lot of airports as it significantly added to the quality of the customer experience

while reducing stress in an otherwise chaotic environment. He reiterated that they were committed to achieving the RTAA Boards' vision for achieving the 1 percent investment allocation for public art.

Mr. Griffin stated that sustainability was a critical part of what the RTAA was working toward and referred to the slide titled *A Sustainable Future* to elaborate further. He stated that the RTAA was continually considering the sustainability of all the projects he mentioned throughout his presentation. He introduced RTAA Trustee Kitty Jung as the board liaison with the Airport Sustainability Advisory Committee, which he stated was charged with investigating matters ranging from airport noise impacts to electric car usage in the development of the Ground Transportation Center to water consumption reduction efforts of approximately 70 percent from building new concourses, and more. He attested that the RTAA was always looking for ways to integrate sustainability into public works and reduce costs, emissions, and the impact on the environment and the people they served.

Mr. Griffin referred to statistics shown on the slide titled *Project Outlook Costs ~\$1 Billion*. He stated that no total sum was listed on the slide, but he noted that the total project cost was approximately \$1 billion. He attested that the first two values in the list showed the approximate final cost for the completed projects, with no variability in the final costs listed for the Ground Transportation Center, as the partnered developers had already signed agreements to develop those projects at the listed cost. Mr. Griffin stated the project cost for the Police and RTAA Headquarters was approximately \$70 million, and the airline-backed concourse development cost was suspected to be around \$650 million for the full concourse replacement. He noted that the RTAA would not be able to borrow more than they already had, so they could only leverage the authority they had so far. He stated that the RTAA had a plan to address that already, as they received their first debt rating completed in over 20 years last summer, where they had received an A rating, which he noted was essentially the best an airport could receive from the public sector. He attested that the RTAA issued its first debt last August, and while the RTAA was not yet debt-free, they were issuing debt for what he identified as the right reasons. He noted that as a quasi-municipal entity, the RTAA's job was to invest in infrastructure and provide an airport that met the community's needs, which was achieved by issuing bonds.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *Strategic Community Partnerships* to describe the agencies the RTAA worked in collaboration with. He stated that the RTAA did nothing alone, whether it was through partnering with Washoe County staff, the Department of Transportation, or other agencies. Mr. Griffin attested that the RTAA relied on several different local, statewide, and national partnerships. Mr. Griffin mentioned the RTAA's participation in the Association of Airports, which assisted in efforts to track legislation that could impact the RTAA or generate interest from the business community regarding the ongoing development projects. He stated that the RTAA was grateful to be a part of the community and for the great partnerships they had made that helped provide airport infrastructure, experiences, and input that kept the RTAA centered and focused on the right things that mattered to both community members and leaders who utilized the airport.

Mr. Griffin referred to the slide titled *Community Events* and listed the different events the RTAA hosted or supported annually. He acknowledged that many individuals may be familiar with or have participated in the listed events on the slide and invited interested viewers to participate in the future, whether it was a flight celebration or a music performance. Mr. Griffin stated that the RTAA supports Girls in Aviation, or Youth in Aviation, to give back to the industry and excite the next generation. Mr. Griffin mentioned the partnership between the RTAA and Operation Santa Claus as a collaboration the RTAA was very proud of. He attested that the RTAA perfected Burning Man and their efforts to prepare visitors to board airplanes following the ten-day-long event after addressing matters of cleanliness and personal appearance. He reiterated that the RTAA went through significant efforts to ensure satisfaction for the arrival and departure experience. He mentioned that there were 100 bus trips conducted out of the airport to the Burning Man event site. He noted that the RTAA's efforts for the Burning Man event were a well-oiled machine. He stated that the Burning Man participants' return to the airport was the busiest day of the year, with over 10,000 passengers processed through the airport in a single day, and that the week of Burning Man was the busiest week of the year for RNO. He attested that the RTAA valued the Burning Man event and viewed it as their equivalent to the traffic at other airports for the Super Bowl. He expressed that the RTAA was very proud of its partnership with the Burning Man Organization specifically.

Mr. Griffin ended his presentation on the slide titled *Questions?* and invited the Board to ask him questions or provide other comments.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Griffin and noted that the update he provided the Board was great. She stated that she would look to members of the Board for further questions or comments.

Vice Chair Herman stated that Mr. Griffin had answered all the questions she had and remarked that the presentation had been wonderful and had explained a lot of what had been happening. She noted that there was special training required for fire crews at airports and asked how Reno would be prepared for that training requirement. Mr. Griffin thanked Vice Chair Herman for the question and answered that the RTAA had 24 firefighters currently at the airport with the required special training that Vice Chair Herman referred to. He stated that the firefighters attended a national academy in Texas to receive special training. He elaborated that the 24 firefighters with the specialty training would transfer at midnight the night of the start of a pay period from the RTAA's employment to employment with the City of Reno. He attested that these firefighters would remain in the role and continue working shifts, and the RTAA would send additional City of Reno firefighters to the national academy in Texas for training. He stated that would be done to ensure that when the 24 current firefighters were exhausted, there would be a pool available to pull from that could come to the airport fire station and take over some of the shifts while working side-by-side with the present firefighters. He acknowledged that the training was required, and federal law stipulated that the firefighters have the necessary training. He noted that the 24 current firefighters were the only ones locally with the specialized training and attested that it was a big win for the RTAA to have that pool to pull from. Mr. Griffin concluded his answer by thanking Vice Chair Herman.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Griffin for the presentation. She stated she had two questions but wanted to first address the fact that having a high-functioning airport was critical. She thanked and acknowledged the Washoe County's RTAA Board of Trustee appointees for signing up to participate as well as for their commitment to such an important part of Washoe County's economic vitality. She stated that she appreciated the airport's emphasis on sustainability and art. Commissioner Garcia reflected on her experience of touring the airport last year and mentioned there had been a discussion about having outdoor spaces integrated within the newly remodeled Concourses A and B. She asked if the integrations were still a part of the development plan.

Mr. Griffin answered that it was still a part of the plan but that those spaces were on a list of elements that would be harder to get if the RTAA were to run out of funding. He attested that he personally felt very strongly that outdoor spaces were a common inclusion in airports for critically important reasons such as providing fresh air. He noted that he had a strong feeling that, one way or another, the RTAA would find a way to include outdoor spaces, as he stated that current modern airport experiences included them. He noted that airports in the United States had been much slower to adopt that element and that European airports had long ago incorporated elements such as decks overlooking flights to provide fresh air. He reiterated that he was sure the RTAA was still looking into ways to provide outdoor spaces.

Commissioner Garcia noted that during the tour of the airport, she believed she had focused on the ticketing hall, the new concourses, and the Ground Transportation Center, but she had not paid much attention to the Police and Airport Authority Headquarters. She noted that Mr. Griffin had mentioned that there would be space released for tenants in the Police and Airport Authority Headquarters. She asked if the RTAA already had people in mind for those open spaces. Mr. Griffin responded by stating that the space they were going to vacate prompted conversations with the TSA, who occupied a significant amount of space in the lower-level Concourse B. He stated that the RTAA planned to tear that space down as it was not optimal to keep the administrative function in that area. He noted that TSA occupying pre-security space was common in other airports and reiterated that the RTAA was looking to relocate the TSA to the new Police and Airport Authority Headquarters. He added that the RTAA would also want to relocate concessionaires' storage or administrative spaces out of the lower-level concourses and noted they, too, would prefer being placed in a pre-security area but had been placed where they were as a result of there being no other space to put them.

Mr. Griffin attested that when building new concourses, the RTAA wanted to ensure they built very expansive spaces for the right tenants and reserved space for airline arrivals that may need additional space to occupy or grow or for airline service providers to utilize. He reiterated that there was currently no additional space to put anybody and noted that it was an immediate need. He stated that in the RTAA boardroom, the wall behind the dais contained the escalators that transported people out of security and indicated that the boardroom could be converted into part of the post-checkpoint experience. He listed several examples of uses that the boardroom could be converted to serve, such as food and beverage, retail, or coffee, but he reiterated that they did not

currently have space for any of those options. He stated that the RTAA was doing a variety of different analyses to identify ways to repurpose the space to serve the customers and tenants that needed to be in the building.

Commissioner Garcia requested Mr. Griffin revisit the slide titled *MoreRNO Progress Projects Coming Soon-ish*, which depicted the image of the Police and Airport Authority Headquarters. She asked if the four stories depicted in the design would include any availability for outside tenants or if that space was strictly for the airport's operations and administration. Mr. Griffin responded that the space would be for the use of the RTAA initially. He stated that the RTAA had fully mapped out the design of the space to account for the relocation of nearly the entirety of the RTAA administrative workforce and airport police force into the building. He noted that the building had been designed, sized, and constructed strictly for relocation purposes. He mentioned that he would not rule out that the RTAA may decide at some point to repurpose some of the space in the Police and Airport Authority Headquarters if a tenant had a need for the space or if somebody wanted to be located adjacent to the police department. He attested that the RTAA was open to ways to create a revenue-generating space, as the building had been created for the RTAA and would not generate revenue back to them. He noted that the RTAA had been very mindful of how that impacted the budget and how they would utilize the space. He reiterated that he would be open to conversations about partnerships in the future.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Griffin for his leadership, the RTAA Board of Trustees, and the RTAA staff. She remarked that the work of the RTAA had been a large undertaking. She stated that she wanted to discuss the slide titled *Our Regional Economic Impact* that Mr. Griffin displayed when he mentioned the value of \$129,500 during the presentation. She noted her amazement regarding the statistic on the slide that stated RTAA operations, including tenants, supported State and local governments by generating an estimated \$82.3 million per year. Commissioner Andriola referred to statistics on the slide titled *RNO's Busiest Year in Almost 2 Decades* and asked if the estimated annual value generated by RTAA operations would change as they approached the estimated 5.5 million total annual passengers expected by approximately 2032.

Mr. Griffin thanked Commissioner Andriola and noted that she asked a great question. He explained that the statistics she referred to were a forecast of what the RTAA estimated for 2032. He stated that he would not be surprised if they outperformed the expected 5.5 million passengers served per year. He recalled that he had been reminded of the region's growth during an Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) luncheon and referred to the airport as a barometer for the economic vitality of the region. He noted that a portion of the generated funds were contributed by the RTAA through tenant activities around the airfield, while the rest was contributed by individuals visiting the area or taking business trips. He attested that as the number of visitors grew, so too would the RTAA's economic impact. He attested that the RTAA attempted to be conservative with estimates regarding financial modeling to prevent overpromising, but he remarked that he would not be surprised if the RTAA outperformed the listed estimates as the economic impact would expectedly increase with other increases.

Mr. Griffin stated that one of the key metrics that had changed was the occurrence of the airport's highest annual passenger count in almost 20 years in 2024. He noted that he had tried to understand what had happened in the region 20 years ago to account for the high volume of passengers in the past. He stated that 70 percent of the people flying through RNO at the time were visitors to the gaming industry, which he noted had changed significantly with casinos on Native American reservations. He attested that the region did not receive as much gaming traffic flying in as there was 20 years ago but that there was still a tremendous amount of gaming traffic driving in. He noted that there had always been traffic to the region due to the lake.

Mr. Griffin attested that the difference between the high passenger volume from 2024 and the volume 20 years ago could be seen by the population base utilizing the airport. He noted that in 2024, 55 percent of passengers were residents from local zip codes, and 45 percent were visitors, though he noted that some days had a closer split of 50 percent of each population. He noted that was the result of the local population growing and residents taking more trips out of the region after COVID-19 (C19) had encouraged many people to take longer trips that he believed they may not have taken otherwise as there was now more ability to blend work and business, which had also kept people in the parking system for longer periods of time.

Mr. Griffin reiterated that the RTAA was conservative in the figures used for their economic impact forecast as he noted that the debt rating agencies were not interested in seeing an airport report that overpromised their ability to repay debts in a decade. He speculated that it would not take long for the RTAA to achieve 5.5 million total passengers per year at RNO and noted the rate of growth they were experiencing and how many years were left before 2032 to make that achievement. He stated that they would see later if they achieved the passenger per year estimates ahead of schedule but affirmed that the RTAA would over-achieve the estimated value of economic impact as airlines grew and airplanes became larger.

Commissioner Andriola expressed that she occasionally felt that the slogan *The Biggest Little City in the World* should be changed to *The Littlest Biggest City in the World* as she was often reminded of it when hearing individuals describe Reno as a big city. She noted that she believed in the importance of the RTAA's vision and stated that the RTAA's ability to accommodate that vision, in addition to the return it would generate, was immense.

