

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

JUNE 17, 2025

PRESENT:

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

Evonne Strickland, Deputy County Clerk
David Solaro, Assistant County Manager
Michael Large, 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, Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

* * * * *

Chair Hill addressed the political unrest across the Country. She thought that having Girl Scouts at the meeting was enjoyable. She felt it was important to be mindful of how people and Commissioners treated each other and thought the Girl Scout Law was a good reminder to treat people with dignity. She read the Girl Scout Law: *I will do my best to be honest and fair, friendly and helpful, considerate and caring, courageous and strong, and responsible for what I do and what I say, and respect others and myself, respect authority, use resources wisely, make the world a better place, and be a sister or brother to every Girl Scout.*

* * * * *

25-0403 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Public Comment.

Mr. Paul White of Education Crusade recited the dictionary definition of murder. He opined upon the responsibility of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), the County Manager, the Volunteers of America (VOA), and the Public Information Office (PIO), for the death of local resident, longtime Cares Campus client, and amphetamine addict John B., also known in the area as Paris. Mr. White indicated that Paris was addicted to illicit substances and had passed away on the evening of Sunday, June 11, 2025. He described the uncomfortable and unnecessary nature of Paris' passing. Mr. White opined that Paris was not strong enough on his own to recover from the addiction that ultimately resulted in his passing. Mr. White noted that when Paris came forward for help at the Cares

Campus, his addiction worsened due to the drug use allowed at high rates in the facility and because clients like Paris had been told dangerous misinformation that suggested an individual did not need to stop using drugs to have a good life. He opined that such lies were sold to individuals suffering from addiction by providing them with access to any material object that could be purchased. He suggested that Paris' passing was related to having believed that information. He opined that the parties he had previously listed as being responsible for such events had chosen to maintain a program that he felt was failed, facilitated misinformation, and allowed drug use, as it was the only option to millions of dollars and enable the program to be funded every year. Mr. White noted that he had offered those he had addressed previously a privately funded alternative program run by a church, but nobody had shown any interest in discussing the topic. He indicated that the matter was a conflict between the perceived value of money compared to human lives. He opined that the parties he believed were responsible for the issues felt as though the lives of individuals like Paris meant nothing. He reported that he had contacted each individual within those parties multiple times, yet none of those he invited had indicated a willingness to accompany him to the Cares Campus to observe firsthand and unannounced, the extent of destruction to people's lives and the permissiveness at the facility that was hidden from the community. He opined that the actions that allowed the Cares Campus program to continue were unlawful, unjustifiable, and had directly contributed to Paris losing his life. He noted that due to such contributions, Paris' death could be considered to have been the responsibility of the parties he had referred to previously, due to their indifference and subsequent choices that allowed the Cares Campus program to continue. Mr. White recited a quote from former President Thomas Jefferson and hoped it would resonate with those he had addressed when they considered their role in the passing of Paris and others like him. He stated that he was uncertain whether their consideration of such involvement made them tremble, but he believed it should.

Mr. Terry Brooks shared an original poem about the impacts and history of different forms of discrimination.

Ms. Ann Nelson thanked the Board for hosting the Girl Scouts of the Sierra Nevada (GSSN) at the BCC meeting that day. She explained that the Girl Scouts Sierra Nevada Council represented all of Northern Nevada and a small portion of eastern California as they helped build girls of courage, confidence, and character who were deeply embedded in the community. She expressed excitement about appearing before the Board. She explained that she was accompanied by three sisters, Ms. Jesslyn McCrea, Ms. Faith McCrea, and Ms. Olivia McCrea, as they continued to raise money for their local council. Ms. Jesslyn McCrea, Ms. Olivia McCrea, and Ms. Faith McCrea introduced themselves to the Board. Ms. Jesslyn McCrea explained that she was a member of Girl Scout Troop 491. She noted that her troop had 4,000 cases of cookies that they were challenging the community to purchase to support the GSSN in the Great Girl Scout Cookie Challenge buyout event. Ms. Jesslyn McCrea explained that her troop challenged Chair Hill to be a *cookie hero* by purchasing cases of cookies, rather than boxes.

Chair Hill accepted the challenge and stated that she wanted to buy several boxes of Girl Scout cookies for the Washoe County Senior Services Center (WCSSC), as

she believed the seniors would love to receive some dessert. She challenged Sheriff Darin Balaam to purchase some cases of cookies as well. She noted that Ms. Nancy Fennell would be challenging all Dickson Realty employees to buy cases of Girl Scout cookies. Chair Hill invited the other members of the BCC to join the challenge and informed the Board that the cost of the cases were \$50. Chair Hill noted that Commissioners Andriola and Garcia, and Vice Chair Herman offered to purchase two cases of cookies each. Chair Hill stated that she would also be purchasing two cases. Commissioner Clark remarked that he wanted to buy ten cases.

Chair Hill explained that the Board would contact the GSSN to give them their payment and collect the cookies at a later time. She thanked them for visiting the BCC meeting and for making the world a better place. Chair Hill noted that they inspired the Board. She assured the Girl Scouts that the Board would endeavor to be as wonderful as they were in their positions as Commissioners.

Ms. Pam Roberts greeted the Board and introduced herself as the Chair of the Senior Advisory Board (SAB). She thanked the Board for offering to bring the Girl Scout cookies to the WCSSC. She noted that she was in attendance to discuss the position of an extremely valuable staff member at Senior Services, which the department had recently lost. She explained that the staff member's name was Mr. Bill Sero, and he had served as the Senior Activities Coordinator. She noted that Mr. Sero had a 20-hour contract. She described Mr. Sero as an inspiration and stated that he impacted the lives of hundreds or potentially thousands of senior citizens by connecting them to the WCSSC and the additional satellite facilities. Ms. Roberts noted that Mr. Sero had left his position because he had asked for an extra 10 to 12 hours to be added to his contract, which he had requested because he could not subsist on the hours stipulated by the original contract. Ms. Roberts emphasized that Mr. Sero loved his job and opined that he had done amazing things. Ms. Roberts referred to the Washoe County Strategic Plan and recited the language used to describe the goal of identifying and triaging the most vulnerable members of the population, as determined by community need, and to work together across departments throughout the region to provide adequate resources and support. She stressed that Mr. Sero's former position did precisely what was described within the Strategic Plan. She noted that Mr. Sero connected the seniors to several different departments. She recited the achievements of the Strategic Plan and noted that the list included a diverse range of senior programming activities that were offered to maintain engagement. She explained that one of the things the SAB had learned since working on an updated master plan for seniors was that engagement of that kind was critical to an individual's mental, emotional, and physical health. She requested that the Board ask staff to dedicate an additional \$20,000 annually for the Senior Activities Coordinator position. She noted that the position's contract was approved in the budget for a cost of \$20,000, but she opined that the County deserved to have a full-time Senior Activity Coordinator. She hoped Mr. Sero would return to his former position, as he was amazing at his job. She asked the Board to act on matters they had voiced support for. She noted that seniors accounted for a significant percentage of the local population and emphasized that the County needed to take care of them.

Ms. Maureen McElroy greeted the Board and thanked them for the opportunity to speak. She introduced herself as a longtime resident of Reno and noted that she was speaking in regard to Agenda Item 6F1. She urged the Board to re-appoint Tami Ruf as a trustee for the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) Library Board of Trustees (LBT). She opined that it was a very important time for the WCLS regarding planning and preparing for the future of the system. She noted that the LBT and WCLS administrative staff were due to complete their strategic plan, review WCLS policies, and recruit a new library director. She opined that Ms. Ruf was eminently qualified, as she was the only LBT member at that time who was a former librarian. She stated that during a period of immense growth and change for the WCLS, the appointment of Ms. Ruf would provide the knowledge and consistency the LBT needed.

Ms. Donna Clontz greeted the Board and displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She introduced herself and explained that she served as an advisor on the SAB and was formerly the SAB's vice chair. She noted that she had spent many years working with the local senior community as a volunteer. She referred to Ms. Robert's earlier statements and agreed that the loss of Mr. Sero was a very serious issue for the senior community. She recounted that she had taken time the day prior to visit each of the satellite sites for the WCSSC, where meals were being served, in order to talk to senior citizens about the loss of Mr. Sero. She noted that she had asked those senior citizens to consider the petition included in the document she had distributed to the Board, so the seniors could sign it if they agreed with the message. She reported that she had told those seniors that she would speak before the BCC that day to make a public comment on the matter. She noted that she had gathered over 100 signatures for the petition in approximately three hours after visiting senior center locations such as the one on 9th Street and others in areas such as Spanish Springs, Sun Valley, and Cold Springs, as well as the Sparks Senior Center and the Westbrook Community Center. She explained that she had talked to seniors at those centers who knew Mr. Sero, because he had visited the sites regularly to prepare and create activities for the seniors to participate in. She stated that Mr. Sero's activities encouraged the seniors who had participated to tell their friends, which subsequently increased attendance and helped the SAB toward its goal. She referred to Ms. Roberts' earlier comments regarding isolation being a health risk. She noted that being alone caused everyone to become more ill. She explained that being with others helped seniors remain physically and emotionally healthy, which demonstrated why the Senior Activities Coordinator position was critically important. Ms. Clontz acknowledged that Ms. Roberts had referred to the County's Strategic Plan and noted that, as the SAB had worked on its master plan for the last year to update activities, the SAB wanted to offer recommendations for the Board and the Senior Services department. She noted that the SAB master plan included increased social engagement and reduced social isolation for seniors, which involved the creation of programs like neighborhood support. She stated that the master plan also referenced the volunteer coordinator job as someone who could assist the SAB in connecting seniors and transporting them to the senior centers to receive resources and remain socially engaged. She reiterated that the senior community really appreciated Mr. Sero. She emphasized that maintaining the Senior Activities Coordinator position was vital, and she noted that the SAB would like the Board's help to identify a way to do so.