Commissioner Andriola stated that she had one more point to share and reflected that when she had previously met with Mr. Griffin, he had mentioned the challenges associated with having an airport uniquely located in the center of a city compared to an airport located in an area similar to RTS in terms of distance. She noted that it would be worth sharing and opined that it might be helpful for Mr. Griffin to address the additional challenges that put an immense burden on what the RTAA was doing. She requested he speak on the previous challenges, and how the challenges compared to other airports in terms of similar size and being in the center of a city.

Mr. Griffin thanked Commissioner Andriola for the question and acknowledged that it was a somewhat unique situation as the city had grown around the airport. He noted that RNO was located in the center of the city. He stated that the situation was incredibly advantageous and recalled that many had told him how much they loved having the airport a short driving distance away. He noted that the location created easy access for those who resided in and around Reno and acknowledged that the same convenience did not apply to others living outside of the designated catchment area. He stated that the RTAA benefitted from the convenience and experience that people have at the airport, which the RTAA did not take for granted. He attested that as the city expanded, it had become more difficult to grow due to the greater impact it could have on the neighborhoods surrounding the airport.

Mr. Griffin affirmed that the RTAA was extremely mindful of how the growth progressed and was engaged in conversations about potential impacts on others, such as aircraft noise. He acknowledged that the Board may receive dissatisfied correspondence about flights or other elements that citizens saw in the air above them. He noted that RNO was unusual in comparison to other airports of comparable size, and referred to the airport located in Spokane, which he noted was located further from the city it served. He also mentioned the airport in Tucson, which he stated was considerably less surrounded by the rest of the city when compared to Reno. He stated that the location of RNO was a function of history and discussed where the airport was situated initially in comparison to how the town had grown around it.

Mr. Griffin acknowledged that there were challenges that arose for the RTAA to grow with the needs of the region without unduly impacting those who live around the airport. He attested that the RTAA was under a federal mandate to be a great neighbor. He attested that even without the FAA mandate, the RTAA would be a great neighbor as they also lived and worked locally. He stated that the RTAA conducted many conversations with tenants to consult with them about how to fly neighborly and discussed with those located near the airport how the RTAA could be a better neighbor, whether that be regarding operations for surface transportation, something in the air, or how they develop their land both at RNO and RTS. He reiterated that there was a very symbiotic relationship. He elaborated by stating that he imagined that the airports were going to be in the same location for a long period of time and that the RTAA was simultaneously under considerable pressure to be a great neighbor that was thoughtful before taking actions that might impact those around them.

Mr. Griffin noted that he had previously received suggestions to relocate commercial air service to RTS, but he expressed his belief that many would be opposed to the idea. He attested that he agreed with the expectation that the RTAA should be a good neighbor and noted that all airports should act as good neighbors regardless. He stated that it was a constant concern for the RTAA with freeways, casinos, residential neighborhoods, and industrial developments in close proximity to their land. He stated that there was a great mix of neighbors and that the RTAA tried not to lose sight of that. He asked the Board to inform him if he had fully addressed what they were discussing.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Griffin and congratulated the RTAA on receiving an A rating. She noted that the presentation was great.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. Griffin for an excellent and informative report and thanked him for the update and for his work.

Chair Hill stated that the Board appreciated Mr. Griffin taking the time to present and noted that they were very proud of their appointees and the work they had done on the RTAA Board of Trustees. She stated that they were also proud of the entire RTAA Board of Trustees as well. She thanked Mr. Griffin for coming to the community and enhancing the economic engine. She attested that the Board looked forward to continuing to support the RTAA however they could at the County level. She asked Mr. Griffin to inform the Board if they could help and stated that they would be in touch.

County Manager Brown noted that he would like to publicly thank Mr. Griffin for being very forthcoming in providing the County with insight into the P3 model as the County began to consider utilizing the P3 model. He noted the insight the RTAA provided regarding the development partnership for the \$300 million Ground Transportation Center project. He thanked Mr. Griffin again and noted that he would continue to look to the expertise of the RTAA. Mr. Griffin stated that he was happy to share the knowledge and noted that the Ground Transportation Center P3 model was a first for the RTAA and that they had learned as the project progressed, but that he was grateful they had. He reiterated that the RTAA would be happy to share anything that would be helpful to the County. Mr. Griffin thanked the Board once again.

25-0103 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Presentation by Andrew McDonald, Washoe County Registrar of Voters, to provide an update on various initiatives and developments within the Registrar of Voters' Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Registrar of Voter (ROV) Andrew McDonald conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview; Final Election Update; Mail Ballots Signature Curing & Reporting (NRS 293.269927; Undeliverable Ballots; Primary & General (NRS 293.269913; Voter Roll List Maintenance "Inactivation" (NRS 293.530); Inactivation Timeline; Voter Roll List Maintenance "Cancellations" (NRS 293.530); (EIVR) Election Integrity Violation Reports (NAC 293.025); Current EIVR Status; The Elections Group – Recommendations Future Board Action/Information; Thank you. He noted the voter turnout and voting timeline on the *Final Election Update* slide and mentioned that email and phone numbers were not optional fields on the registration application. He indicated that many voters did not provide email or phone numbers, making it difficult for the ROV's Office to contact them. He explained that political parties felt that the challenged voter report could be enhanced, which the ROV's Office was working on.

Mr. McDonald noted that mail-in ballots had to be returned to the ROV's office by the United States Postal Service (USPS) if the voter was no longer listed at the mailing address on file. Voters who updated their records were sent a new mail-in ballot,

while others went to the polls to update their addresses while voting in person. Because of the action taken, those voters were active, and address confirmations would not be sent. He indicated that once the 12,000 voters who had not updated their records were sent address confirmation cards, the 33-day inactivation process would begin. He explained the maintenance process and schedule on the *Voter Roll List Maintenance "Inactivation" (NRS 293.530)* slide and said the Secretary of State (SOS) requested the ROV send future address confirmation cards to voters who did not vote in the presidential preference primary (PPP), the primary election, or the general election.

Mr. McDonald commented that the primary inactivation timeline had closed since the February inactivated voter update. If a voter had not updated their record or voted within two federal general elections, the voter would need to re-register. He said that on March 28, 2025, the ROV would work on bulk cancellations for voters who had not updated their records or voted within the last two elections. He explained that an analysis was being conducted for voter cancellations, and he would provide an update at a future Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting or as requested. He explained bulk cancellations would be conducted for voters who did not update their records or vote during the 2024 and 2026 federal general elections on March 26, 2027. He referred to the *(EIVR) Election Integrity Violation Reports (NAC 293.025)* and *Current EIVR Status* slides and said the EIVRs submitted during the 2024 election cycle included the PPP, the primary election, and the general election. He mentioned that the SOS was the custodian of the EIVRs and would ask for the ROV's input if and as needed. No current EIVRs were overseen by the ROV, and many were closed by the SOS without action from the ROV.

Mr. McDonald indicated that The Elections Group was hired in 2023 to run an audit for recommendations to the ROV based on the 2022 election cycle. He said the ROV had provided an update of the recommendations to the Office of the County Manager (OCM). He mentioned that new ballot printers would allow the ROV to print a full-length ballot for the voter to review and cast. He noted that the interlocal agreement was outstanding and that the ROV would pay for their portion of the Voter Registration Election Management System (VREMS) starting July 1, 2025. He explained that the cost was derived from the number of registered voters per county. All contracts for vote centers expired after the 2024 general election, and he thought there was a new opportunity to properly cite vote center locations within the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the American Disability Act (ADA) settlement to meet community needs. He reported that the ROV had been in contact with Human Resources (HR) to enhance the ADA policies and procedures and asked Technical Services (TS) to provide heat maps for proper citing based on specific criteria.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. McDonald for the detailed presentation, which allowed for answers to questions the public often misunderstood. She noted that the ROV's Office was extensively reconfigured to include new desks, signage, and glass. She noticed a ballot printer was needed and wanted to know if there were any other technological needs.

Mr. McDonald believed it was important to provide voters with the ability to print full-length ballots at the voting center. He indicated that the voter would be able to print the ballot, review it, and cast it at the voting center. He mentioned the printer was costly but would make a big difference in integrity and confidence. In the future, he would love to have a new building to house additional equipment and process ballots faster.

County Manager Eric Brown noted that the OCM hosted the Speaker of the Assembly a month prior. He mentioned that the SOS needed to finish the modules and that the County implemented one of three phases during the 2024 election. He said there were budget pressures from the State's perspective and other competing priorities; however, he thought an incomplete job would be shameful.

Commissioner Andriola appreciated Mr. McDonald's presentation and was thankful for the leadership and direction provided. She understood the difficulties and uncertainties involved with the election process and the legislation. She asked what Mr. McDonald thought about the timing of the budget if bills were to be passed in the Legislature as expected.

Mr. McDonald wanted to buy new equipment before the end of the fiscal year (FY). He believed that the equipment was important for mock elections. He mentioned that the SOS was planning several mock elections before the 2026 election cycle and felt that the more staff got used to the equipment, the better voter outreach and education would be. He explained that there was much involved with the new ballot-casting process and wanted the community to be aware of it. He indicated that other counties were moving in the same direction and reported that Clark County already bought new ballot counters. He believed Washoe County should do the same.

Commissioner Andriola asked if Mr. McDonald felt that he had addressed the various nuanced issues that came up, such as power outages, and if additional equipment, such as a generator, was necessary.

Mr. McDonald indicated that the ROV always planned for power outages. He mentioned that the power outage during the recent election was difficult due to the holiday. That meant staff and electricians were called in from home, which took time. He noted that the restoration time was about two hours which he felt was not bad considering the holiday. He explained that the process was contentious for the electricians because it was a life and safety hazard to flip the breaker. He communicated that the only way to make the process easier was to have the generator connected to the building; however, he understood the current generator did not have that capability. He speculated future action would be to source a different generator and if the ROV moved forward with new ballot printers, more energy would be needed. When looking into new voting centers, he wanted to ensure the facility could handle the power load for the printers. He opined that the contracts might need to be investigated to find out if small generators were necessary to power the printers at the voting centers.

Commissioner Andriola thought it was always best to be prepared. She was sure preparedness would be incorporated into mock voting and disaster scenarios, and she appreciated the ROV's hard work.

Mr. McDonald thanked the BCC for the support.

Commissioner Clark referred to the *(EIVR) Election Integrity Violation Reports (NAC 293.025)* slide and asked for a detailed list of the 68 categories and 96 complete recommendations. He wanted to know what in-progress meant and whether the EIVRs were near completion or only starting to progress. Mr. McDonald reported the information should be available on the OCM website; however, he would send Commissioner Clark the link and information. Chair Hill said she could not locate the information on the OCM or ROV websites. Mr. McDonald indicated that he would address the link issue.

Chair Hill noted that partners in the State brought voting booths to schools, and she wondered if the County had provided the same service. Mr. McDonald explained that voting booths were possible at schools; however, he was unaware if the County had done that historically.

Chair Hill referred to her time at the American Legion Auxiliary Nevada Girls State Program while utilizing punch ballots, which she thought was a good experience for understanding the voting process. She opined if time and staff allowed, incorporating programming with students would be beneficial. She felt there was an opportunity to support the youth's understanding of the ROV through mock elections and education. Mr. McDonald loved the idea of working with the students. Chair Hill felt that students outside of specialty government-related programs deserved to learn and understand election processes. Mr. McDonald felt that incorporating children would be accomplished by working with the Washoe County School District (WSCD) Chief Operating Officer (COO) Adam Searcy.

Chair Hill asked for updates regarding programming. She believed that if the new ballot system was approved, the election workers and volunteers needed to be trained adequately. She feared voters would walk away without physically casting their ballots.

Mr. McDonald confirmed that the training would occur. Chair Hill thanked Mr. McDonald for wanting the ROV position and keeping the team happy and motivated. Mr. McDonald thanked the BCC and the OCM for their support. He was proud to be a member of the executive team.