Mr. DeAndre Burleson introduced himself and displayed several documents. No copies were submitted for the public record. He explained that he had appeared before the Board to provide them with an update on his status. Mr. Burleson reported that he had visited the Reno Housing Authority (RHA) and was told by an employee that additional information was not needed from him, as his file had been completed. Mr. Burleson explained that the representative conveyed to him that she was awaiting three properties to have available units and would call him once that availability was determined. He opined that such events were good news. He displayed documents with information regarding his case manager at the community court and records of his standard expenditures while awaiting a decision from the RHA. He reported that while under the care of the court, he had been struck with a blunt object by an unknown individual while sleeping in downtown Reno near businesses such as The Eddy and Wild River Grille. He explained that his eye had been injured during the altercation, and he called the police to file a report on the incident and handle the situation diplomatically. He wanted to share that he had assumed he was welcome to receive ice from the ice machines inside the Washoe County Administrative Complex. He reported having been confronted by an employee or security guard regarding a cup of ice. He assumed that taking ice would not be considered excessive due to his medical condition. He reiterated that he had been denied ice for his water, which he indicated was medically necessary. He recited his health insurance number and concluded his comment after noting that aside from the confrontation, all was well with him.

Chair Hill thanked and congratulated Mr. Burleson. She remarked that it had been amazing to watch him progress through his journey to obtain housing and expressed excitement that he was close to finding a resolution. Mr. Burleson thanked Chair Hill.

Ms. Penny Brock introduced herself and displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. Ms. Brock stated that she would update the Board on election integrity matters. She explained that news had recently broken about events in Washington, D.C. She reported that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) had documents which revealed that the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) produced fake United States (US) driver's licenses to impact the 2020 US presidential election by submitting falsified mail-in ballots in favor of former President Joseph Biden. She recited the title of an article from the publication *Just The News*, which she included in the documentation she submitted. She noted that the article was published the day prior, on Monday, June 16, 2025. She described speculation that the fake ballots were sent to swing states, such as Nevada. She noted that Washoe County was considered one of seven swing counties in the State. She wanted to bring that news to the Board's attention as she believed FBI Director Kash Patel would be investigating the matter. She recited a quote from Mr. Patel taken before he was appointed as the FBI Director, where he named Nevada while promising to investigate the elections held in several states should he be elected into his position. Ms. Brock wanted to inform the Board that Mr. Patel might be visiting the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office, the Office of the County Manager (OCM), and all those involved with elections in Washoe County. She hoped to bring the matter to the Board's attention so they would not be surprised if such events occurred in the future. She emphasized that the

situation was serious and hoped the Board would consider it as such. She noted that concerns regarding personal experiences at the ROV Office had been voiced by many citizens since 2021. She opined that similar events occurred in 2024. She stated that the Board could revisit the record to see the number of individuals who came before the Board after observing the election. She recounted her story of being denied the right to vote at Depoali Middle School, which she emphasized was a violation of her Constitutional rights. She hoped to have the chance to share that story with Mr. Patel.

Ms. Trista Gomez indicated that she would discuss the situation regarding the county manager position. She opined that Washoe County had experienced a concern regarding a superintendent position for several years. She stated that people would be hired for the position one after another, which presented repeated problems. She explained that staff had ultimately conducted a community survey, which she thought had mentioned trying to hire an individual located in Reno, who knew the local population, and had a record that showed who they were and what they had done. She noted that the current superintendent was local, which offered more balance and improved the situation. She related that event to the position of county manager. She described her belief that the one responsibility of a county manager was to ensure that all County residents had the same quality of life or better. She opined that when the county manager took over, there was increased traffic and fatal accidents. She explained that she provided vehicle insurance coverage for young drivers, which had risen by 25 percent in her local area from no fault of her own, but instead due to the frequency of car accidents. She opined that people were sitting in traffic, the County's budget was uncontrolled, and there were unsustainable programs and revenue needs. She requested and expressed that she would appreciate it if the Board paused action on appointing Assistant County Manager (ACM) Kate Thomas to the role of interim County Manager. Ms. Gomez reported that she had engaged in a single conversation with ACM David Solaro and had never spoken to ACM Thomas. Ms. Gomez explained that she knew people who had worked with both individuals. Ms. Gomez speculated that there might be ethical implications due to a relationship between ACM Thomas and Chair Hill, though Ms. Gomez acknowledged that the topic was merely a rumor and she was uncertain about the validity of her statement. Based on the accounts she had heard from those who worked under both ACM Thomas and ACM Solaro, Ms. Gomez suggested that ACM Solaro be chosen as the interim County Manager. She expressed uncertainty about whether ACM Solaro desired to be appointed to that position. She wanted community input in the form of a survey conducted on the matter prior to naming an interim County Manager. She requested that the vacancy be considered without urgency so the Board could make a calculated and mutually beneficial decision without rushing into something. She reiterated that the matter had no urgency as the Board had two capable candidates. She reiterated her request for the Board to pause any action on the appointment and to think about the matter further.

Mr. Roger Edwards introduced himself as a resident of Washoe County for the past 50 years. He noted that he had attended BCC meetings since 1974. He was impressed that he no longer needed to discuss a refund from a water recharge program and expressed appreciation for the Board resolving the problem he faced with that program. He voiced concern regarding the costs associated with staff, which he noted the Board had

mentioned during previous BCC meetings. He opined that staffing was a major cost to the County. He explained that he understood the matter as he was a retiree. He expressed appreciation for receiving his paycheck, but did not know how such expenses could be managed. He noted that the County employed 3,100 staff members who would retire at some point. He stated that the County would have to pay those retirees 50 to 70 percent of their salary in retirement. He noted that people could live long enough to be retired for as many years as they had worked, which would be the factor that made the situation irremediable. He opined that the Board could only raise taxes to a certain point before the population of the County was forced to relocate. He urged the Board to consider that possibility when they deliberated on hiring additional personnel. He asked the Board to consider a hiring and building moratorium, which he believed needed to be put in place. He noted that he was worried about everyone and thanked the Board.

Mr. Russell Bierle provided his comment virtually from Gerlach. He noted that the Board was familiar with him as he took on many roles, including the Gerlach General Improvement District (GID) Public Works Supervisor, the Treasurer of the Gerlach Volunteer Fire Department (GVFD), and a member of the Gerlach Empire Citizen Advisory Board (CAB). Mr. Bierle wanted to comment on Agenda Item 15 regarding the contract between Washoe County and Royal Ambulance, Inc., for emergency medical services (EMS) for the Gerlach area. He opined that the contract represented a foundation for a good plan but was incomplete. He recommended that the Commissioners approve the contract despite having several serious flaws. He noted that the first flaw was that the contract committed the use of the Gerlach Fire Station to Royal Ambulance Inc. He explained that Washoe County did not own the Gerlach Fire Station, as it was under the jurisdiction of the Gerlach GID. He noted that he had spoken to the Board, who expressed willingness to conduct an emergency meeting to approve a lease that would prevent a disruption in service within Gerlach. He noted that such action needed to be completed within two weeks from that day, as that date marked when Royal Ambulance, Inc. hoped to take over Gerlach's EMS. He opined that the timeline could work so long as all stakeholders were involved, including the Gerlach GID and the GVFD, who he believed would be responsible for the area's fire service. He noted that a formal arrangement had not been finalized with anybody and certain details on the matter were unclear, such as who the GVFD would report to, whether any funding was available, and whether the GVFD would be under the County's insurance. He noted that those examples demonstrated the details that had to be resolved within 14 days. He wanted to hear from a representative of the County to begin determining specific resolutions. He opined that the most pressing issue presented by the contract was that it covered the costs of a full-time paramedic and Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) for a level of care known as Advanced Life Support (ALS) for eight months of the year. He explained that for the other four months, the contract only covered a paramedic, which was not a level of care recognized by the State of Nevada EMS Office. He noted that he had spoken to staff at the State of Nevada EMS Office the day prior, who had notified him that they were not able to or willing to approve the plan as it was written. He explained that the Board approving the contract might allow it to last until December 1, when the contract stipulated that the personnel member provided by Royal Ambulance, Inc. would step down to only the role of a single paramedic. He noted that the contract could also not go into effect entirely. He expressed that he was not

qualified to say how that process worked definitively. He reported that when he spoke to the State of Nevada EMS Office the day prior, they expressed their intent to have a representative attend the BCC meeting to be available to answer the Board's questions regarding the contract. He noted that the only time he would be able to comment on Agenda Item 15 was during the general public comment he was speaking on at that time, as a County staff member informed him that Agenda Item 15 was not eligible for remote public comment. He noted that another individual who intended to make a virtual public comment had arrived and asked if it was too late for that person to speak.

Chair Hill stated that Mr. Bierle was welcome to finish his remarks, as he still had 17 seconds remaining from the 3 minutes allotted to each speaker. Mr. Bierle noted that he had already spoken for close to the allowed time and thanked the Board. He introduced Ms. Tina Walters as the speaker he had mentioned previously.

Ms. Walters provided her comment virtually from Gerlach and apologized for arriving late. She noted that her concern was regarding Royal Ambulance, Inc. She opined that insufficient research had been conducted on solutions for Gerlach's fire services and EMS.

25-0404 AGENDA ITEM 4 Announcements/Reports.

Chair Hill inquired whether Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro intended to make any announcements that day. ACM Solaro noted that he had one item to discuss. He reported that staff were continuing to track legislative changes at the federal level. He acknowledged that many legislative topics were covered in the news, including discussions about lands bills and funding changes. He wanted to ensure the Board knew that staff would communicate the information they knew to be the truth as they gathered it, though he emphasized that information changed and was updated very rapidly. He noted that staff wanted to ensure the correct information was presented to the Board within an appropriate timeframe. He hoped to ensure the Board knew that staff were working towards such efforts. Chair Hill asked whether those updates were expected to come before the Board. ACM Solaro affirmed that the updates would be presented before the Board as soon as staff verified several factors. Chair Hill thanked ACM Solaro.

Vice Chair Herman expressed concern over Mr. Russell Bierle mentioning during his comment on Agenda Item 3 that he had been told by staff that he would not be able to speak on Agenda Item 15. Chair Hill noted that she had been surprised upon hearing him say that as well, as that item impacted Gerlach residents. She speculated that the issue resulted from an oversight. She explained that, as Chair, she could allow public comment to be heard during Agenda Item 15 when the time came to deliberate on that item. Vice Chair Herman said she planned to remove Agenda Item 15 from the Block vote to allow people to speak when the item was brought before the Board. Chair Hill noted that Vice Chair Herman's suggestion was sensible and thanked her.