DONATIONS

25-0104 **7A1** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an estimated market value of [\$16,180.78]; and (2) accept donations from various donors to Washoe County Human Services Agency Child

Protective Services Fund to support welfare activities in the amount of [\$12,022.22] retroactive for the period October 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0105** **7A2** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an estimated market value of [\$6,256.06]; and (2) accept donations from various donors to Washoe County Human Services Agency Homelessness Fund to support welfare activities in the amount of [\$9,539.40] retroactive for the period of October 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0106** **7A3** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an estimated market value of [\$500.50]; and (2) accept donations from various donors to the Human Services Agency Senior Services Fund used to support seniors in our community in the amount of [\$10,577.10] retroactive for the period October 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0107** **7B1** Recommendation to accept a one-time cash donation of [\$185,000.00] from a private citizen to Washoe County Emergency Management. These funds will be used for the purpose of conducting an evacuation study for Washoe County. Emergency Management will bring the contract to conduct the evacuation study to the Board of County Commissioners at a future date. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia discussed three donations for the Human Services Agency (HSA) that supported children, the unhoused, and seniors in Washoe County. She specifically highlighted Item 7B1 since it was the first donation given to Washoe County Emergency Management. She said it was a large cash donation of \$185,000 from a private citizen to allow Washoe County to conduct an evacuation study.

Ms. Kelly Echeverria, Emergency Management Administrator, said the County had discussed the importance of conducting an evacuation study, especially in the process of updating plans and ensuring that it did all it could to support the expansion of the community. She thanked everyone who listened, helped, and championed the opportunity. She thanked the families of Mr. Greg Nelson and Mr. Warren Nelson for the donation. She expressed her sincerest gratitude to them for helping to increase the safety of the community. Commissioner Garcia recalled Ms. Echeverria confirmed the families allowed the plan to be extended to include the Cities of Reno and Sparks for a more comprehensive outcome. She noted she was thrilled to hear that.

Chair Hill expressed her recognition and appreciation for Ms. Echeverria and her presentation during the regional fire meeting. She believed if Ms. Echeverria had

not given that presentation, the families would not have been inspired to make the donation. She noted someone in the audience was inspired by the work that Ms. Echeverria was doing and wanted to support the evacuation study to be done as quickly as possible without the County having to find money in the budget. She shared her appreciation for Ms. Echeverria's passion and hard work and said it showed the inspiration that was created from that meeting.

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7A1 through 7B1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8F2

- 25-0108** **8A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of January 14, 2025, and January 21, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0109** **8A2** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Communications, Monthly Statements/Reports, and Annual Statements/Reports. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0110** **8B1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2021/2022, 2022/2023, 2023/2024 and 2024/2025 secured and unsecured tax rolls 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibits A and B and 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$162,305.90]. Assessor. (Commission Districts 1, 2, 3, 5.)
- 25-0111** **8C1** Recommendation to accept the second amendment to the subaward of the Child Welfare Collaborative Agreement with Casey Family Programs in the amount of [\$40,000.00; no county match] retroactive from January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2026, to facilitate family reunification and permanency for children and reduce foster care reentries; and authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to retroactively execute agreement documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0112** **8C2** Recommendation to accept subaward amendments #1 and #2 of the FY24 Capacity Building supplemental subaward through the State of Nevada, Department of Health and Human Services, Aging and Disability Services Division in the amount of [\$146,314.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2023 to June 30, 2025 to support the purchase

of nutrition equipment for the Congregate and Home-Delivered Meals programs; retroactively authorize the Agency Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the supplemental grant award; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0113** **8D1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$4,237.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Nevada Childhood Lead Poisoning Grant Amendment, retroactive to September 30, 2024, through September 29, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support the Nevada Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0114** **8D2** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$15,000.00; no county match] in both revenue and expenses to the FY25 United Healthcare Fetal Infant Mortality Program, retroactive to September 26, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health (CCHS) Division to support the United Healthcare FIMR Program Agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0115** **8D3** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$6,432.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Preventative Health and Health Services (PHHS) Grant Amendment, retroactive to October 1, 2023, through September 30, 2024, for the Community and Clinical Health (CCHS) Division to support Preventative Health and Health Services Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0116** **8D4** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$64,885.56; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Notice of Subaward, retroactive to October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Services (CCHS) Division to support Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program agreement and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0117** **8D5** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$15,000.00; including up to \$5,000 for participant incentives – including gift cards] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 United Healthcare Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Program, retroactive to September 26, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Services

(CCHS) Division to support the United Healthcare Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0118** **8D6** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$5,916.00; no county match] in both revenue and expenses to the FY25 Tobacco Prevention & Control Program Notice of Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Nevada Clinical Services (NCS) Tobacco Prevention & Control Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0119** **8D7** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$242,016.06; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Community and Clinical Services (CCHS) Program Notice of Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Sexual Transmitted Disease (STD) program agreement and direct Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0120** **8D8** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$50,000.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 United Healthcare Immunization Program, retroactive to October 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support the United Healthcare Immunization Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0121** **8D9** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$29,874.50; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Family Planning State Vaccine Program Notice of Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Family Planning State Vaccine Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0122** **8D10** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$42,441.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Immunization School Located Vaccination Clinic (SLVC) Program Notice of Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Immunization School Located Vaccination Clinic (SLVC)

Program agreement and Direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0123** **8D11** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$69,602.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Immunization Supplemental Special Projects Program Notice of Subaward, retroactive to October 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Immunization Supplemental Special Projects Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0124** **8D12** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$71,571.00; \$7,191.80 in county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 PHP BP5 NCE Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, for the Epidemiology and Public Health Preparedness (EPHP) Division to support demonstration of achievement in the program domains and capabilities according to the Hospital Preparedness Program (HPP) cooperative agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0125** **8E1** Recommendation to accept a 2024 National Shelter Initiative Grant award from the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals® to Washoe County Regional Animal Services (“WCRAS”) in the amount of [\$115,000.00; no County match] retroactive to December 17, 2024, to support construction of the dog enrichment play yard [Capital Improvement Project: PW920441] and community humane education; retroactively authorize the Director of Regional Animal Services to execute the Grant Agreement; approve cross-fund budget appropriation transfer in the total amount of [\$95,000] from the Animal Services Fund (205) to the Capital Improvement Fund (402) and, if approved, direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments, and net zero cross-fund budget appropriation transfers (net-zero impact, no additional funding is requested). Regional Animal Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0126** **8E2** Recommendation to: (1) reappoint Julie McMahon to serve a second term as the member of the Washoe County Regional Animal Services Advisory Board specified in WCC 55.036(1)(a): a veterinarian or veterinary technician licensed to practice in Nevada, and who is not employed by Washoe County, with a term to expire on June 30, 2029; and (2) reappoint Trudy Brussard to serve a second term as the member of the Washoe County Regional Animal Services Advisory Board specified in WCC 55.036(1)(b): a real estate professional or business professional with knowledge of or experience related to homeowners' associations, business organizations

and/or financial operations, with a term to expire on June 30, 2029. Regional Animal Services. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0127 **8F1** Recommendation to accept a Justice Assistance Grant award [amount not to exceed \$57,400.00, no County match required] as administered through the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety Office, Office of Criminal Justice Assistance, to cover the cost of equipment for the Special Weapons and Tactics Team, Special Operations Division, for the retroactive grant period of January 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0128 **8F2** Recommendation to accept a Justice Assistance Grant award [amount not to exceed \$32,814.00, no County match required] as administered through the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety Office, Office of Criminal Justice Assistance, to cover the cost of a Digital Forensic Detective Workstation for the Detective Bureau, working under the Special Operations Division, for the retroactive grant period of January 1, 2025 through June 30, 2025; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff (All Commission Districts)

There was no response to the call for public comment on the Consent Agenda Items listed above.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8F2 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8F2 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, and 20

25-0129 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to: (1) Accept a Project Funding Agreement between the State of Nevada acting by and through its Division of State Lands and the Fund to Protect Lake Tahoe funding agreement [in the amount of \$742,458.09 with a Washoe County cash/in-kind match in the amount of \$185,614.52 for this phase of the project] for the purpose of planning, permitting, and design (Phase I), of the Upper Third and Rosewood Creeks Water Quality Improvement Project, with funds identified for planning, design, and permitting to be fully expended by December 31st, 2026, and with provisions to receive additional funding for future phases of the project, subject to final approval by the Board of County Commissioners; (2) approve an Agreement for Professional Services between Washoe County and CDM Smith to provide design services for

shoulder stabilization, new storm drain, drainage pattern impacts, and infiltration storm drain for portions of the Upper Third and Rosewood Creeks Water Quality Improvement Project in the amount of [\$742,458.09], and to support the Lake Tahoe Maximum Daily Load requirements to reduce the pollutant load in stormwater runoff; (3) authorize the County Manager to execute all funding agreement documents; and, (4) direct the Finance Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be accepted, approved, authorized, and directed.

25-0130 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to: 1) approve Fiscal Year 2026 Street and Highway Projects Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Washoe County, the City of Reno, and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC); and 2) approve the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 Street and Highway Projects Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Washoe County, the City of Sparks, and the RTC; for the RTC FY 2026 Program of Projects that were identified and approved in the RTC FY 2026 Regional Transportation Plan Update. The agreements identify regional roadway projects and priorities with construction project estimates of \$104.5 million determined by RTC and funding sources. Washoe County is the pass-through agency with associated fiscal costs under the Interlocal Cooperative Agreements. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be approved.

25-0131 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Mills B. Lane Justice Center Chiller Replacement Project, PWP-WA-2024-109 [staff recommends American Chiller Service Inc, for the base bid in the amount of \$489,500; (2) approve construction bid alternates 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 in the amount of \$65,629; and (3) approve a project construction contingency fund in the amount of \$55,467.90] for a total award amount of \$554,679 with a \$55,467.90 contingency for a total project construction cost not to exceed \$610,146.90. The Project is located at 1 South Sierra Street, Reno, Nevada, and the scope of work includes the procurement, delivery, installation and controls of a water-cooled magnetic levitating centrifugal chiller and connection to existing chilled and condenser water piping. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 11 be awarded and approved.

25-0132 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to accept a FY25 Adoption Savings subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services in the amount of [\$445,718.00; no county match] retroactive for the period of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 to provide supportive services to facilitate and maintain the successful adoption of children from the Washoe County Child Welfare System; authorize the Agency Director of Human Services Agency to execute the award and related documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

25-0133 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to accept Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) from the Nevada Governor's Office of Economic Development: Sidehill Pedestrian Safety Project, in the amount of [\$495,250, no match required] retroactive from July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2026 to remove and replace the existing asphalt curb with a concrete curb and gutter and a 5-foot-wide sidewalk; removal and replacement of two existing drainage inlets with Type 4-R catch basins to ensure the current drainage of the site is not negatively impacted by the installation of the new sidewalk; and raising of existing sanitary sewer manholes with installation of concrete collars through coordination with the utility provider; and if approved, authorize County Manager to retroactively execute grant documents in the amount of \$495,250, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Manager. (Commission District 4.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be accepted, approved, authorized, and directed.

25-0134 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to approve the budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$662,488.00; no county match] in both revenue and expenditures to the EPA Multipollutant Monitoring Grant retroactive to January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2028, and direct Finance to make

the appropriate budget amendments. The purpose of this grant agreement is to provide funding for the Air Quality Management Division to support the maintenance, operation, and upgrade of existing ambient monitoring stations, primarily through new equipment purchases. This project will increase the reliability and sustainability of ambient air monitoring networks and full automation of air quality monitors allowing real-time comparisons in and around disadvantaged communities to air quality in nearby areas. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be approved and directed.

25-0135 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$305,617.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 PHIIG Subaward, retroactive to December 1, 2024, through June 30, 2027, for Northern Nevada Public Health to maintain Health District workforce capacity to reduce health disparities and improve health equity in Washoe County, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be approved and directed.

25-0136 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$420,347.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 ELC Enhancing Detection Expansion FY25 Subaward, retroactive to August 1, 2024, through July 31, 2026, for the Epidemiology and Public Health Preparedness (EPHP) Division; the funds will be used to maintain data for reported COVID-19 cases and other respiratory cases as directed by federal and state partners and to conduct investigations for other public health conditions of importance, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 19 be approved and directed.

25-0137 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Recommendation to approve the reimbursement of costs incurred by the City of Sparks, the City of Reno, and Washoe County for expenses related to and in support of the Enhanced 911 Emergency Response System as recommended by the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee on January 16, 2025, in an amount not to exceed [\$333,263.16] as specified within the adopted Enhanced 911 Fund's operating budget. Technology Services.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 20 be approved.