Commissioner Garcia wished everybody a happy Father's Day, particularly the fathers, stepfathers, and father figures. An attendee at the meeting suggested including

great-grandfathers in addition to those she had mentioned, and Commissioner Garcia agreed.

Commissioner Garcia reported that she had written an opinion article for the *Reno Gazette Journal*, which had been published that day and covered the funding, access, and infrastructure of parks. She hoped those in attendance could read the article. She noted that she began the article with data on the two-year project she conducted with Sierra Nevada Journeys, which demonstrated very stark inequities experienced by some of the low-income students in Reno, Sparks, and Sun Valley. She explained that a portion of her article reflected on the budget cuts faced during and after the 2008 Great Recession, what efforts were taken to recover, and what could be done in preparation for the next occurrence of fiscal restraints the County faced to ensure that the level of service requested by constituents could be met. She noted that the final portion of her article included a call to action. She stated that there would be a joint meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 26, 2025, at 5:00 pm at the City of Reno Council Chambers. She explained that the reason she wanted everyone to get involved was that the joint meeting represented the first major step of the public process for people to share their input, ideas, and thoughts. She opined that the meeting was the right time for those who loved parks, trails, and open spaces to step forward and get involved. She noted that it was easy to participate, as anybody could show up to the meeting to learn about the Parks District Service Plan that was the topic of discussion. She noted that over the following year or two, progress would be made toward a real, viable, and possible solution that could be faced regionally. She stated that public input was needed, and she would love for people to become engaged on the matter. She announced that she would not be in attendance at the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting the following week, as she would be at the Education Commission meeting in Las Vegas. She noted that she would not be able to attend the meeting virtually.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Garcia for her comment and for all of her work on behalf of Washoe County's parks and open space.

Commissioner Andriola echoed Commissioner Garcia's wishes for a happy Father's Day, believing it was a great day to celebrate. Commissioner Andriola wanted to announce that the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) would be hosting the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) on July 2, 2025. She noted that the RTC would share lots of information with those in attendance. She hoped everyone in Spanish Springs could attend the event and clarified that those living outside the area could also join, despite the focus being primarily on Spanish Springs. She opined that those who participated in the event would find it highly beneficial to better understand how the process behind requesting traffic signals worked. She explained that she had received many requests regarding that topic, so she and the Spanish Springs CAB thought hosting an event on the matter would be very helpful. She noted that more would be discussed at the event than just traffic signal requests.

Commissioner Andriola shared that a pet memorial at the Link Piazza Dog Park located within her district in Hidden Valley would be unveiled at 9:00 a.m. on August 16, 2025. She thanked staff for creating a memorial with a great concept that honored pets

and Mr. Guy Clifton, who she noted had spent every moment he could at the Link Piazza Dog Park. She recited a quote that indicated that a canine could have no better friend than Mr. Clifton. Commissioner Andriola noted that she wanted to be a dog raised by Mr. Clifton. She emphasized that Mr. Clifton made an impact on the community in many ways. She opined that the unveiling of the memorial offered a special opportunity for everybody to show their respect and love for their beloved pets. She reiterated that the unveiling would take place on August 16, 2025, at 9:00 am.

Commissioner Clark noted that he had several items to discuss and provide his comments on. He was glad to see that Ms. Pam Roberts, Ms. Donna Clontz, and others from the Washoe County Senior Advisory Board (SAB) were in attendance at the meeting. He opined that they had presented an excellent point during their previous comments on Agenda Item 3. Commissioner Clark stated that when former Senior Activities Coordinator Bill Sero worked, it seemed more like he was interacting with his family members as he was everywhere, helped everyone he could, and was extremely helpful with many things. Commissioner Clark recounted that Mr. Sero obtained a commercial driver's license (CDL) so he could drive the bus donated by the Lifestyle Foundation to take seniors on field trips to Carson City, museums, shops, and medical appointments. Commissioner Clark emphasized how helpful Mr. Sero was in doing everything at senior centers across the County, such as the centers in Cold Springs, Sparks, and Reno. He opined that it was unfortunate that Mr. Sero had taken the job initially as a part-time position and eventually needed more hours before looking for another job on account of the high costs and changes in the economy. Commissioner Clark reported that he had received an email from a staff member who informed him that the County had located the funding for Mr. Sero's position. He speculated that at the same time, Mr. Sero had potentially accepted a position elsewhere. Commissioner Clark opined that while very few people were irreplaceable, Mr. Sero came very close to being considered as such. Commissioner Clark reiterated that Mr. Sero was an excellent person who was very helpful to the senior community. He expressed that it was unfortunate that Mr. Sero had to find employment elsewhere. He hoped that the County could find somebody to fill Mr. Sero's former position as well as he had. Commissioner Clark noted that Mr. Sero had done a great job and would be missed.

Commissioner Clark noted that he received a request from the seniors at the Cold Springs Community Center who had been asking for several months or even years for sandwich signs to display in front of the facility so those in the community would know that senior lunches were offered there. He explained that those at the facility had been told that the signs had been ordered but had yet to see them. He reiterated that the Cold Springs Community Center requested to be given several sandwich signs to display. He noted that a nurse, possibly with Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH), had previously visited the Cold Springs Community Center once or twice a month during the lunch hour to measure the seniors' blood pressure. He stated that the seniors appreciated that service but had not seen that nurse for a while. Commissioner Clark wondered if staff could investigate that matter.

Commissioner Clark stated that he had often spoken about fire stations. He apologized for the other Commissioners being upset about his actions regarding them

having to wait 15 minutes to vote on a measure. He compared that period to those who had waited five to seven years for a fire station after being misled about whether they would get one. He emphasized that those individuals who awaited the fire station were taxpayers and citizens who paid money to the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) while being led to believe they would be given something that they had not received. He noted that his actions were his way to peacefully protest the lack of transparency and honesty towards those citizens. Commissioner Clark acknowledged that the Board had heard a comment from Mr. Bierle in Gerlach during Agenda Item 3. He explained that Gerlach still had a volunteer fire station and noted that at least two volunteer fire station locations in Washoe Valley could be reconstituted and returned to service. He opined that considering the reinstatement of two or more fire stations in Washoe Valley was something to be looked into, as it could temporarily remedy the problem in that area. He asked staff to consider assigning volunteer firemen in Washoe Valley.

Commissioner Clark reported that during the previous BCC meeting held the week prior, the County Manager stated that the answer to Commissioner Clark's question regarding bus tickets was both a yes and a no. Commissioner Clark explained that he had asked who the bus tickets were given out to, as they had been intended to reunite families. He specified his question to ask which families were receiving those tickets. He recounted having asked whether the bus tickets were going to those traveling from senior centers or the Cares Campus, for example. He provided a follow-up question by inquiring where the individuals receiving the bus tickets were departing from and where they were being driven to.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Clark. She announced that the Girl Scouts' Great Cookie Challenge event van was parked in the roundabout of the Washoe County Administrative Complex. She hoped the Girl Scouts would stay there for a while, but noted that if they did not, the Commissioners could coordinate on the orders they had placed with them later. She stated that anybody in the audience interested in purchasing a \$50 case of Girl Scout cookies, which was discounted by half of the original cost, could find them located in the roundabout where food trucks regularly parked. She noted that the Girl Scouts would be there for a short period, and if anyone were interested, they could stop by the van to help out the Girl Scouts of the Sierra Nevada (GSSN).

25-0405 **AGENDA ITEM 5A1** Presentation by Dana Searcy, Director Housing and Homeless Services, to provide an update on Housing and Homeless Services. (All Commission Districts.).

Division Director Housing & Homeless Services (HHS) Dana Searcy conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Housing & Homeless Services Overview; Key Accomplishments; Washoe County Implementations; 1. Regional Coordination & Centralized Data; Built for Zero – HMIS Reporting; Service Provider Partnerships; 2. Increased Shelter Capacity; Shelter & Services Model; Increased Shelter Beds Outcomes; 3. Increasing Coordinated Outreach; 4. Tenancy Support; Current Status Overview; Shelter & Outreach Outcomes; Client Information Snapshot; Intake Process; Intake Process – Addressing Gaps; Intake Process

– Arriving Outside County Area (2 slides); Built for Zero & Actively Homeless Count; Actively Homeless Count (By Name List) (4 slides); Current Challenges; Impact of Addressing Homelessness; Our Challenges (3 slides); Ongoing Initiatives; Critical Support Areas.

Ms. Searcy apologized for the delay in providing the presentation and said the data was the most current. She hoped the presentation would be the beginning of future conversations. She reviewed the slide titled *Washoe County Implementations* and noted past accomplishments. She said that there had been an enormous amount of work done since homelessness transitioned to Washoe County in September of 2021. On the slide titled *1. Regional Coordination & Centralized Data*, she noted that the mission of that work was not only for the County to provide quality services, but also to expand the capacity and build a system in the community that provided services.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *Built for Zero – HMIS Reporting* and said that there was a significant focus on centralizing data. She pointed out that previously, 40 percent of programs reported into the Health Management Information System (HMIS), and currently, over 90 percent did. She noted that on the slide titled *Service Provider Partnerships*, the list was a memorandum of understanding (MOU) of over 40 partners who agreed to provide services alongside Washoe County.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *2. Increased Shelter Capacity* and stated that the focus was to increase shelter capacity between Our Place and the Cares Campus. On the slides titled *Shelter & Services Model* and *Increased Shelter Beds Outcomes*, she indicated that barriers were lowered and service models were enhanced, which allowed more people access to shelters, leading to a significant decrease in the number of unsheltered people in the community.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *3. Increasing Coordinated Outreach* and said that staff focused on increasing outreach, which was done through regional client staffing, meetings, and MOU partnerships, as shown on the *Senior Provider Partnership* slide. She stated that the projects allowed staff to reach more people than before. She reviewed the slide titled *4. Tenancy Support* and explained that it involved a case manager guiding people through the housing process. She noted the proven success with the Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) Program, in which over 90 percent of people remained steadily housed. She reviewed the slide titled *Client Information Snapshot* and mentioned that the number of seniors was being monitored and had stabilized slightly since previous presentations. She explained that seniors aged 55 and older accounted for 40 percent of the people served.