25-0138 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Direction to staff regarding the potential disposition of 10 Kirman Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Number 012-150-012), a property previously identified as surplus to Washoe County needs at the Board of County Commission meeting on August 22, 2023. Based on Board of County Commissioner direction in May of 2024, staff is recommending sale by direct negotiation with Renown Health for economic development purposes in the amount of \$750,000.00 after adoption of a separate resolution finding that it is in the best interest of the public to sell the property without offering the property to the public and potentially for less than fair market value as prescribed in Nevada State Law. Renown Health plans to use the property to expand its healthcare services which will create highly skilled jobs and enhance the quality of healthcare available to the community. Manager. (Commission District 3.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro explained that Agenda Item 14 was specific to the sale of property located on the southeast corner of 2nd Street and Kirman Avenue, which he described as approximately 70 percent vacant. He said the additional 30 percent was occupied by the Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) tuberculosis (TB) clinic. He informed that NNPH was constructing a new facility on the southeast corner of 9th Street and Sutro Street. He recalled that at a Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting on May 28, 2024, the Board directed staff to negotiate directly with Renown Health (Renown) to determine if an agreeable sale price could be reached. He advised that the negotiation conformed to a Nevada State Law provision that allowed a direct sale for economic development purposes. He disclosed that the negotiation was timed to align with Renown's completion of its strategic planning in October 2024 and the County's completion of two separate appraisals as outlined in Nevada State law. He referred to the Staff Report for Agenda Item 14 and explained that two appraisals were completed. He revealed that the appraisal numbers varied widely, from \$860,000 to \$2,600,000. He said staff also reviewed a letter Renown provided to County Manager Eric Brown that outlined alignment between Renown and the County's Strategic Plan and described benefits Renown brought to the community. He noted the letter was attached to the Staff Report for the item. He stated that in consideration of the size of the parcel at just 0.5 acres and the critically poor condition of the building, the County staff was comfortable

with the negotiated price of \$750,000. He recommended the direct sale to Renown. In anticipation of the County receiving one-time funds from the sale of a community asset, he requested direction from the BCC regarding the use of those funds. He advised that staff recommended the use of the funds for the improvement of other community assets directly in alignment with the County's strategic plan. He recalled a suggestion from Commissioner Clark in 2023 for improvements to the recently purchased West Hills property. He added that Renown staff was present and available to answer questions.

Vice Chair Herman observed that discussion about the sale had been underway for quite some time.

Commissioner Clark commented that he had been a vocal proponent of selling the property for a long time. He discerned that the value was in the land, and the building had virtually no value. He opined that Renown was getting preferential treatment because the sales price was lower than what was determined in either of the appraisals. He questioned whether County taxpayers were being served by the property being sold at what he considered a severe discount, especially considering the economic forecast. He wondered if there was an issue in selling the property to one entity versus putting it on the open market. He encouraged the County to sell the property soon but was unhappy with the price.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be directed.

25-0139 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to execute a resolution of intent of the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners to sell real property located at 10 Kirman Avenue, Reno, Nevada, Assessor's Parcel Number 012-150-12 as surplus to the needs of Washoe County for economic development purposes at a price less than appraised value to Renown Health, who plans to use the property to expand its healthcare services which will create highly skilled jobs and enhance the quality of healthcare available to the community, and matters property related thereto setting the date of March 11, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. to allow for any objections to this action. Manager. (Commission District 3.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro advised that Nevada State Law required a public hearing be held to allow for any objections from the public based on the actions taken in regard to the sale of property directed by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in Agenda Item 14. He noted the public hearing was scheduled to be on the agenda for the BCC meeting on March 11, 2025. He expected direction regarding the use of funds would be included in the staff report for the public hearing on March 11, 2025. He discerned that the BCC wanted funds from the sale of 10 Kirman Avenue to go towards the West Hills project.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be authorized.

25-0140 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Discussion and possible adoption of the proposed Board of Commissioners Rules of Procedure to be effective upon approval. The purpose of the Rules is to provide parliamentary authority and to establish supplemental rules of procedures for the conduct of County Commission meetings and individual Commission members where such rules are consistent with the laws of the State of Nevada. The proposed Rules of Procedure have been reviewed and reorganized to reflect the current practices of the Board. The proposed Rules include, but are not limited to, changes clarifying use of Rules and applicability of Robert's Rules of Order (Arts. 1-4), preparation of agenda (Art. 5), role of Manager and Chair in agenda preparation (Art. 5.4), placement of items on agendas (Art. 5.4.2), order of business (Art. 5.4.3), consent agenda parameters (Art. 5.5), requests by commissioners for agenda items (Art. 5.7), requests of staff time by Commissioner (Art 5.8), virtual attendance of meetings (Art. 6.1.2), reconsideration of meeting votes (Art. 6.7), communications by commissioners and adherence to the Code of Conduct (Art. 7), and adherence by citizen appointees to Code of Conduct (Art. 8.2.3). Commissioners may propose other amendments. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill thanked County Manager Brown and Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras for working on the proposed Board of Commissioners (BCC) Rules of Procedure for what she noted had been quite a long time. She suggested that the proposed BCC Rules of Procedure had been long-awaited. She thanked DDA Mary Kandaras again and looked to the Board for questions or comments.

Commissioner Garcia stated that Article 7 had been her priority in the last year, and she noted that it had included content regarding Commissioner conduct and communications. She thanked DDA Mary Kandaras and expressed her belief in the importance of holding Board members to the same degree of accountability, expectation of respect, and civility as Washoe County staff and Board appointees. She asserted that the language added to the Washoe County Code of Conduct was very important. She noted that she was comfortable with all other proposed changes.

Commissioner Andriola stated that she had several recommendations for the proposed Rules of Procedure, the first of which was regarding Article 5.7.1, which she said was included under the heading *Requests for Agenda Items by Commissioners*. She attested that she had reviewed the section thoroughly and stressed that she had reviewed every word. She recommended that the language of the subsection be adjusted to include mention of both the County Manager and the Presiding Officer. She noted that the

recommended addition of the Presiding Officer to the language would ensure consistency with other provisions throughout the document.

Commissioner Andriola referred to subsection 5.8.2 of the Rules of Procedure, which she noted was listed under the heading *Requests of Staff Time by Commissioners*. She acknowledged the importance of designating the four hours stipulated in subsection 5.8.1 and designating the less than four hours mentioned in subsection 5.8.2. She asked the Board for their consideration in removing the exemption for the Commissioner Support Team from this requirement on the basis of consistency and practice, where the County Manager was responsible for directing, organizing, and delegating for efficiency. She reiterated her recommendation to remove that section in consideration of that process.

Commissioner Andriola referred to Articles 6.7.1 and 6.7.2 listed under the heading *Reconsideration* in the proposed Rules of Procedure. She recommended that the language be adjusted to combine Articles 6.7.1 and 6.7.2, as those subsections could not stand alone regarding the legality of compliance with one or the other. She recited from the Rules of Procedure and read aloud her recommended alterations, which included the suggested conjunction to combine the language of the two subsections. She reiterated that the modifications in language to combine the two subsections was a condition that she would like to recommend for consideration.

Commissioner Andriola referred to Article 7.6 of the proposed Rules of Procedure and recited from the section. She noted that as the Board was a part of Washoe County, she recommended that the passage instead be written as *Commissioners may go through Washoe County elected officials in their jurisdiction*. She reiterated that she was asking the Board to consider editing the language.

Commissioner Andriola referred to Article 7.8.3 of the proposed Rules of Procedure and suggested that the language of the subsection be edited to replace the use of the word *should* with the word *shall* for the sake of consistency with the language used in Article 7.9 and throughout the proposed Rules of Procedure. She reiterated that the adjusted language captured the spirit of how the subsection was written. She echoed Chair Hill's remarks about DDA Mary Kandaras, who she acknowledged had done an immense amount of work on the proposed Rules of Procedure and said that the document spoke to consistency.

Commissioner Andriola recited the content of Article 7.9, which she noted was included under the heading *Commissioner Correspondence*. She recommended that the language be adjusted to include mention of both the Presiding Officer and the County Manager to remain consistent with the language used in other articles of the proposed Rules of Procedure.

Commissioner Andriola noted that her final recommendation for consideration by the Board concerned Article 11, which referred to the procedure related to amendments for the proposed Rules of Procedure. She recited the section aloud and

included her recommendation to add language to bring the article into alignment with the Commission agenda preparation section. She noted that the recommended addition was proposed to ensure clarity and compliance.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Andriola for her recommendations. She asked DDA Mary Kandaras whether she had any legal concerns regarding the suggested changes Commissioner Andriola brought forward for consideration. DDA Mary Kandaras stated that she believed the recommendations were minor and indicated no issues with the suggestions. She attested that she would likely put Article 11 in accordance with Article 5. Chair Hill noted that she had not noticed any problems with the recommendations. DDA Mary Kandaras attested that she similarly had no other concerns regarding the recommendations and acknowledged Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards for his assistance in drafting the proposed Board of Commissioners Rules of Procedure. Chair Hill thanked DDA Mary Kandaras for crediting her coworker for his assistance.

Commissioner Clark requested that his previous comments regarding the truthfulness and accuracy of statements made by Commissioners speaking for the County, especially the Chair, be considered. He noted that during a prior BCC meeting, the truth was misrepresented by a claim that there had been a 40 percent reduction in homelessness. He indicated that when members of the Board made inaccurate statements that were later discovered to be untrue, it tarnished the reputation of the County, regardless of which Commissioner was responsible. He noted that if any changes were to be made to the proposed Rules of Procedure, the addition of language regarding complete accuracy should be considered. He stated that whoever prepared the inaccurate information should apologize for giving erroneous information out to the public.

Chair Hill suggested Commissioner Clark work with DDA Mary Kandaras to determine where that stipulation should go. She agreed that his suggestion of accuracy, transparency, and truthfulness should apply to all Commissioners.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Hill noted that she was comfortable with the changes suggested by Commissioner Andriola and opined that the recommendations should be included if a motion was made. She asked DDA Mary Kandaras if the request from Commissioner Clark would come back to the Board for consideration. DDA Mary Kandaras remarked that the Washoe County Code of Conduct, made applicable to the Commissioners via the proposed Board of Commissioners Rules of Procedure, already contained a section on honesty. She elaborated that subsequently, a member of the Board making a misrepresentation would be considered against the Washoe County Code of Conduct. She clarified that the Washoe County Code of Conduct was internal and not intended to create punitive action, but if violations were made, a complaint could be lodged. She stated that the Washoe County Code of Conduct applied to all staff, but the proposed Board of Commissioners Rules of Procedure did not. She requested to review the language within the Rules of Procedure to better address the spirit of Commissioner Clark's concerns.

She suggested that the Board approve the proposed Board of County Commissioners Rules of Procedure with the recommended changes. She stated that upon receiving the Board's approval, she would make the requested changes, and the document would become effective. She noted that if any additional changes were requested, another Agenda Item would be brought forward for deliberation. Chair Hill asked if the updated Rules of Procedure would be uploaded to their website after the motion and the changes were completed. DDA Mary Kandaras confirmed that to be accurate.

Commissioner Garcia requested that Commissioner Andriola provide an overview of her recommendation for Article 5.8.2, listed under the subheading *Requests of Staff Time by Commissioners*. Commissioner Garcia acknowledged hearing Commissioner Andriola's recommendation to remove the Commission Support Team as exempt from the stipulated requirement. She inquired if Commissioner Andriola had any additional changes to recommend for Article 5.8.2. Commissioner Andriola stated that she had no further recommendations for that article. Commissioner Garcia asked if the suggested recommendation was for omitting the last sentence in Article 5.8.2, which Commissioner Andriola confirmed. Commissioner Garcia thanked Commissioner Andriola for her clarification.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be adopted with the recommended amendments, including the changes recommended by the Board and the Washoe County Code of Conduct.

25-0141 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Discussion and direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by legislators, by Washoe County, or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues as may be deemed by the Chair or the Board to be of critical significance to Washoe County. Pending legislative bills can be located here: <<<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025/Bills/List>>>. Current bills the County is tracking that may be reported on or discussed are listed under Government Affairs at <<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>>. Due to time constraints inherent in the legislative process, a list of specific bills that staff will seek direction from the Commission on during this item will be posted on the web site under Government Affairs at <<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>> by 6:00 p.m. the Friday before the meeting. Due to the rapid pace of the legislative session, additional bills upon which comment may be sought from the Board of County Commissioners will be posted as soon as known. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager Eric Brown stated that Ms. Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, would not be present at the meeting because the legislative

session was going strong. He advised the Board that Ms. Matijevich could respond to any questions regarding her most recent report when she was available.

Commissioner Clark reiterated a previously stated comment that he was personally against Assembly Bill (AB) 51 and anything that limited the distribution of public records. He stated that public records should be available to the public and made easier to obtain instead of being more restrictive. He stated that taxpayers paid staff to record the information and keep the records public. He felt taxpayers, the media, and all citizens should have the right to ask for almost anything, excluding certain Human Resource (HR) issues or things that contained sensitive information. He pointed out that it was unclear to him who determined sensitivity. He felt that social security numbers and addresses for judges or law enforcement were a few examples of sensitive information.

There was no public comment or action on this item.

12:51 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

1:30 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

25-0142 **AGENDA ITEM 22** Public Hearing: Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0007 (Galena Creek School). Consideration of the Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt an amendment to the Forest Regulatory Zone Map to change the regulatory zoning on a 1-acre parcel (APN: 045-472-28) from Low Density Suburban (LDS- 1 du/acre) to Parks/Recreation (PR); and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. The site is located at 16000 Callahan Rd. and owned by Washoe County. The Board of County Commissioners may adopt the proposed amendment, may adopt the proposed amendment with modifications, or may deny the proposed amendment after the public hearing. If the Board denies a proposed amendment, the reason(s) for the denial (i.e., which findings cannot be made) shall either be stated in the motion or discussed on the record by the individual Board members. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Hill asked if the Board desired a staff presentation, and it was determined that no presentation was needed.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 22 be approved and authorized.

25-0143

AGENDA ITEM 23 Public hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's approval of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0003 which seeks to amend the North Valleys Regulatory Zone Map to change the regulatory zone on two parcels from 169.91 acres of Low Density Suburban (LDS- 1 du/acre) to 163.92 acres of Medium Density Suburban (MDS- 3 du/acre) and 5.99 acres of Open Space (OS). The applicant and property owner is Silver Sky Ranch, LLC. The addresses for the parcels are 10235 White Owl Dr. and 12000 Red Rock Rd., Reno. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 086-250-81 and 086-250-01. The appellant is Russ Earle who lists his address as 11400 Osage Road. The applicant also filed an appeal to preserve their rights to judicial review. The Board of County Commissioners shall consider the appeals based on the record and any testimony and materials submitted at the public hearing. The Board of County Commissioners may affirm or reverse the Planning Commission's decision. If the Board affirms the Planning Commission's decision, it may adopt the requested regulatory zone amendment. If adopted, the Board shall authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to this effect. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Community Services Department (CSD) Planner Timothy Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WRZA24-0003 (White Owl Dr. and Red Rock Rd.); Appeal; Background; Request; Existing and Proposed Zoning; Availability of Facilities; RZA Findings – Planning Commission; Recommendation.

Mr. Evans said the Planning Commission initially heard the project on December 3, 2024, and having been able to make all six findings required under the Washoe County Code (WCC), the Planning Commission approved the regulatory zone amendment. After the approval, two appeals were filed. The first, filed on December 13, 2024, was from a neighboring property owner, Mr. Russ Earle. Mr. Earle alleged the findings within WCC could not be made. He said the second appeal that was filed came from the applicant for the regulatory zone amendment, Silver Sky Ranch LLC, to preserve their right for judicial review.

Mr. Evans reviewed the *Background* slide and specified the subject properties were located within the North Valley planning area and were currently zoned low-density suburban (lds). He explained the request before the Board was to change the regulatory zone on the two parcels from lds to medium-density suburban (mds). As a result of that change, the allowed density would be increased from 169 dwelling units to 489 dwelling units. He clarified the regulatory zone amendment itself was only to change the zoning not to approve a subdivision. He clarified that the application before the Board was not for the subdivision approval. He said the subdivision approval would be a separate process, which would include public hearings and more. He reviewed the *Existing and Proposed Zoning* slide and explained the proposed mds zoning included a 50-foot open space buffer along the north and east portions of the properties. He stated the reason for that was to give a buffer between the existing parcels that were larger in size to the potential

higher density. The 50-foot open space buffer would ensure no building would be allowed within that area.

Mr. Evans mentioned that the regulatory zoning amendment was sent for review to multiple agencies and departments, which included the Engineering Department. The Engineering Department provided comments that stated traffic and roadways would be addressed at the time of a future development application, which he explained would be similar to a tentative map application for a subdivision. He said power would be provided to the subject parcels by NV Energy. The Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) provided comments stating the subject properties needed to be annexed into TMWA's retail service area and obtain available water rights. The City of Reno responded and said that sewer service could be provided by the Reno Stead Water Reclamation Facility (RSWRF) and informed the facility was being expanded. He included that the subject parcels would be served by the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD). He noted there were two fire stations nearby that were approximately five miles from the subject parcels, so response times were expected to be approximately 8 to 12 minutes. Mr. Evans directed the Board to the Planning Commission's findings located on the *RZA Findings-Planning Commission* slide and discussed the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) possible actions.

Chair Hill said that per the Board's protocol, both the appellant and the applicant had 10 minutes for their presentation. After the presentations, there would be a discussion with the Board, followed by public comments, and then the Board would have further discussion before a decision was made.

Mr. Earle believed he would have 15 minutes to present. Chair Hill apologized but stated that it had always been 10 minutes. He mentioned the Board received a packet of information from him. He reviewed a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: White Owl Drive & Red Rock Road WRZA24-003 Regulatory Zone Amendment Appeal; Correction/Clarifications to Planning Dept Presentation; Corrections/Clarifications to Applicants Presentation and Reports; Non-Adherence to Findings; Non-Adherence to Findings (7).

Mr. Earle noted the *Corrections/Clarifications to Planning Dept Presentation* slides were corrections and clarifications to previous notes provided by the Planning Commission. He displayed a document. Copies were not submitted for the public record. He clarified that the second bullet on the second slide referred to an approximately four-mile area on Red Rock Road. He said he was a professional firefighter for 15 years and felt that increasing density would likely increase the risks to the surrounding Silver Knolls community. He displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He informed the Board that the Lyten gigafactory had received \$650 million in funding to move forward and had just signed contracts with the ports of Stockton and Los Angeles to move sulfur to Reno.

Mr. Earle displayed documents. A copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He noted there was a study done in 2019 when Silver Hills was approved. He

explained the study showed that the Silver Hills project would cause the congestion on Red Rock Road to become worse, and the 2,000 residents of Silver Lake would be increasingly isolated from fire, ambulances, and other emergency services. He stated the study also showed that if all the developments were looked at cumulatively, with 9,100 homes once Evans Ranch and Silver Star and Silver Hills were made, it would total a level of service of an F on Red Rock Road. He noted that the score included the expansion to four lanes.

Mr. Earle read from the third slide in his presentation. He displayed a document, a copy of which was not submitted for the public record. He said the displayed map showed the one acre per home dwelling unit and pointed out that the proposed area where density would be increased was at the top of the map. He felt it did not make sense given the previous requests on the already approved Silver Hills plan. He displayed documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He said the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) draft was released in January 2025 and showed that many of the projects that the Planning Commission approved had been delayed to a later timeline. He noted that included the unfunded United States (US) Highway 395 improvement project between Stead Boulevard and Red Rock, which was delayed to between 2035 and 2050. He discussed the Moya Boulevard's capacity project from Red Rock Road to Echo Avenue, which was moved to the 2025 to 2034 timeframe. He noted North Virginia Street projects were also delayed until 2035 to 2050. He mentioned the report showed the Red Rock Road and Stead interchanges, the Lear Boulevard and Lemmon Drive extensions, and the Red Rock Road widening were delayed to occur between 2035 and 2050. He stated there would not be any improvements in the traffic for potentially 25 years. He said the report also showed unfunded projects by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), including the 395 widening north of Stead to Red Rock and the Cold Springs to the Red Rock connector.

Mr. Earle read from the fourth slide of his presentation and referred to Altadena, California, where earlier in the year, fire had easily moved from house to house. He read the fifth and sixth slides of his presentation and mentioned the 9,100 approved homes on Red Rock were nearly 50 percent greater than what the applicant's presentation showed. He stated that the lithium and sulfur gigafactory to be built at the Reno Stead Airport would be within close range of the project. He felt the project would triple the threat to the people who lived there and believed that increasing the density was not smart when there was a hazardous material manufacturing facility being put in. He said the gigafactory had everyone in Washington, D.C.'s approval and would move forward.

Mr. Earle read from the seventh slide and believed, with 9,100 approved homes and only 1,100 wastewater connections left, another sewer treatment plant would need to be built. He added the State said it could take 7 to 10 years to have a sewer treatment plant permitted, planned, and implemented. He noted he personally experienced the Washoe County Sheriff's Office's (WCSO) response time of over 30 minutes when he recently experienced a Code 3 response to his private residence where he had laid on the ice for 18 minutes before anyone arrived.

Mr. Earle read from the eighth slide of his presentation and reminded the RTC's draft report did not show any changes to the roads. He read from the ninth and tenth slides of his presentation.

Attorney Garrett Gordon introduced himself as the representative for the property owner and applicant, Lifestyle Homes, and reviewed slides with the following titles: White Owl Drive and Red Rock Road Regulatory Zone Amendment; Area Map; Change of Regulatory Zoning; Master Plan – Suburban Residential; Silver Hills East; Traffic; Findings Consistent with the Master Plan; Findings Compatible Land Uses (2); Findings Response to Changed Conditions (2); Site Location Details; Exhibit B; Land Use Plan; Findings Response to Changed Conditions; Findings Availability of Facilities; Findings; Findings Desired Pattern of Growth; Reno Gazette Journal; Questions.

Mr. Gordon introduced Mr. Dustin Listner, Mr. Bob Listner, and Mr. Peter Listner and indicated they were three generations of the Listner family. He mentioned the open space 50-foot buffer on the north and east sides of the property was a great transition or buffer area for the compatibility finding. He stated he was not asking for a master plan amendment and explained the master plan on the property currently allowed mds, which was a modest three units per acre. It also allowed for high-density suburban (hds), which he explained was seven units per acre. He stated the current plan was the in-between at one unit per acre. He noted the applicant was not asking for the seven units per acre that the master plan allowed for. He felt the middle ground was three units per acre and would provide additional housing in the area.

Mr. Gordon displayed the *Master Plan* slide and mentioned he was glad the appellant showed it in his presentation. He recalled showing the same slide at the Planning Commission meeting. He mentioned the applicant's property was directly north of the property shown on the right. He directed the Board's attention to a pattern of open space buffer that ran along the east side of the property to create the transition from one unit per acre to three. He argued that the appellant and the Homeowner Association (HOA) filed litigation over Silver Hills after the BCC's approval and a judge confirming that the compatibility finding was made with the 50-foot buffer. He noted the 50-foot buffer was extended from Silver Hills northbound to provide transition on the east side properties and on the north side of the property. He felt the proposed project was compatible and flowed nicely on the east side of Red Rock. He referenced the *Traffic* slide and recalled the appellant's concern regarding traffic. He read the first three bullet points on the slide and noted the findings were provided by the applicant's traffic engineer and supported by a County engineer. He felt the most important bullet point on the slide was the fourth bullet point that stated the matter was only a zone change, and the applicant would have to return to the BCC for approval of a tentative map with the exact number of lots identified and a traffic impact study completed. He said he did not disagree with the appellant regarding the timing of traffic improvements and other planned projects; however, he felt those issues should be discussed at a later date when the applicant returned to the BCC with a project and the number of units.

Mr. Gordon noted he wished to focus on the findings. He explained there would be one unit per acre on the west side with an open space buffer and then a transition to three units per acre. He reminded it was not 1 to 7 units per acre, although that was allowed under the Master Plan. He noted that increasing the residential density, coupled with the Silver Hills density, would allow the cost to be spread over a larger number of units for the infrastructure. He said water and sewer costs would be divided by the potential new lots which allowed Lifestyle Homes to lower its price point. He informed the Board that Lifestyle Homes' niche was entry-level housing and that allowing Lifestyle Homes to add density would help subsidize the ability to bring infrastructure to the area. He believed that it was mutually beneficial for everyone. He said the applicant had thought of allowing open space in the tentative map; however, County staff wanted that area to be zoned open space. Due to that, the applicant decided to allow for a 50-foot buffer.