Ms. Searcy noted on the slide titled *Intake Process* that the data consisted of two large and complicated sets. She explained that the data regarding where people came from had been requested by the Board and the community. She said that in 2024, staff looked closely at what was being reported and how it related to data being collected. She mentioned that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) standards were followed during the intake process and that the data aligned with what was required to be

reported. On the slide titled *Intake Process – Addressing Gaps*, she reviewed questions that were not being answered in the intake process. She explained that in July of 2024, intake was added to address where people came from and whether they were homeless prior to moving to the area. Regarding the slide titled *Intake Process – Arriving Outside County Area*, she said the data reflected that people who were homeless when they moved to Washoe County largely came from California and Nevada. She reviewed the second *Intake Process – Arriving Outside County Area* slide and explained that the light purple on the bottom was the total number of people who entered homelessness each month. She noted that in recent months, that number had dropped. She mentioned that staff worked directly with other jurisdictions who sent people to Washoe County to communicate that the County could not accept individuals from outside the area, so that locals could be served.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *Built for Zero & Actively Homeless Count* and said the by-name list had been updated and was likely the most complex piece of data. She explained that when Built for Zero (BFZ) began in 2020, staff discussed building the by-name list. She indicated that Washoe County was the first community in the Country to produce an active homeless count for all five subpopulations. She noted that HMIS was used to create that list, which was uncommon at the time. She said the method was built based on the system at the time, and a significant update was needed due to the programs added and how HMIS was used. She stated that several months were spent examining that, and she thanked the partners, BFZ, and the data team for helping. She explained that there was a grant on the meeting agenda that would help cover the cost of the HMIS updates. She mentioned that staff remained committed to continuous improvement.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *Actively Homeless Count (By Name List)* and explained that the darker line on the bottom was the initial count, and the revised count was the lighter line on the top, which was about two years of data. She noted that over time, there was not a considerable increase in the number of people experiencing homelessness. She indicated the modified counting procedure was different than the point-in-time (PIT) count, which was a snapshot of a single day. She said it accounted for activity over a full 90 days, which was why it was significantly higher than the PIT count. She stated that it created a broader net to ensure the most comprehensive data was available. On the second *Actively Homeless Count (By Name List)* slide, she noted that the list in the lower left was programs that would qualify to count someone. She said that a program offering services only was not used for those counts. She explained that the idea was that someone might stay at the Cares Campus but get a meal from the Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada (CCNN) or be signed up with a managed care organization (MCO) provider to receive insurance case management. She stated that those were examples where staff did not want to count people more than once, which was why a program offering services only was not used for the count. She mentioned that when someone entered a shelter and then left to stay in a motel, but utilized the MCO case management service, the individual would not have been counted initially because the most recent enrollment was in a service, not a bed. She indicated that one of the reasons for the change was so that all activity over 90 days was reviewed. She said if someone used the shelter system or housing programs within 90 days, then they would be counted. For the third *Actively Homeless*

Count (By Name List) slide, she explained that the monthly count was relatively stable and decreased by a few hundred since 2024. She stated that levels increased as more people entered throughout the winter season. She reviewed the fourth *Actively Homeless Count (By Name List)* slide and said data would be available to the public and would provide in-depth detail regarding the different categories.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *Impact of Addressing Homelessness* and noted that what had been done to address homelessness had an impact. She explained that the slide had previously been presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), and it was important to understand that the Board's investment impacted the community.

She reviewed the slide titled *Our Challenges* and said that the increase in Washoe County was less than the rest of the Country, but locally, rent costs had increased. She noted that the slide was a comparison of rent related to wages and unemployment rates, which had risen slightly. She stated that Washoe County was above the national average. On the second *Our Challenges* slide, she mentioned that there was no significant increase in subsidized units. Regarding the third *Our Challenges* slide, she said it was not surprising that rents continued to increase, affordable housing units were not keeping pace with the population growth, unemployment remained elevated, existing resources were stretched thin, depleted, or cut, and few new resources were on the horizon. She explained that there were unknowns due to a shift in federal funding related to EHV and Medicaid. She said that staff continued to evaluate and adjust accordingly to ensure resources were being used in the most appropriate and efficient way.

Ms. Searcy reviewed the slide titled *Ongoing Initiatives* and stated that staff continued to focus on data. She noted that HMIS lacked a few key partners. She explained that there was an agenda item for the County's data policy, which stated that any funds approved for a homeless program would be required to be reported into HMIS so that outcomes could be shared with the Board. She indicated that additional work continued with other jurisdictions to find answers within those communities instead of sending people to Washoe County. She mentioned that the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)-funded Shallow Subsidy Program would not increase shelter beds but would house people while they waited for their EHV. She said there were a lot of additional housing units that would be available. She mentioned there would be a large grant from the State to fund the services at the supportive housing building. She noted there was continued work with the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) for community education to align regional processes related to building affordable housing. She acknowledged the Community Services Department (CSD) for their work on the Envision Washoe 2040 to align planning procedures.

Chair Hill thought a lesson learned was that housing was key, because the intent was not for people to live in emergency shelters permanently. She stated that the Board discussed options for support, which involved zoning. She explained that discussing how to address permanent supportive housing, or as Commissioner Andriola called it, dignity housing, should be a future workshop. She said seniors who could not afford to pay

astronomical rents and ended up in homeless shelters, and disabled community members without family needed assistance.

Commissioner Garcia acknowledged that she needed time to digest the data. She agreed that as policymakers, the BCC needed to provide additional tenancy support and access to permanent supportive and affordable housing. She noted that the missing middle needed to be a primary focus for the region. She indicated that progress could not be made if the larger systemic issues were not addressed. She understood that the goal continued to be a focus at the local and State levels. She said moving from 40 percent HMIS compliant to 91 percent was a huge success. She wondered what the holdouts meant and what kept the County from attaining 100 percent. She was curious about what the last 9 percent said was challenging.

Ms. Searcy believed there were a few reasons. She stated they worked with many nonprofits, and there was a cost associated with licensing. She explained that staff addressed that early on with ARPA funding, which put a small amount towards covering licensing for up to two years, with the belief that people would see the benefit. She noted that the structure had been adjusted slightly. She mentioned that interlocal agreements with Clark County were approved at a previous BCC meeting, which updated the way that licensing was handled so that the County could purchase in bulk, which reduced the cost. She said a larger issue was dual systems. She explained that the most significant piece missing from HMIS was health care providers. She noted that there were many systems required to enter the data. She felt that with that extra step, the staff had done all they could to reduce the time required. She noted that the process decreased by approximately three minutes. She said that the idea was that across the community, it would be documented that people visited those locations multiple times.

Commissioner Garcia thanked her for providing the information on where individuals were coming from. She thought the data had been needed for a very long time. She wondered what the most significant barrier was in gathering, collecting, and showcasing data over the 90-day period. Ms. Searcy said the process was very complex and tedious. She explained that the way the team chose to collect data and the unanswered questions had a significant impact. She noted that information was collected inside HMIS and was specific to where people came from. She said that data had been shown in the region a few times, but many questions remained unanswered. She recalled conversations with the Board and the downtown ambassadors in 2024 during which it was made clear that the BCC needed to know where people were sent from and whether they were homeless upon arrival to the County, or after.

Commissioner Andriola explained that it appeared that a high number of people came to the area from California. She hoped Ms. Searcy could explain the reason for staff reaching out to other counties, and the purpose of that was to ask if those counties were sending people to Washoe County. She mentioned that it had already been verified that there were individuals arriving in Washoe County who were from other counties in Nevada. She wondered if Ms. Searcy could speak about how staff handled arrivals from out-of-state and in-state, but from different counties. She believed Washoe County could

not provide everything to every person who came to the area because funds were not available to support that transition.

Ms. Searcy noted that if someone needed help, Washoe County would help them; however, staff would document where the person came from, and a case management phone call would be made to the jurisdiction from which the person came. She shared an example of how that conversation would flow. She said that the staff told other jurisdictions that they were unable to help people from outside of the area and asked that the different jurisdictions not send people to Washoe County. She mentioned that phone calls were tracked, which was a new process without much data to share. She noted that the idea was to track the number of times a jurisdiction had been contacted, and if they continued sending individuals, the situation would be escalated. She explained that there had been conversations across Nevada with rural counties, who said they did not have as many resources as Washoe County. She stated that there was open dialogue about potential solutions in those rural areas. She recognized there was a fine line, and the County could not assist people from other regions. She indicated that the number of people arriving from other counties had started to decrease. She stated that there were conversations about whether the County would be willing to accept funding from outlying areas to help fund the Cares Campus. She said that the Cares Campus was at capacity with waitlists, so that was not an option. She mentioned that staff could share lessons learned, as well as available resources, with other counties, which could potentially help them.

Commissioner Andriola thought that although the phone call tracking system was new, it would be helpful for the BCC to see if there was a pattern. She said she wanted to digest the information and would follow up later. She saw the potential for Ms. Searcy to present to the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), where all 17 counties were represented. She wondered how many individuals were on the waitlist for housing.

Ms. Searcy clarified that everyone who was homeless was waiting for permanent housing. She said that the HUD system was a community queue, and everyone who entered the system was assessed. She indicated that approximately 500 people were on the waitlist for permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing. She said that previously, the number of supportive housing units needed was identified, based on the estimates of the overall population. She noted that she would share that information with the Board.

Commissioner Andriola said she would appreciate receiving that information. She thought she remembered the figure being around 1,100, which Ms. Searcy confirmed. She hoped that the number would continue to decrease as facilities were constructed. She recalled the beginning of Ms. Searcy's presentation, where Ms. Searcy mentioned that since 2021, the goal had been to expand the capacity to build a system where the community could come together to provide services. She acknowledged that the community struggled with the challenges of funding services, but she wondered if there was an opportunity for Washoe County to turn services over to the community in the long term. She noted that Washoe County could be involved in the project management aspect of the Cares Campus, rather than running it. She felt clarification was essential to help with

the BCC's understanding. She acknowledged that the goal could evolve over time. She believed plans could change based on circumstances and wondered if Washoe County would continue in the business of providing homeless services.