Mr. Gordon explained the project information was sent for review to multiple agencies. He noted the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) commented that the project should meet and comply with all requirements of the TMFPD's fire codes, ordinances, and standards. He said the applicant would comply with those requirements and reminded that the applicant had a legal obligation to show the BCC how the project met all fire codes, ordinances, and standards. He assured that all the County agencies and departments had no concerns with the project application. He discussed the 2022 Consensus Forecast on the *Findings Response to Changed Conditions* slide and said he believed Lifestyle Homes was doing its part to contribute to the needed housing supply.

Mr. Gordon referenced the slide *Site Location Details* and noted that the site between Red Rock and the airport was surrounded by industrial manufacturing and businesses; however, the area lacked housing. He stated Lifestyle Homes believed that increasing the density with its project would provide entry-level housing for the workers in that area. He mentioned the housing would create a reverse commute in the area and keep people off the major roadways. He said roadways were being developed, and some had already been completed. He mentioned Moya Boulevard was addressed on the RTC's website and would be completed in 2027. He read from the *Findings Availability of Facilities* slide and discussed the facilities to accommodate the uses and densities of the project. He mentioned he would have to return to the BCC with a tentative map to prove the project fell under the cap; however, he felt comfortable with the capacity requirements and noted if the project could not meet the capacity, it would not move forward.

Mr. Gordon noted that the appellant used his *Reno Gazette Journal* slide in his presentation that was previously presented at the Planning Commission meeting. He shared that the applicant had a commitment, through efforts with the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), for Lyten to invest more than \$1 billion into the project over a 125-acre campus. He referred to the *Reno Gazette Journal* slide that mentioned the gigawatt factory would increase staffing to over 1,000 employees. He said those employees would have retail and commercial but would lack housing. Lifestyle Homes felt it could provide that niche of entry-level housing that would work and would be compatible with the wages those employees made.

Vice Chair Herman believed the project was troublesome for the people who lived in the area. She felt that the factory would cause quite a bit of turmoil. She mentioned reflecting on the history of similar operations and wisdom from the people who had experienced it. She stated she supported the appellant and brought up the lack of available sewer. She said she supported the appeal of Mr. Earle and his neighbors. She asked to hear from the neighbors at the meeting.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Howard Owens indicated that people made a big deal about the Planning Commission's approval; however, he said the vote was 3 to 2, including the PC Chair voting against the project. He mentioned that the infrastructure was not in place and said the sewer system could handle 1,081 new homes; however, the initiative was to approve 872 new units. He explained that the map on page 45 of Mr. Evan's presentation showed a total of 12,274 approved lots. Mr. Owens said water would be an issue. He noted that people said infrastructure was expensive and that it was advantageous to spread the cost of the infrastructure to additional units, which would include people who already lived in the area. He commented that people in the area who used wells would be forced to move to city water and sewer when or if it was available. He communicated that many people were retired or on fixed incomes which would make the water and sewer expensive. He voiced that according to the BCC, the financial outlook for the County showed signs of flat growth. He reported that the rezoning map was originally for three units per acre but was recently changed to eight units per acre on Omaha Street and Western Street. He opined that once the units increased, it was easy for the units per acre to keep increasing. He said that the County recently changed the Lemmon Valley flood map to double its previous size. He described that people bought new homes in the flood zone, which lowered property values and increased insurance costs. He recounted that he read the original 50-page presentation in December, which he said indicated no comments or concerns. He said he felt that no comments or concerns did not mean agreement.

Ms. Mercedes Sanbrailo noted that she was a Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) disabled military veteran who intentionally purchased a home on Osage Road. She said that she looked for a home with very few neighbors or neighbors she knew and the ability to have animals and create a place of peace. She mentioned that all three of her acres were in a flood zone except for her home. She indicated that the flood zone was directly up to her home at the time, but if it increased, her home would be in a flood zone. She explained that her insurance was based on her home not being in a flood zone. She commented that a large part of her home was sub-basement, which she made into a library with her family's books, antique piano, and irreplaceable heirlooms. She communicated that once her home was in the flood zone, it would be almost impossible for her to receive insurance for the home and property. She said she was a Native American from the Osage Tribe in Oklahoma and that when she bought her home, it felt like her ancestors sent her there to find peace in Nevada. She displayed an image of her property. No copy was submitted for the public record. She pointed out that the flood zone on the image was about an inch away from her home. She voiced that if the flood zone were rezoned to include her home, she would be unable to receive insurance for the belongings that she had worked hard for.

Ms. Tami Rougeau said she was a veteran and 34-year resident of the Silver Knolls area. She requested the BCC overturn the Planning Commission's decision to rezone the area. She noted that the request failed to meet any of the seven key points required. She mentioned the Staff Report contained omissions and errors and there were already 9,151 low and ultra-low-income homes approved for the area. She indicated that the approved homes were not located in the presentation. She commented that there were previously approved homes that were never built and thought there must not be a large need for them. She believed if those homes were built the gigafactory workers would have a place to live. She reported that the approved plans for those homes had been available for many years with no attempt to start building them. She noted the Staff Report failed to identify the pending build of the lithium battery factory. She displayed a document that showed a changed floodplain. No copy was submitted for the public record. She noted that she was told a changed floodplain document was sent to the residents of the area. She believed that if the area were developed, more water would enter her property and drain into nearby properties. She explained that the ditches were already overflowing and were reminiscent of a river. She communicated that the area was on a high-risk fire plain. She felt if the homes became condensed, the area could face the same fire consequences as California. She recalled there had been multiple fires since she had lived in the area, which caused her to evacuate once and prepare for evacuations twice. She said there was one way in and out of the area and believed if the residents had to wait until 2050 to receive better roads, then the proposed 10,000 homes would increase risk to the area. She mentioned that some homeowners in the community lost their fire insurance, and if the risk increased, everyone would lose theirs. She opined low and ultra-low families could not afford the insurance.

Mr. Malcolm St. Pierre noted that Silver Knolls was a rural area with only a few people wanting to live there. He speculated that the residents of the area did not want another 500 homes with increased cars on unmaintained roads. He indicated that the County did not maintain the ditches and only maintained the gravel pit road and in town areas. He reported that if there was half an inch of rain, the ditches flooded, and the County would only shovel. He mentioned that he lived on a private road with four acres that the County would not assist with. He explained the only time the WCSO went to his property was if he was in trouble. He said it was ridiculous for out-of-town developers to buy roughly 100 acres to make money. He commented that Lemmon Drive, Red Rock Road, and Pyramid Highway displayed what engineers did. He asked how long the expanded freeway had been under construction into the North Valleys. He wanted to know why there was a 40-foot wall on North Virginia Street for an off-ramp. He said if the engineers wanted to build homes, they needed to build roads first since there was only one way in and out. He communicated that there was a herd of antelope that frequented the property the developers wanted to build on. He opined if a subdivision was desired for workers, USA Parkway was where it should be built. He explained that his property taxes were already high and said he was against the project.

Ms. Trista Gomez empathized with the residents of the North Valleys and said that she lived in Spanish Springs, whose citizens were fighting development due to the lack of roads. She explained that there was flooding and fatal accidents in her area. She

noted that she heard about the engineers and the Commissioners approving developments; however, there was already cluster housing and high density in her area. She mentioned that the residents of the valley suffered every day when commuting to work due to the lack of money in the infrastructure budget to maintain current commitments. She said she had heard the current commitments were \$100 million under budget and other infrastructure budgets were not being met. She said she knew the roads were not going to be built, and that the development-funded Commissioners continuously approved developments the residents opposed. She indicated that the North Valley's residents' insurance had increased and that they could not afford it. She speculated that she was in the same situation. She opined that the only way the County consistently had money was due to the property tax revenue from developments that supported the Commissioners but did not have adequate impact fees or shared costs for the community. She believed that the BCC was doing a disservice and making residents suffer. She felt the only way the development would not happen was if the BCC chose not to approve the zoning.

Mr. Russ Earle displayed documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He noted that the prior Silver Hills case never went to court. He said he did not deal with the appeal but was the president of the community organization, which he clarified was not a Home Owner Association (HOA). He mentioned that the applicant stated the traffic study accounted for 2,361 dwelling units, but if the appeal were approved, there would be 9,600 units. He indicated that the traffic study noted the road could not handle 9,600 units. He commented that he interpreted the planning staff as not being aware of Silver Star and Evans Ranch at the time of researching the application. He highlighted that there were already 9,100 units approved for the area, and he felt there was zero need for the approval of the appeal. He believed that once the approved homes were developed, the developer could come back with a higher-density request. He reported that the development would be within 500 feet of a sulfur factory. He speculated that if there was a fire, the smoke emanating from sulfur could be lethal. He opined people could try to evacuate and noted he would not be able to get his horses out of the property. He explained that the area was in the process of having a wastewater treatment facility built on American Flat that would reinject water into the aquifer. He communicated that TMWA had two extraction wells in the area, and if there were a hazardous material issue at the factory that contaminated the water, it would affect everyone. He noted that it was not prudent to have more people and triple the density. He said the applicant was ingratiated with the hazmat facility. He mentioned that the current warehouses being built were speculated and that there was no one in the buildings. He felt that the agency responses were basic and not approvals.

Mr. Keith Dayton mentioned that he moved to the Silver Knolls area two and a half years ago and that he had saved his whole life to live in the area and loved it. He indicated that he did not know how the infrastructure would handle the development. He mentioned that the applicant reported it was 8 to 12 minutes for a fire department response. Mr. Dayton said he prayed he did not have to deal with a fire because he had witnessed what happened in California regarding fires and congestion. He commented that he had worked in the Reno area for 20 years and witnessed the Sparks area explode in development. He said there was one road in and out of the area, and it was difficult at times

to ride bikes or take walks. He communicated that putting more homes in the area was a danger. He said that he enjoyed the night sky and felt he would lose it with more homes. He reported that there were trench and water issues that he was not aware of before buying and that three days into living on his property, the home flooded. He noted that he was told the ditch in front of his home was not able to accommodate what was currently there. He indicated that he had asked for help previously regarding the water issue, and it took the County nine months to clean the area once, which did very little. He mentioned that he had dug the vegetation out of the ditches. He wanted to know where all the water would go once the developers built concrete homes. He displayed an image of his property and ditches. No copy was submitted for the public record. He voiced that his home was located at the lowest point of the valley and that the water should drain to the lake; however, it backed up and could not get to the lake in time.

Vice Chair Herman reiterated that she supported the appeal.

Commissioner Garcia said she had read the emails and watched the Planning Commission meeting and appreciated everyone being present at the BCC meeting. She mentioned the Board had a tough job because they had to balance the rights of a private property owner who wanted to develop his land with the rights of the property owners who lived in that area. She explained that the project being in the first phase is what grounded her through the process. She stated that there was a lot of work the applicant had to accomplish to continue in the process, and she felt there would be many people watching carefully. She mentioned that when appeals came before the BCC, she listened to the concerns of the Planning Commissioners. She noted sewer capacity was mentioned, and she felt staff did a great job of answering those concerns. She recalled traffic concerns were discussed, and said she believed the presentation had enough information for her to feel comfortable regarding those concerns. She reminded different agencies had reviewed the project and that she was able to find all the required findings. She acknowledged her decision was not what the public wanted to hear but she believed the BCC had to follow a process.

Commissioner Andriola echoed Commissioner Garcia's comments and added that the first phase of planning could be difficult when all the details were not known. She recalled meeting with someone who voiced concerns about wildlife. Commissioner Andriola said she met with staff to understand if there were any endangered species in the area or other impacts that had not been addressed. She believed the infrastructure concerns would be thoroughly reviewed as the project progressed. She felt the County needed to think about infrastructure and development, and how to catch up on infrastructure. She knew that had been a cause of frustration and thought that the Board needed to think about what resources were available to help with the infrastructure without putting that cost on the taxpayer. She discussed that options could include developers and resources that were used by other jurisdictions that the County had not yet explored. She mentioned many of the sewer capacity issues were being resolved throughout the County. She believed there was a history of development paying for infrastructure, but the County could not wait for that infrastructure to occur. She hoped the public would soon see actions the County was taking regarding infrastructure and noted she was actively researching resources to

leverage. She thought that as the applicant's project progressed, there could be opportunities for infrastructure.

Commissioner Andriola agreed with Commissioner Garcia's comment that what was in front of the Board that day was not the approval of the entire project. The project would go through all the required processes and regulations and provide an opportunity for the public to get more details and provide feedback. She thought it was important to acknowledge that the region was growing and was no longer the biggest little city. She mentioned that she was part of the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) and informed that a claim could not be legally made that a project fit in the Master Plan if it did not. She stated the facts were that the findings could be made. She said she appreciated the feelings of the public commenters and appellant and acknowledged that change was hard. She assured the citizens that the process in place was not haphazard. She hoped there were resources to provide infrastructure soon.

Commissioner Clark commented that many things went into development and noted a lot had been brought up that day. He said there were not enough Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) deputies in the project area and the County. He opined the County had to ensure adequate fire service to the project area. He agreed that water was a big issue, and sewer was an even bigger issue. Alternatively, the County and State were facing a severe housing shortage for entry-level buyers. He felt there were many facets to the project and noted Planning Commission approved it on a three to two vote. He acknowledged there were many issues before the BCC that passed with a three to two vote. He believed entry-level buyers needed to be taken into consideration and stated the community needed housing. He said he heard what everyone had said and mentioned he lived a rural lifestyle, so he was very cognizant of that.

Chair Hill said all the findings could be made, and additional steps for the applicant would follow. She acknowledged the public commenters' frustration and assured them there would be more work for the developer moving forward due to the constraints the community outlined. She said the Board had a legal requirement to ensure that State law was followed when approving developments. She explained that the Board was committed to ensuring the County was growing in a sustainable manner. She understood the frustrations of the appellant and public commenters.

Commissioner Andriola added that she knew it was important to look at the dark sky. She mentioned she spoke to staff and felt really encouraged that the Board could move forward with fine-tuning that policy. She believed the project before the Board that day was a great project for the policy, and she hoped that there would be an opportunity to discuss that later.

On motion by Chair Hill seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman voting no, it was ordered to deny Russ Earle's appeal and affirm the Planning Commission's decision. It was further moved to adopt Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0003 (White Owl Drive and Red Rock Road) and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment K

to that effect. The denial was based upon the ability to make all six of the required regulatory zone amendment findings in Washoe County Code 110.821.15(d) based on the record and evidence presented.

25-0144 **AGENDA ITEM 24** Public hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's denial of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0004 which seeks to amend the North Valleys Regulatory Zone Map to change the regulatory zone on three parcels, totaling 47.15 acres, from Low Density Suburban (LDS- 1 du/acre) to Medium Density Suburban (MDS- 3 du/acre), and to change the regulatory zone on a 2.08 acre portion of Osage Road from Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP) to MDS. The applicant for the regulatory zone amendment, property owner, and appellant is Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC. The addresses of the subject parcels are 10600, 10100 and 10101 Osage Road in Reno. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 086-350-37; 086-370-09; 086-370-18; and 086-370-10. The Board of County Commissioners shall consider the appeal based on the record and any testimony and materials submitted at the public hearing. The Board of County Commissioners may affirm or reverse the Planning Commission's decision. If the Board reverses the Planning Commission's decision, it may adopt the requested regulatory zone amendment. If adopted, the Board shall authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to this effect. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Planner Tim Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WRZA24-0004 (Osage Road); Appeal; Background; Request; Existing and Proposed Zoning; Floodplain; Availability of Facilities; RZA Findings-Planning Commission; Recommendation; Thank you.

Mr. Evans explained that the Planning Commission heard Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0004 on December 3, 2024, and unanimously denied it. He described that the applicant, Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC, subsequently submitted an appeal. He said the applicant appealed because they believed all of the findings could be made. He read from the *Background* slide and informed that the subject parcels totaled approximately 49.23 acres, 2.08 acres of which was a portion of Osage Road. He shared that the property was located within the North Valleys planning area. He read from the *Request* slide and specified that Agenda Item 24 only addressed the zoning change. He clarified that WRZA24-0004 did not create a subdivision, which would be a separate process. He displayed the *Existing and Proposed Zoning* slide and indicated that the area on the right side of the slide was the proposed medium-density suburban (MDS) zoning, and the remaining blue portions were zoned for Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP). He showed the *Floodplain* slide and acknowledged that a portion of the property was located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Zone AE Special Flood Hazard Area, which was a 100-year flood plain. He said the County Engineering and Operations Team (EOT) was provided with the project information for review, and they determined that if a development application and tentative map application were submitted in the future, floodplain considerations could be addressed and mitigated at that time.

Mr. Evans showed the *Availability of Facilities* slide and described that the proposed project was sent to multiple agencies for review. He stated that the EOT informed

that traffic and roadway considerations could be addressed in the future if a development application for a subdivision was submitted. He shared that the properties would be served by NV Energy for power. He advised that the project information was sent to Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) for review. TMWA responded that the project would need to be annexed into TMWA's retail service area, and the developer would need to obtain available water rights through TMWA. He reported that the project information was sent to the City of Reno, which stated that sewer service could be provided by the Reno-Stead Water Reclamation Facility (RSWRF). The City added that RSWRF had the capacity to serve the proposed facility and was being expanded. He advised that the project information was sent to the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD), which conveyed that there were two fire stations within approximately five miles of the subject properties. TMFPD estimated their emergency response time would be between six and eight minutes. Mr. Evans showed the *RZA Findings-Planning Commission* slide and affirmed that the Planning Commission was not able to make the findings. He displayed the *Recommendation* slide and summarized the options available to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He said he was available for questions.

Chair Hill invited the appellant to present. She said they had ten minutes to present their case to the Board.

Lifestyle Homes representative Garrett Gordon conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Osage Road Regulatory Zone Amendment; Area Map (Approximately 218 Acres); Change of Regulatory Zoning on Three (3) Parcels; Master Plan – Suburban Residential; Traffic; Flood and Drainage Impacts; Findings – Consistent with the Master Plan; Findings – Compatible Land Uses (2 slides); Findings – Response to Changed Conditions (2 slides); Site Location Details; Exhibit B Current Concept Plan; Land Use Plan; Findings – Response to Changed Conditions; Findings – Availability of Facilities; Findings – Adversely Affect Master Plan Policies and Action Programs; Findings – Desired Pattern of Growth; Reno Gazette-Journal; Questions?

On behalf of the applicant, Mr. Gordon requested that the BCC overturn the decision of the Planning Commission to deny case number WRZA24-0004. He noted that his presentation was somewhat redundant in regard to the findings, but he stated his intent to ensure that a clear record was provided. He claimed the project site was different than previously reported. He asserted that it was surrounded to the east by the City of Reno and was on the boundary of the city limits. He added that it was possible to see apartments, manufacturing facilities, and industrial usage to the east, and he suggested that it was a thriving part of the City of Reno. He expressed agreement with the description County staff provided in their staff report about it being a transition area. He pointed out the project site in blue on the *Area Map (Approximately 218 Acres)* slide. He said the site would provide a transition from more intensive industrial and multi-family uses to three units per acre, and that it would further transition into one unit per acre further away from the Reno AirLogistics Park. He reiterated that the request was to change the zoning from 1 unit per acre to 3 units per acre, which would result in an allowance for approximately 131 units. He contended that the Master Plan permitted MDS zoning and even allowed for high-

density suburban (HDS) zoning, which was 7 units per acre. He clarified that the appellant was only asking for the area to be rezoned to MDS. He directed attention to the *Traffic* slide and emphasized the fourth bullet point in his slide. He expected that when and if a tentative map application was submitted, the plans would be scrutinized to ensure adequate infrastructure was in place. He stated the applicant would be prepared to answer questions and work with the EOT on a traffic impact study.

Mr. Gordon argued that the Planning Commission focused on flooding concerns when case number WRZA24-0004 was initially presented. He informed that the applicant addressed flooding concerns thoroughly in their appeal letter and hired a civil engineer with experience in the North Valleys who specialized in flood and water rights. He noted that specialist was present to answer questions. He remarked that there was no legal prohibition against zoning changes in a flood zone. He recalled that a County engineer who presented at the Planning Commission meeting outlined some positive impacts of development. Mr. Gordon read quotes from the engineer that were shown on his *Flood and Drainage Impacts* slide, and he summarized that development projects overseen by the County allowed for improved flood mitigation. He specified that projects needed to demonstrate an improvement of 130 percent over current conditions. He said the expert hired by the applicant disclosed that when tentative map plans were designed, one of the flood mitigation methods approved by the County would be selected.

Mr. Gordon read highlights from the *Findings – Consistent with the Master Plan* slide. He said he viewed case number WRZA24-0004 as a modest urban infill project because it was next to city limits. He did not think it was necessary to adhere to the existing zoning of one unit per acre. He supposed that entry-level homebuyers wanted a variety of housing types, and he opined that was the niche served by the applicant, Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC. He read from the *Findings – Compatible Land Uses* slides. He determined the infrastructure was in place with Osage Road, Moya Boulevard, and road connections that extended to the Stead Airport. He explained that the project supported a gradual increase in residential density and did not include a proposal for apartments or HDS zoning. He noted that all of the agencies listed in his slide told the Planning Commission on the record that the project met all required legal findings. He expected agencies would need to restate their position at the time of a tentative map application.

Mr. Gordon showed the *Findings - Response to Changed Conditions* slide and commented that the project would help satisfy the first bullet point in the slide by adding 140 units to housing inventory. He thought the location of the proposed development near the Stead Airport was a good place to start, in part because of the existing infrastructure there. He showed the *Site Location Details* slide and theorized that Dermody Properties was excited about developing some residential properties in that area. He communicated that it was a great opportunity to create entry-level housing for employees of the Reno AirLogistics Park. He showed the *Land Use Plan* slide and observed that housing was needed to support the other development in the area. On the *Findings – Response to Changed Conditions* slide, he added that the project would work well with other planned infrastructure and growth nearby. He said it was consistent and concurrent with the transportation network that was under construction. Mr. Gordon elaborated on the

Findings - Availability of Facilities slide and recalled that City of Reno staff stated for the record that there was sewer capacity for over 1,000 residential units. He anticipated that capacity would still be there in the future and he knew that it was essential for it to be in place when the applicant presented a tentative map application.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Linda Vogedes disclosed that she had lived in Silver Knolls for 29 years. She revealed that she moved there for a rural life. She initially understood that the proposed development would add 126 homes but surmised that the projection had increased to 131 homes. She remarked that the development would impact residents significantly. She recalled hearing about the planned road widening from Red Rock Road to Moya Boulevard and said residents had to get to their homes by using Osage Road. She described that Osage Road was almost a mile long, and there were 23 homes built on it. She noted that a few more were going to be built but informed that there would not be more than 27 even if every owner built a home on their property. She claimed the developer wanted to put five times that number of homes at the end of Osage Road. She shared that, according to information provided by the United States (US) Census Bureau, an additional 126 housing units would likely increase vehicle trips by a minimum of 668 daily trips on the one-mile stretch of Osage Road. She felt that would be like a freeway and would impact existing residents immensely. She theorized that there would be significant safety impacts when the road was paved. She predicted there would be speeding and people would not be able to walk their dogs, ride their horses, or let their children go out and ride their bikes anymore. She expressed concern about flooding and revealed that she and her husband had observed Silver Lake go from dry to full in 24-48 hours. She mentioned warehouse construction and flooding from a recent storm.

Mr. Howard Owens divulged his residence was near the proposed development. He described that page 54 of the original report claimed that Silver Knolls property owners supported rezoning of the subject properties. He stated that was simply not true. He theorized that many more people would have been at the meeting that day if it was not held during working hours. He reasoned that people could not attend because they had to go to work. He described that Orange County in California had recently enacted a moratorium on new battery facilities, including in unincorporated rural areas. He said the purpose of that moratorium was to protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents. He was concerned about the placement of a toxic gas battery facility in the middle of a residential area of Washoe County, which he noted would be an even bigger residential area if the new development was approved. He observed that the environmental impacts reported only addressed sage plants and did not include other species that he thought might be endangered, including the toads on his property. He spoke about potential impacts on local schools and understood that school children already had to sit on the floor of the school bus because there were not enough seats. He calculated that the new development would add two schoolchildren per residence. He informed that firearms were legal in Silver Knolls, and he often heard people shooting there. He supposed that would have to be addressed. He said the request to change to the new zoning was a departure from historical development projects. He mentioned that the report indicated that there were no military installations within the required noticing area, but he recalled there was a National Guard presence at the Stead Airport.