Ms. Searcy indicated that the Board would make that decision and set the direction moving forward. She mentioned that Washoe County got into the business because the government needed to support through structure. She noted that staff had met with communities across the Nation to discuss things that were working well and things that were not successful. She explained that due to all the funding issues, government agencies have stepped in, alongside the nonprofits, to ensure the data, funding streams, and the structure of how to work together as a community to identify who is homeless and the most efficient type of housing needed for those individuals. She stated that when that oversight was gone, control was lost, and inefficiencies occurred.

Commissioner Andriola thought that was an important point. She mentioned that the slide that Ms. Searcy presented at the strategic planning meeting, which showed the statistics for Nevada versus Florida, was terrific. She thought that knowing Washoe County was using a Florida model for best practice was encouraging. She said she was not familiar with the ratio of populations but believed that the population of Florida compared to that of Nevada was significantly different. She expressed her appreciation for Washoe County staff who helped get HMIS to where it was for tracking and incorporating the 90-day count, instead of using PIT. She mentioned that PIT was a common practice. She felt that the recent summit that occurred a while back was a good indication of how far the concept had come. She addressed the sequential intercept model (SIM) as an example and wondered if there were discussions to look at a more formal regionalization. She mentioned that there were independent teams and a great jurisdictional connection with the local success. She thought having future policy discussions would help leverage resources. She felt that the timing was right because of the SIM and other achievements of the County. She said there was more work to be done, and there were many housing challenges. She indicated that coordinating at a more formal level with an interlocal agreement would be a critical aspect. She said that there was an abundance of information and wondered if there was a percentage or number of individuals who were in permanent housing, living independently, moving out of homelessness, and were employed. She thought that homelessness would never be non-existent, and unemployment would always be 3 percent or higher. She wondered what the percentage of homeless successes was and if it was possible for a person to be free of homeless services.

Ms. Searcy was unsure if that would be possible, but said staff would continue to track the information. She mentioned that there had been growth compared to when the data was initially shared. She noted that the number increased and would be celebrated because that meant there was more data available in the system, not necessarily that the count was rising. She said that the Human Services Agency (HSA) was in one location, things were more organized, and information was available in HMIS, for the most part, which allowed staff to track trends. She indicated that there was barely enough information to have a good understanding of how many people in the community were homeless. She said that the staff would share information about the housing data using

numbers and housing statistics. She believed that the information would explain how many housing placements into permanent housing came from the work that the County funded monthly. She mentioned that recidivism, of 18 to 24 percent, was directly related to the Cares Campus, Our Place, and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office's (WCSO) Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) team. She noted that recidivism referred to how many individuals were still housed after six months in permanent housing. She indicated that the recidivism rate was currently at 23 percent. She said that statistics would be monitored, and programs would be adjusted to continue to decrease that number. She stated that it was a learning process for tenancy support and case managers. She noted that the County and nonprofits spent time working to help get the support in place for successful long-term housing, and gave the example of the paperwork that had to be filled out each year by the applicant. She said if staff were not available to help with the paperwork, it would be difficult for applicants to complete it without support. She stated that processes were being evaluated to see how staff could be most helpful in achieving as much progress as possible.

Chair Hill thought the goal shown on the slide titled *Shelter & Outreach Outcomes* was 50 per month, but thought staff had only hit 30 per month until recently. She felt the data seemed to have doubled from the original numbers. Ms. Searcy clarified that the goal was for the Cares Campus, which remained consistent at about 30 to 35 a month, and stated that the lack of housing was a barrier. She mentioned the number on the slide referred to all programs. Chair Hill said the County lacked the house, but there were individuals ready to be placed.

Commissioner Clark thanked her for the report. He thought more time could be spent questioning each slide, but instead, he wanted to point out the importance of housing individuals who were not from the area and new enrollments. He said California accounted for 45 percent of the new enrollments, and other areas of Nevada were at 20 percent. He mentioned that those figures totaled 65 percent, and once Washington and Arizona were added, 74 percent of new individuals came to the system from other areas. He felt concerned and believed that the information should be evaluated. He stated that people needed to be housed and sheltered, but there was a housing shortage. He thought the housing shortage could be caused by people from other states coming to the area with money. He believed that asking people where they came from and how long they had been in the area should not be that difficult and could be answered with a few simple questions. He asked for a copy of the letters that had been sent to the other Nevada counties and California. He thought some of the bus tickets were being used to send individuals to different places. He believed that if a person were poor when they came to the area, they likely did not have a lot prior to arriving. He wondered if moving to the Cares Campus improved their life compared to what their life was like before. He felt it was unlikely that somebody automatically became homeless when they got into the County. He alleged that people likely moved to the County to get more than they had previously. He said if Florida was doing a better job, maybe the County should hire Florida to run the Cares Campus and its other programs. He suggested privatizing the Cares Campus and letting someone else run it while Washoe County funded it. He stated that budgetarily, the County would get a better result for the money spent. He thought that there were many ways to improve.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that new enrollment percentages sounded high when framed that way. She clarified that in the past 8 months, there were 97 clients from California, 28 from Las Vegas, and 9 from Carson City. She thought it was important to remember that the whole system would do well if neighboring partners were doing well. She noted the extraordinary work being done in Washoe County but wondered about Las Vegas, Carson City, and the State.

Ms. Searcy said she was not prepared to discuss that topic, but noted that recently, Carson City had conversations with Washoe County and several nonprofits and worked with Karma Box and other programs because they were aware that they lacked resources. She mentioned that, on average, 14 percent of people who were homeless came from outside the County. She explained that in the past, it was easy for jurisdictions to send individuals to Reno or other shelters. She stated that with so much money being invested in programs and services, there was a high demand. In response to Commissioner Clark's request, she clarified that staff did not send a letter but made a personal phone call. She said people were not being penalized for showing up and would be helped. She confirmed that questions were asked to other jurisdictions to find out what their situation was, if they had resources, and if Washoe County could help. She felt it was important for the Board to receive that feedback because staff did what they could, and often those conversations needed to be escalated. She mentioned that funding would be used to find alternate solutions, and that the process was evolving. She said whether people were in larger shelters, no shelters, or housing in converted motel rooms, the County was trying to be a good partner to find common ground.

Chair Hill said she was glad that Commissioner Andriola would address the topic with NACO, because there had been previous discussions with NACO and the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities. She thought it was great that the data was being collected. She mentioned that if the data remained consistent and Washoe County continued serving individuals from around the State, specifically Las Vegas and Carson City, there would need to be a discussion about the problem at the next legislative session. She noted that local jurisdictions that did not have the resources should be evaluated. She explained that resources were needed, and there should be some sort of equity as part of the discussion. She appreciated that people who needed help and had nowhere to go were not being turned away. She indicated that she had spoken to individuals whose lives had changed from staying at the Cares Campus and who were not able to gain stability until there was a place for them to have a bed and clean their clothes and themselves. She said the unhoused may be numbers, but lives were being changed. She mentioned that staff had incredible expertise and were professional caseworkers who were interested in their work. She said they wanted to work for the government because they wanted a job with the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS). She stated that she was glad that the State supported Washoe County with tenancy support and wraparound services for permanent supportive housing. She believed the State should continue to help build programs. She thought that staff needed to be recognized for the difficulty of their jobs. She commended Ms. Searcy and her team for showing up each day and working so hard. She said she was glad that Ms. Searcy was a part of Washoe County and mentioned she would continue to offer her support.

11:33 a.m. Commissioner Clark left the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 6A1 THROUGH 6I1

- 25-0406** **6A1** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Monthly Statements/Reports and Annual Statements/Reports. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0407** **6B1** Recommendation, pursuant to NRS 278.0262(c) and related authorities, to reappoint Rob Pierce, member of the Washoe County Planning Commission to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission for a full-term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2028; or until such time as a successor is appointed, whichever occurs first. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0408** **6C1** Recommendation to accept a renewed National Children’s Alliance (NCA) Chapter Grant to the District Attorney’s Office in the amount of [\$136,249.00, no match required], from the U.S. Department of Justice through the National Children’s Alliance to fund chapter activities including professional services, supplies, registrations, dues, and travel retroactive from January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and retroactively authorize the District Attorney or his designees to sign the cooperative agreement. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0409** **6C2** Recommendation to accept a renewed Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) grant to the District Attorney’s Office in the amount of [\$290,0000, \$72,500 in-kind match], from the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety Office of Traffic Safety to continue funding a Deputy District Attorney IV; retroactive from October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2025; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and retroactively authorize the District Attorney or his designees to sign the cooperative agreement. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0410** **6D1** Approve the installation and operation of audio-visual equipment in the courtrooms of the Second Judicial District Court for the recording of civil and criminal proceedings, in lieu of court reporters, as authorized by NRS 3.380 with approval retroactive to January 1, 2020. District Court. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0411** **6E1** Recommendation to approve the Homeless Programs Data Policy in order to standardize data collection for all programs in Washoe County serving people experiencing homelessness, ensure data is centralized and apply common outcome metrics to best assess program outcomes. The proposed policy will require centralization of the following kinds of data:

client demographics, number of clients served, number of beds available, and program outcomes. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).

- 25-0412** **6E2** Recommendation to accept a Built for Zero System Infrastructure Community Investment from Community Solutions in the amount of [\$37,525.00; no county match] retroactive for the period May 9, 2025 through September 9, 2025 to develop Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reporting dashboards and consultation on the web embedding on the county website for the Housing and Homeless Services; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0413** **6F1** Recommendation to reappoint Tami Ruf as a Trustee to the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees for a consecutive four-year term pursuant to NRS 379.020(3) beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on June 30, 2029, or until a successor Trustee is appointed. Library. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0414** **6G1** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$2,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2024-2025; District 3 Commissioner Mariluz Garcia recommends a [\$2,000.00] grant to the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID) - a government entity - to support a free swim day and complimentary popsicles at the Sun Valley Pool on July 5, 2025; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager. (Commission District 3.).
- 25-0415** **6H1** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Forensic Support Services Agreements between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and various Local Law Enforcement Agencies: Churchill County Sheriff's Office \$113,117; Elko Police Department \$120,658; Lander County Sheriff's Office \$25,137; Mineral County Sheriff's Office \$18,853 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 with a total income of [\$277,765.00]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0416** **6I1** Recommendation to approve the acceptance of the Secretary of State's Budget appropriation to Washoe County in the amount of [\$189,387.50] for reimbursement for ballot stock and envelopes for the 2024 General Election (NAC 293.200). No match required. The award period is retroactive from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. If approved, direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Voters. (All Commission Districts.).

On the call for public comment, Ms. Eileen Ecklund, a resident of Sparks, asked the Board to reappoint Tami Ruf to the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees (LBT). She said public libraries had endured significant disruption and turmoil over the last few years. She mentioned that future funding was unclear with the defeat of Washoe County Question Number One (WC-1). She stated that following the resignation of the library director, the trustees were set to launch a search for a new director. She noted that the libraries needed strong and stable leadership amid the instability. She suggested that strong leadership should be the highest priority for the library system going forward and thought that reappointing Ms. Ruf would be an essential first step. She said Ms. Ruf served on the LBT for over a year and understood libraries' challenges. She felt that Ms. Ruf, a former librarian, was the only trustee with practical experience and knowledge of how libraries operated. She believed that Ms. Ruf would maintain control to guide the libraries as they navigated the difficult economic times ahead. She trusted that Ms. Ruf would continue to support the library's commitment to inclusivity and maintaining the community's access to a wide variety of books and experiences. She stated that libraries provided an incredible wealth of information and activities and were places for everyone to come together and build a community, particularly in challenging times. She thanked the Board for their ongoing support of an essential community resource.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Clark absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 6A1 through 6I1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 6A1 through 6I1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 7, 8, 9, AND 11

25-0417 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Recommendation to approve the asset reassignment of multiple vehicles from various Washoe County Departments to Equipment Services Fund; and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the appropriate asset adjustments [estimated net \$1,886,971.11]. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.).

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 7 be approved and directed.

25-0418 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to approve the use of Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Contingency in the amount of [\$1,753,364] in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 to increase expenditure authority in the Risk Management Fund, the Roads Fund, and the Utilities Fund, to pay non-reimbursable costs incurred by Washoe County to mitigate the effects of the July 21, 2024 flash flood impacts to Hidden Valley Regional Park, public roads, and sewer and utility

infrastructure, for debris removal, drainage reconstruction, trail reconstruction, sewer and utility equipment replacement and repairs, and direct Finance and Comptroller to make the necessary budget appropriation and cash transfers. Finance. (All Commission Districts.).

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 8 be approved and directed.

25-0419 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to 1) approve the Fiscal Year 2025 use of General Fund Contingency in the amount of [\$5,473,689] to increase expenditure authority in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and 2) acknowledge necessary General Fund net zero, cross function appropriation transfers of [\$2,482,026.09] to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, both actions in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005, required to move non-departmental budget from one function to another function so as to bring the budget authority to the level of anticipated actual expenditures required for Fiscal Year 2025; both the Contingency and net zero budget appropriation transfers are associated with the net impact of the unbudgeted Collective Bargaining Agreements approved after the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2025 final budget; and, if approved, 3) direct Finance to make the budget appropriation transfers prior to June 30, 2025 (net impact to County is zero). Finance. (All Commission Districts.).

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 9 be approved, acknowledged, and directed.

25-0420 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to: (1) Accept a Supportive Housing Development Fund award from the State of Nevada Housing Division in the amount of [\$5,595,378.00; \$3,857,360.68 in-kind match] for the period of June 17, 2025 through June 30, 2031 to provide clinical services, support services, operations, training and administration activities at the Nevada Cares Campus, Permanent Supportive Housing building; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments; (2) Approve reclassification of Eligibility Certification Specialist (ECS) II position (70000972), pay grade 12, to Mental Health Counselor Supervisor, pay grade 17 [\$64,563.00] and reclassification of Eligibility Certification Specialist (ECS) II position (70000971), pay grade 12, to Mental Health Counselor II, pay grade 16 [\$43,952.00] contingent and effective upon Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) review and approval.

Both positions will be funded 50% on the Supportive Housing Development Grant and 50% in a Homelessness fund cost center. All reclassification costs will be absorbed in this grant award. As this grant funds positions, if grant funding is reduced or eliminated, the position hours will be reduced and/or the positions will be abolished accordingly unless additional funding is secured; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments; and direct the Human Resources Department to make the necessary staffing adjustments as evaluated by the JEC; and (3) Approve Amendment #5 to the contract currently awarded to Volunteers of America, Greater Sacramento and Northern Nevada (VOA) for Operator of the Emergency Shelter on the Nevada Cares Campus, authorizing an increase in the amount of [\$248,538.00] to support of the retention and recruitment of shelter staff and additional staffing and operations needs to operate the Nevada Cares Campus and an increase of [\$238,169.00] to add the 24/7 VOA staff coverage for the Cares Campus Permanent Supportive Housing building to provide oversight and support of the tenants within the common spaces and individual tenant units for a total not to exceed [\$7,588,852.00] the term of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).

11:37 a.m. **Commissioner Clark returned to the meeting.**

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock said there appeared to be a lot of funding for the Cares Campus, which she felt was confusing. She noted a portion of the item stated that there was a grant from the State of over \$5 million, and another for over \$3 million, which was an in-kind match. She wondered if that meant that Washoe County taxpayers would match the \$9 million. She mentioned that another portion of the item amended the contract for the Volunteers of America (VOA). She was not familiar with the original VOA contract and felt that the information was difficult to obtain. She alleged that public records requests (PRR) were nearly impossible to receive a response to. She thought that the total of the three amounts, unless the \$3 million was an in-kind match that Washoe County taxpayers paid for, was \$12.5 million. She asked for clarification whether that amount was over and above the \$44 million already in the budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 through 2026. She suggested that taxpayers wanted to know where the \$12.5 million was coming from. She said it was unclear to her why the VOA was receiving a significant increase. She thought it appeared to be a permanent supportive housing building. She mentioned that the item stated not to exceed \$7.5 million. She believed that taxpayers had many questions regarding the funding.

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 9 be accepted, authorized, directed, and approved.

11:38 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

11:51 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

AGENDA ITEM 10 Discussion and possible action to approve a plan to recruit and select a Washoe County Manager, including authorizing the Department of Human Resources to contract with an executive search firm to conduct the recruitment; to appoint Assistant County Manager Kate Thomas as Interim County Manager for the period of July 1, 2025, until the Interim County Manager vacates the position or a permanent County Manager is appointed; and to authorize a 10% non-PERS compensable special salary increase to Ms. Thomas's July 1, 2025 hourly base rate of pay (\$150.61) while she serves in the capacity as Interim County Manager. The non-PERS compensable special salary adjustment is estimated to cost a maximum of \$1,222.00 per pay period (80 hours). The total cost per the estimated timeline (i.e., interim appointment period of July 1, 2025, through January 5, 2026) is \$16,502. The fiscal impact shall be absorbed within the fiscal year 26 adopted budget of the Office of the County Manager. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)

Compensation and Recruitment Human Resources (HR) Manager Julie Paholke conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Tentative Timeline and Recruitment Process for Washoe County Manager (2 slides); June 17, 2025; July 9, 2025-July 18, 2025; July 21, 2025-August 1, 2025; September 2, 2025-October 3, 2025; October 23-25, 2025; October 28, 2025 – November 4, 2025; Thank you. She read from the second *Tentative Timeline and Recruitment Process for Washoe County Manager* slide regarding the recruitment timeline, anticipated start date, and the soliciting of proposals from the executive search firms for the County Manager. She noted that the proposals would be received from June 17 to July 8, 2025. She mentioned that the executive search firms preferred three weeks to compile recruitment information and indicated that HR would include tentative timelines to the executive search firm to ensure expectations were clear.

Ms. Paholke referred to the *July 9, 2025-July 18, 2025* slide regarding HR's consultation timeline with the Chair and Vice Chair to review the recruitment proposals. She explained that interviews would be scheduled with prospective executive search firms on July 14 through July 18, 2025, and that the process for the County Manager recruitment was similar to the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Chief recruitment. She read from the *July 21, 2025 - August 1, 2025* slide regarding the development of the recruitment process and outreach plan, which was contingent on the executive search firm's schedule. She communicated that HR hoped the executive search firm would conduct recruitment in August; however, it depended on the executive search firm's schedule.

Ms. Paholke read from the *September 2, 2025 - October 3, 2025* slide regarding the timeline to identify top candidates whom HR, the Chair, and Vice Chair would like to perform background checks on. She recalled that HR went through the entire recruitment process before conducting background checks on candidates in the past, which left HR waiting for the background checks to clear before hiring the candidate. She indicated that the background check would be conducted first during the recruitment to ensure disqualifications were identified sooner. She referred to the *October 23-25, 2025*

slide regarding the meet and greet timeline for the top candidates and stakeholders. She reiterated that the process was similar to the TMFPD Chief recruitment and that she desired three meet and greets due to the many stakeholders' schedules. She said that the locations for the meet and greets would be identified by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and that a special session would take place on October 27, 2025, with the top candidates.

Ms. Paholke explained that the appointment of Assistant County Manager (ACM) Kate Thomas as interim County Manager would go into effect July 1, 2025, through the new County Manager's start date. She indicated that ACM Thomas would receive a 10 percent increase while in the interim position. She noted that staff members were entitled to a 10 percent increase when serving in an acting capacity and performing the entire job of another position. She mentioned that ACM Thomas would receive the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) increase and the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) decrease in July.