Ms. Tami Rogeau displayed a floodplain map. No copy was submitted for the public record. She thought the floodplain map was a good indicator of what would happen to homes in the Osage Road area if the new development was realized. She contended that more construction did not improve the floodplain. She cited the negative effects of development in Sun Valley and cautioned against approving the project and waiting to see what happened. She recalled hearing someone say the County could not absorb the legal fees that would be incurred by a lawsuit from developers, but she countered that taxpayers ultimately paid for bad decisions, like those in Sun Valley. She predicted that, if further development was not stopped, backflow would affect all of the properties and residents in the area. She commented that there were not currently any multifamily homes on the east side; only warehouses. She added that the closest multifamily houses were in Stead. She mentioned construction that was taking place on Military Road and Lemmon Drive in Stead. She said the developer failed to acknowledge the 9,150 homes that were already approved. She suggested that infrastructure tests for roads, water, and sewer be carried out on projects that had already been approved. She shared that although TMFPD estimated their emergency response time for the proposed development as six to eight minutes, she experienced a dwelling fire on her property, and it took TMFPD over 20 minutes to respond. She added that the event occurred at 4:20 a.m. when there was no traffic. She disclosed that neighbors had waited over 45 minutes for an ambulance to respond and almost an hour to get to the local emergency room because of traffic. She concluded that by continuing to approve overdevelopment, Commissioners put the lives of residents at risk and showed complete disregard for the residents who had lived there and paid taxes for many years. She recommended the developers be held accountable and required to finish what they had already started.

Mr. Russ Earle wanted to further investigate Finding 3: Response to Changed Conditions, which he pointed out the Planning Commission was not able to make. He mentioned another application that experienced the same challenge and noted that the other application was ultimately approved. He understood the same developer that requested the increase in density already had approval for over 9,100 dwelling units. Mr. Earle observed it had been projected that 6,840 units would be needed over the next 17 years. He claimed the developer had not yet started work to move forward with what had already been approved, but continued to request approval for more housing with higher density. He felt that Finding 3: Response to Changed Conditions could not be made because the developer already had approval to address changed conditions. He spoke about the 1,100 sewer connections available from RSWRF. He warned that it would be possible to overcommit by approving multiple projects that all relied on the same access. He echoed observations from Ms. Rogeau about the abundance of building happening in Stead and Lemmon Drive, which he theorized would start to utilize the 1,100 sewer connections available. He supposed that if the already-approved 9,100 units were built, they would use up the available connections. He recommended working with what had already been approved in that area, and did not think it made sense to compound existing problems. He expressed concern about the ability of emergency medical services (EMS) to respond. He disclosed that he recently fell on the ice and had to lay there for almost 20 minutes before EMS arrived. He reported that it took him 45 minutes to get the Veterans Affairs (VA) hospital, which he said was unacceptable. He expected those issues would be compounded

by further development. He wondered how water would be managed to prevent flooding. He warned that if there was a breach to a reservoir or holding tank, everybody downstream would be at severe risk.

Ms. Jan Bishop discerned that there was simultaneously a need for drinking water in the area and the potential for flooding from excess water. She spoke about concerns she had with the OneWater Nevada Advanced Purified Water Facility (APWF) at American Flat. She wondered about the effects of the APWF on the aquifer, whether arsenic could be released, and whether the ground would swell due to groundwater augmentation. She supposed that TMWA could add to the groundwater reserves and then might be able to extract the water at a later date and sell it. She understood that developments needed water, but she supposed it would take time to see if the APWF plan worked. She thought there was great science underway, but she wanted to ensure that the aquifer that served wells in the area would be preserved. She was concerned that construction of too many houses could create problems with the water supply. She recommended allowing enough time to analyze and plan before moving forward.

Ms. Mercedes Sanbrailo asked the BCC to reject the appeal of case number WRZA24-0004. She recalled displaying pictures during public comment earlier in the meeting, which she clarified were related to the proposed project on Osage Road. She requested that the values outlined in the Master Plan be upheld, and she did not believe the plans for case number WRZA24-0004 and the related development conformed to those values. She said the Master Plan talked about the community vision for the Silver Knolls rural lifestyle and she felt that the rural character should be maintained and the lifestyles of residents should be supported. She explained people in the area had animals and could shoot on their property because there were coyotes. She expected the allowance for shooting would be eliminated if the housing density changed due to rezoning. She disagreed with the assertion that the proposed development would improve flooding. She supposed that things would improve on some parcels because floodwater would be spread out to neighbors. She displayed an image to indicate the proximity of her house to the floodplain. No copy was submitted for the public record. She expected mitigation measures would bury her house and flood her basement. She disclosed that she recently had her water tested and the results were good. She was concerned about the potential impacts of the proposed project on the aquifer, and did not want to dig a deeper well or have pollution in the water.

County Clerk Jan Galassini advised the Board that she received emailed public comments, which were placed on file.

Vice Chair Herman said it was heartbreaking when the County continued to allow what she viewed as irresponsible development. She commented that it had been happening for the past 10 years, and she wished more responsibility was taken. She recalled being promised a lot of things when she first became a Commissioner, but she felt things had not worked out well for the communities. She said District 5 had been badly impacted by flooding, and she concluded that in support of her district, she would have to make a motion to affirm the denial of case number WRZA24-0004.

Commissioner Garcia shared that when she watched the Planning Commission meeting, she was taken off guard by the pendulum swing from the previous agenda item to the Osage Road item. She remarked that she tried to understand the reasons why Planning Commissioners could not make the findings, but she felt like the justifications were not clear. She observed that a FEMA floodwater map was brought up, but she did not fully understand the objections of Planning Commissioners. She wondered if there were things said in the December 3, 2024, Planning Commission meeting that were not projected on the video that would provide more information about what occurred. She said it felt very disjointed.

Mr. Evans responded that he was present at the December 3, 2024, Planning Commission meeting and watched it a few times. He discerned that Planning Commissioners were primarily concerned with issues related to the floodplain. He could not confirm that anything beyond floodplain concerns led them to their decision to deny case number WRZA24-0004.

Commissioner Garcia questioned which specific finding was not met because of flood concerns. She spoke about the comparisons a public commenter made between this agenda item and inadequate planning in Sun Valley. She said she appreciated the example, but she noted that Sun Valley was an unplanned community that developed on parcels deemed unsuitable for agriculture, homesteading, or commercial use. She informed that the Sun Valley community arose as a result of land made available by the Small Tract Act of 1938 when the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) chose to dispose of those parcels. She revealed that infrastructure was a daily concern in District 3, particularly in Sun Valley. Returning to case number WRZA24-0004, she thought the flooding concerns that the Planning Commissioners had were comprehensively addressed by the applicant in his slides. She said that she was very sensitive to floods, fires, and other natural disasters and did not take those things lightly. Regardless, she revealed that she had a difficult time understanding why Planning Commissioners could not make the findings.

Mr. Evans advised that County staff recommended approval of case number WRZA24-0004 based on their research and the evidence provided during the agency review. He said they determined the findings could be made, and their evidence was in a staff report from the December 3, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Andriola discerned from watching the Planning Commission meeting that Planning Commissioners were primarily concerned with the potential for flooding in the project area. She said she appreciated the questions Commissioner Garcia posed and the answers provided by Mr. Evans. She acknowledged that the appellant hired an independent engineer who specialized in flooding, which she thought indicated a commitment to responsible development. She was mindful that approval of case number WRZA24-0004 would be the beginning of an extensive process that included public comment and more research on conditions in the area. She surmised that research would include flood considerations and evaluation of the potential impacts on local wildlife. She stated her support for the reversal of the Planning Commission's denial of case number WRZA24-0004, based on the assurance that a stringent process would be followed.

Commissioner Clark revealed that he had the same concerns about flooding. He said that if the project moved forward, he wanted to hear more about the flood mitigation proposals from the engineer.

Chair Hill concluded that she could make the findings.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Vice Chair Herman voting no, it was ordered to grant Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC's appeal and reverse the Planning Commission's decision to deny Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0004 (Osage Rd.) It was further moved to adopt Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0004 (Osage Rd.) and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment J to that effect. The reversal of the Planning Commission's decision and adoption of the proposed amendment was based on the Board's ability to make all the findings required by WCC Section 110.821.15(d) based on the record and evidence presented.

25-0145 **AGENDA ITEM 25** Public Comment.

Ms. Trista Gomez described her experience attending Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meetings as miserable. She thanked Vice Chair Herman and opined that residents felt similarly miserable due to the impact of the BCC's approval of development which could not be supported due to inadequate planning or current infrastructure. She described the situation as heartbreaking. Ms. Gomez opined the changes affected the way of life that most residents had initially come to the area for. She explained that she had requested that her comments be written verbatim to ensure consistency and to ensure the spirit of her comments was captured in the record. She noted that she did not feel that they had been, which she requested to be addressed. She referred to a presentation by Mr. Andrew McDonald, which provided an update on initiatives and developments within the Registrar of Voters' Office. She mentioned that she had heard concerns expressed by constituents regarding residents not having a way to audit the internal votes on Washoe County's voting machines. She acknowledged the utilization of paper ballots and asked if the Dominion equipment would still be used. She referred to the planned regulatory zoning adjustments to Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 534-561-04 for The Village Green Commerce Center plan located near Pyramid Highway. She attested that the plan was for the construction of a warehouse near Pyramid Highway and affirmed her certainty that the plan would be approved based on the Board's voting record. She noted concerns regarding the area's ditch capacity to contain incoming water. She emphasized that flooding occurred with every rainfall of any significance, not just every five or ten years. She reiterated that the ditches around the roads surrounding the area could not handle the floods. She opined that there was an unfortunate lack of consideration for residents. She mentioned that during the budget presentation, the Board distinguished between two categories of buyers as either local or out-of-state. She opined that the Board had lamented that they could not increase property taxes but was not as concerned when they had exceeded the budget by \$100 million. She noted that raising taxes would further inhibit local buyers from purchasing homes. She stated that the homes planned for construction would be subject to high property taxes, which she noted would be in the range of \$5,000

to \$7,000, and that the price would prevent local buyers from purchasing those homes. She opined that was the basis of their revenue and that the County did not have the necessary infrastructure without that revenue. She opined that the way the BCC was treating residents was sad, unfortunate, and appalling. She expressed her hope for change, noted that there had not been any change, and opined that things had only worsened.

Ms. Linda Tomsick introduced herself and noted that she owned 19 acres of property near Red Rock Road off Osage Road. She expressed frustration with the current traffic in that area, describing it as horrendous. She noted that there had been mention of the construction of additional homes in that area. She attested that there had been instances of individuals speeding down the gravel roads near her property, which had led her to encounter difficulties preventing dust from entering her home. She inquired how further developments would impact the property value of her 19 acres of land. She reiterated her frustration regarding the development of numerous homes near their property and described the lots for the home development as small. She inquired why residents could not do so as well but noted that residents had no interest in doing so as they were interested in keeping their land, which she described as more than just small two-by-four plots. She stated that the residents had been in that area for decades, had built their homes, and had raised their families there. She reiterated her concern about the small size of the parcels and asked why development plans could not be relocated. She suggested relocating the construction to Cold Springs, where she stated there were open lands. She wondered why development was being done in the small community. She suggested that developing homes at the end of their road would force residents to leave their homes, properties, and all they had built. She asked why another plot could not be identified to relocate development and attested that another area could be more suitable for constructing homes. She stated that she had lived in that area for 14 years, and her husband had lived there for 25 years. She stressed that those were long periods to have lived in a home, just for it to be uprooted. She attested that her property values had already decreased due to the number of developments in the area. Ms. Tomsick reflected that residents had moved to that area for the peace and quiet and to raise their families. She stated that her three dogs and cats could not roam freely due to traffic concerns. She speculated that there would be an increase in traffic and a subsequent 400 to 600 percent change in the number of cars traveling through the area. She reiterated her concerns about the traffic spreading dust and gravel. She expressed worries about flooding in the area. She acknowledged the distance of her home from the flooding but asked what would keep the flooding from reaching their part of town if it occurred in nearby areas. She expressed frustration that a better location could not be found to relocate the nearby development of houses. She reiterated that the development would take over the small amount of land that had stood there for many years.

County Clerk Jan Galassini stated that emailed public comment was received and placed on file.

25-0146 **AGENDA ITEM 26** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Andriola acknowledged the little ducks left around the County complex and said they brought a smile to her face.

* * * * *

3:31 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:
Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk
Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*

Pending Board Approval