Chair Hill believed there was confusion about the salary increase designation for ACM Thomas. She asked if ACM Thomas's pay while she was interim County Manager was based on the approved ACM salary instead of County Manager Eric Brown's current salary. HR Director Patricia Hurley confirmed that the ACM and County Manager positions had a 12.4 percent difference in pay. She explained that by providing the interim County Manager a 10 percent pay increase that was not PERS compensable, a gap of 2.4 percent would occur. She indicated that \$16,000 in additional wages for ACM Thomas was an approximate amount, should she begin on July 1, 2025, and continue until January 5, 2026. She noted that the amount could be less if a new County Manager were hired before January 5, 2026.

Chair Hill noted that the ACMs were amazing, and that she initially wanted the two ACMs to rotate the interim County Manager position; however, she was told by the District Attorney's (DA) Office and HR that having the two rotate was not best practice. She mentioned that the staff needed one individual to report to. She hoped that ACM David Solaro would manage special projects while ACM Thomas acted as the point of contact for the Office of the County Manager (OCM). She believed that ACM Thomas would manage the OCM well and appreciated the work HR put into the recruitment.

Commissioner Clark requested to be allowed to ask ACM Thomas questions. Chair Hill inquired if that was allowed. Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large indicated that the agenda item was not labeled as a recruitment, and the BCC had the discretion to ask questions.

Commissioner Clark indicated that his biggest concern with County Manager Eric Brown was the process of sharing public records and asked ACM Thomas how she envisioned the County's role in sharing public records in a timely fashion. He thought that all public records, besides HR concerns, should be easily accessible to the public and recalled that a judge was recently told that their public records request (PRR) would not be fulfilled until October. Ms. Thomas noted that her role as interim County Manager would be to work with the BCC and staff to decide how to organize processes

and better understand what the BCC would like done differently. She thought that the PRR procedure could be reorganized and that the County owed the community a level of public transparency. She indicated that the OCM followed the BCC's desired policy, and it was not the County Manager's discretion. Commissioner Clark knew it was not solely the County Manager's job to handle PRRs, but he felt that others in management positions shared records in an untimely fashion. He communicated that anything that the County Manager could do to make progress was appreciated.

Commissioner Clark felt that it was almost impossible for him to get items on the agenda. He mentioned his request for a City of Reno representative to provide a horse fencing presentation to the BCC. He heard about horse fencing from a recent South Valleys Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) meeting and thought that it was important for all residents to understand what occurred on County property. He did not think it was harmful to share information; however, the request to have the discussion and presentation at a BCC meeting was denied. He asked ACM Thomas if she would assist the Commissioners in getting their items placed on the agenda. ACM Thomas commented that consistent processing that was open, transparent, and inclusive was part of the recommendations in the Raftelis report. She communicated that the OCM looked forward to putting items on agendas in a way that made sense for the BCC. She believed that there was room for improvement. Commissioner Clark speculated there was a lot of room for improvement and felt that people needed to understand that an agenda item was not automatically approved. He explained that items on the agenda were open for discussion to better understand how the BCC felt about the matter. He did not expect anyone to vote in favor of something he proposed, but he expected a robust discussion to be had. He speculated that not placing something on the agenda when requested was the opposite of transparency. He recalled that it was suggested at the recent South Valleys CAB meeting that there be quarterly evening meetings for individuals with day jobs. He opined that it was a simple request; however, it was denied placement on an agenda. He reported that there were other cities that held evening meetings for those who worked during the day. ACM Thomas expressed that she looked forward to a collaborative discussion regarding how to improve the agenda process.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She noted that she was excited that Chair Hill wanted to rotate the interim County Manager position between the two ACMs. She expressed concern regarding the appointment of ACM Thomas as interim County Manager and referred to the distributed document, which contained a lawsuit regarding ACM Thomas when she worked for the City of Reno. She said she was shocked to read about the lawsuit and worried that ACM Thomas would make herself, staff, and public officials feel unsafe. She said ACM Thomas had an established history of criticizing and making light of others. She believed that ACM Thomas did not have the experience, knowledge, or budget understanding to be the County Manager. She indicated that former Human Services Agency (HSA) Director Amber Howell was concerned about a violation of the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) policy that ACM Thomas was involved in. She explained that Sober 24 was involved in a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) case and speculated that the FBI was investigating ACM

Thomas's involvement. She recalled that former Registrar of Voters (ROV) Cari Ann Burgess filed a lawsuit regarding an event that took place during an election. She asked the BCC to reconsider the appointment of ACM Thomas as interim County Manager.

Ms. Roblyn Williams expressed opposition to the appointment of ACM Thomas as the interim County Manager. She disagreed with a pay increase during a budget deficit unless it was a raise for government officials. She recalled that she observed the 2024 election while ACM Thomas was acting in an interim position. She reported that a live ballot scanner with Wi-Fi capability was removed from the counting room during an active election. She explained that when she asked ACM Thomas and ROV Andrew McDonald where the ballot scanner was, they ignored her. She noted that she asked ACM Thomas where the scanner was after hours and was informed that the scanner was moved to a public warehouse on Rock Boulevard, which she noted was under no mandatory observation or security cameras. She communicated that citizens did not feel comfortable or confident in the elections. She commented that the BCC hired Mr. McDonald, who she believed was part of the 2024 election's failure. She felt that hiring Ms. Thomas would lead to a continued constituent division. She opined that the FBI would likely perform a forensic audit, which she welcomed and looked forward to.

Vice Chair Herman believed that the public commenters were brave to share information and indicated that public commenters attempted to assist the BCC in making the right decision. She suggested that Agenda Item 10 be tabled until the BCC was able to research the allegations made against ACM Thomas and maintain the respect of the citizens. She thought that the BCC could choose someone different and that the allegations were worrisome. She recalled that the allegations against ACM Thomas were brought before the BCC many times, which bothered her because it put a suspicion on the BCC.

Commissioner Clark reported that he had a long history with Ms. Thomas. He recalled that individuals were worried about the budget and lawsuits; however, he was willing to move forward with the appointment of ACM Thomas as interim County Manager, based on her answers. He said that he may receive criticism from people for his decision, but he was willing to support the appointment if ACM Thomas was held accountable for her answers. He noted he had planned to recuse himself before hearing Ms. Thomas's answers to his questions. Chair Hill appreciated Commissioner Clark's open-mindedness. She communicated that ACM Thomas had an incredible career in Nevada government. She recalled that ACM Thomas served in the Secretary of State's (SOS) Office, worked at the City of Reno and managed their budget, and was a committed public servant at the County. She said it upset her when accusations were made about a candidate that she believed was overly qualified for the position and would do a great job.

Commissioner Clark indicated that Chair Hill could assist with getting items on the agenda and ensuring accessible public records. He noted that there was a new County Manager and a new District Attorney (DA) in the meetings and thought that the spirit of the County should be to provide transparent records without impediment. He thought there had been an obstruction of public records over the past five years, which started with his predecessor. He said that he had been with the County for roughly 11 years and recalled

that the departments used to answer their own PRRs when he was the Assessor. He noted that the Assessor did not need Washoe 311 or attorneys to assist in PRRs. He mentioned that all department heads should answer their own PRRs because the centralized clearing house had the appearance of hiding records. He felt all records should be made public when requested because the taxpayers funded everything the County did, including the building, maintenance, and staff. He speculated that the distrust of the government would be removed if ACM Thomas were truthful in her answers to him and worked to streamline processes. He opined that it was disrespectful not to share records when the public requested them and asked Chair Hill and ACM Thomas to help remedy the process.

Commissioner Andriola appreciated that the Raftelis report provided clarity and transparency. She thought that the commitment from ACM Solaro to research the execution of the report and balance the workload of the OCM was commendable. She thought the Raftelis report was a great opportunity to make a change that would allow the new County Manager to embrace progress and transparency. She shared that the interim County Manager would be in their position for a short time, and changes would have to go through the BCC. She indicated that the Raftelis report was a guideline to get business done and provided an opportunity for beneficial communal change. She commented that she would support ACM Thomas as the interim County Manager and appreciated the staff who organized the recruitment. She believed the recent hiring process for the TMFPD Chief went well. She thought that providing the BCC with a voice in the recruitment process was welcomed. She commended ACM Thomas for her hard work and professional relationship with ACM Solaro to ensure communication was the top priority. She looked forward to the County Manager recruitment process and the possibilities it could lead to.

Commissioner Garcia thanked County Manager Eric Brown for his service and ACMs Thomas and Solaro for their collaboration and teamwork. She was confident that ACM Thomas would be a great interim County Manager.

Commissioner Clark requested information about Manager Brown's payout and whether the County was saving money with Manager Brown's retirement.

Chair Hill asked that the Commissioners provide her or HR with questions for the new County Manager. She felt like she could have done a better job as a liaison in the TMFPD Chief's recruitment regarding questions. She asked the Commissioners to inform her or HR if there were desired traits or experience desired for the new County Manager, so she and HR could ensure those aspects were expressed during the recruitment.

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

25-0422 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to appoint one candidate to the Washoe County open seat on the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council (NLJRCC) for a two-year term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027, pursuant to Assembly Bill 236 (2019), now

codified at NRS 176.014. Candidates include: Amy Baker, Brian Erbis, Darrin Rice, Andrea E. Schumann, and Danielle Shelley. Manager.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Andrea Schumann stated that she was a long-term Nevada resident who grew up in Fallon, Churchill County. She noted that she was a probation officer for that area and Lyon County. She said she lived in Sparks with her family and had children and grandchildren. She mentioned that while being a probation officer, she managed diverse responsibilities and believed many would be beneficial in the position. She explained that she worked with treatment centers and incarcerated juveniles, where they worked hard to find resources. She noted that although her office tried to maintain everything themselves, they also used Washoe County's services. She stated that she understood the need for additional resources.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the results, naming Ms. Schumann as the selected candidate. Chair Hill indicated she would need a formal motion to appoint Ms. Schumann to the NLJRCC.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ms. Andrea Schumann be appointed to the NLJCC for a two-year term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027.

25-0423 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to appoint, per NRS 501.260, one candidate to the Public Seat on the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (WCABMW), with a term beginning on July 1, 2025 and ending on June 30, 2028. Candidates include: Thuy Carpenter, Luke Elliott, Brian E. Erbis, Kaylie Hardy, Jesse Huntsman, Julie Karabelas, Brandon Karatz, Wayne M. Lund, Kristie Marchese, Rob Pierce, Daniel C. Scinto, Frederick Shafer, Shea Sliter, Caron L. Tayloe, and Brian Ward. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Ms. Penny Brock was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Caron Tayloe stated she had been a Washoe County resident since her childhood. She hoped her application spoke for itself. She shared that she had attended WCABMW meetings for nearly 16 years and considered herself a strong wildlife advocate. She mentioned that she had fished but was not a hunter. She said that she respected the long tradition of hunting in Nevada and noted that hunters were a great conservation resource. She felt that the WCABMW needed additions and fresh ideas. She explained her concerns regarding population problems with wildlife in Nevada, not only mule deer, but also other wildlife species. She noted that she had ideas to present if selected for the WCABMW. She said that she would appreciate the Board's consideration for the vital position in Nevada culture and heritage.

Mr. Jesse Huntsman thanked the Board for the opportunity to introduce himself. He appreciated Commissioner Clark's comment regarding alternate meeting

times. He indicated that he had to take the day off to attend the meeting because he was a laborer. He stated that he and his wife were lifelong residents, and he was a candidate for the WCABMW. He felt that he had a good understanding of what sportsmen wanted, and he could be helpful. He explained that he had many networks in the community. He noted that he was very active and was involved in various volunteer projects. He would be happy to help in any way possible, whether it was being on the WCABMW or something else.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the Commissioners' votes aloud naming Ms. Tayloe as the selected candidate. Chair Hill indicated she would need a formal motion to appoint Ms. Tayloe to the WCABMW.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that that Ms. Caron Tayloe be appointed to the WCABMW for a two-year term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027.

25-0424 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code ("WCC") Chapter 45 and, if supported, set a public hearing for second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance on July 8, 2025. If passed, the proposed ordinance will: 1) repeal WCC 45.430 (Adult Day Health Services/Daybreak Program) in its entirety; 2) modify WCC 45.410 (Division Directors) to reflect gender-neutral language, correct job title, and selection process; 3) modify WCC 45.435 (Homemaker Program) to include permissive language and address any limitation based on funding availability; 4) modify WCC 45.445 (Nutrition Program) to include permissive language and address any limitation based on funding availability; 5) modify WCC 45.450 (Representative Payee Program) to include permissive language, provide for management of funding, and address any limitation based on funding availability; and 6) modify WCC 45.455 (Human Services Program) to reflect caseworkers' correct job title. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1931.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1931 was introduced by Commissioner Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

25-0425 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to approve a Contractor Agreement between Washoe County, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, and Royal Ambulance, Inc. a California corporation authorized to do business in the State of Nevada to provide emergency medical services for a two and a half year term to the Gerlach area of Washoe County effective July 1, 2025 and ending December 31, 2027 with an option for a two year

extension. [annual cost \$603,000.00]. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro indicated that providing fire and emergency medical services (EMS) in Gerlach was very difficult for the County. He recalled that various attempts were made over the years and that there used to be a robust volunteer fire department in that area that provided services. He noted that the Gerlach Volunteer Fire Department (GVFD) was fantastic, but the volunteers had decreased with the Empire Mine recently reopened, and the community's needs had changed. He mentioned that the GVFD was trying their best to perform the duties and services needed; however, it was challenging to maintain a group of strong volunteers with a population of about 140 individuals. He explained that the County had contracted with volunteers and the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD), while additionally creating a County fire department and hiring staff to assist the volunteers. He reported that the recent interlocal agreement with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (PLPT) to provide fire services and EMS in Gerlach had ceased on February 28, 2025, because the PLPT needed to focus on areas within their tribal boundaries. He relayed that there were not many providers who could assist the GVFD, including the TMFPD, the Regional Emergency Medical Service Agency (REMSA), and Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC). He detailed that the Burning Man Project recommended Royal Ambulance Inc. because they provided services during the Burning Man Festival. He communicated that the amount of money budgeted for fire services and EMS in Gerlach was about \$652,000 and pointed out that working with fire personnel and the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) with the limited budget was daunting. He reported that hiring three people would push the service costs to be over \$750,000.

ACM Solaro mentioned that Royal Ambulance Inc. gave a proposal to provide continuous, year-round paramedic and emergency medical technician (EMT) services in the community, which the County could not afford. He pointed out that Royal Ambulance Inc. provided a new proposal of non-stop, year-round paramedic service; however, three months out of the year, an EMT would not be available. He explained that Royal Ambulance Inc. was working with the State of Nevada to understand what licensing was required. He noted that further discussion with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) regarding the use of General Fund contingency to hire an EMT for the three missing months may be needed. He thought that fire services and EMS were an emergency requirement to assist the Gerlach community. He reported that he could not locate a State law or Washoe County Code (WCC) that required the County to provide services to Gerlach. He noted that the TMFPD was created for unincorporated Washoe County up to Township 22, which was midway through Warm Springs Valley, and did not include Red Rock. He communicated that there were no dedicated taxes to pay for services in Gerlach, but there were interlocal and mutual aid agreements with many agencies for some fire and wildland services. He believed that it was essential to take care of the residents of Gerlach and that the contract with Royal Ambulance Inc. was the best solution he could come up with in a short amount of time. He recalled that he visited Gerlach in March to discuss the needs of the community, and the majority voted for non-stop service and paramedic services. He commented that he attended the Gerlach Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)

meeting, and there were questions regarding the use of the fire station. He noted that he was previously unaware that there was no contract, license, or lease for the County to use the fire station. He said Washoe County provided funding to expand the bays at the fire station, and he had to finalize the final components of that. He explained that he was under the impression that the fire station was similar to the Senior Center and that the Gerlach General Improvement District (GGID) owned the land, with the County having a lease on the building; however, that was not the case. He noted staff were working through the details of dispatch services and transition with the PLPT, but he needed to get an item before the Board for consideration to continue the service or explore other options.

Vice Chair Herman thanked ACM Solaro for his hard work. She noted that the situation was temporary and that it should continue to be worked on. She recalled that the blue ribbon report regarding fire service assistance was presented during her first or second year as a Commissioner. She explained that at one point, there were 30 volunteers at the GVFD, and she believed that the volunteers were saviors who assisted the community. She relayed that residents were concerned about their homes burning every summer. She reported that the BCC voted against the blue ribbon report, which she believed started a significant issue in Gerlach. She indicated that ACM Solaro attempted to remedy concerns, and she looked forward to hearing from the Gerlach constituents. She said that Gerlach was two hours away and that there must be a way to get previous services back to Gerlach. She did not want people to die in their homes due to a lack of fire service.

Chair Hill thanked Vice Chair Herman for her passion towards Gerlach.

Commissioner Clark thought that it was incumbent upon the BCC to do everything in their power to support the citizens of Gerlach. He said that Gerlach used to have a vibrant volunteer fire department, and he was unsure what happened to it. He recalled that Washoe Valley used to have a volunteer fire department. He believed that it was a good opportunity to work with the TMFPD Chief to see how the BCC could assist the rural parts of the County with volunteer services. He wanted to ensure the constituents were protected.

On the call for public comment, GVFD President Lisa Nash explained that the GVFD consisted of three all-risk members who could perform any task, two fire-specific volunteers, and six administrative members. She noted that the administrative members attempted to recruit new volunteers; however, Gerlach was a small community, and volunteers were held to the same standard as paid staff. She mentioned that the volunteer association supported the GVFD's training and fees. She reluctantly supported the proposed services from Royal Ambulance Inc. if it was an interim service. She felt that there were unclear details regarding the GVFD's role, who the volunteers would report to, how they would fund equipment, and how they would obtain insurance or fuel. She believed that there were legal issues with Royal Ambulance Inc. using the GVFD's branding without proper agreement or permission. She felt that the agreement granted Royal Ambulance Inc. access to the GVFD; however, the County did not own the property, and there was no provision in the agreement that allowed the fire station to be used by the GVFD. She referred to Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section E, and said she believed that

the apparatus would not be under the purview of Royal Ambulance Inc., as they were not a fire department and should be removed from the contract. She pointed out that the GVFD would need the apparatus if they were to create their own department. She commented that Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section Q, improperly allowed Royal Ambulance Inc. to use the GVFD's name without agreement or consent. She asserted that the GVFD asked to be removed from the contract because they were a separate entity and not subject to assignment or use of the name or branding by the County. She opined that the staffing of one paramedic from December to March violated Nevada's EMS regulations and had not been submitted for State approval. She said that Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section G, Part B, threatened to unravel the entire plan in five months due to staffing concerns. She relayed that there was a history of instability, and Gerlach was left unsupported due to shifting oversight and no sustained plans. She expressed that the agreement was not enough, and a functional plan required urgent collaboration from all parties.

Mr. Russel Bierle agreed with Ms. Nash's comments and said that there was time to present a lease to the GGID Board. He explained that the GGID Board expressed a willingness to have an emergency meeting within two weeks. He mentioned that if a lease were approved, it would be the third lease with the County for the use of the property. He pointed out that there was a lease for staff housing for the Washoe County Roads yard and the Gerlach Senior Center lease, which made him believe there was no reason another lease could not be created for the use of the fire station by July 1. He reported that the plan was not approved by the State and felt there was no indication that they would approve the plan. He said that the State informed him that one paramedic for Gerlach's level of coverage was illegal in Nevada. He was unsure if that meant the agreement would never go into effect or if he had until December 1, when the EMT was off duty for three months, to think of another solution. He thanked ACM Solaro for researching options. He looked forward to collaborating with ACM Solaro to keep the fire service uninterrupted in Gerlach.

Ms. Elisabeth Gambrell was appreciative that the discussion around fire services and EMS in Gerlach continued. She said that the original member of the GVFD became overwhelmed by their regular day jobs and the drive to TMFPD training. She asked the BCC to consider local training for the volunteers because Gerlach was two hours from any major city in the County. She believed that expecting the volunteers to drive four hours round-trip for training was dysfunctional. She corrected ACM Solaro and said that the population of the area was roughly 420 because it was not only Gerlach residents. She noted that fire services, EMS, and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) had to cover 2,200 square miles. She recalled that a recent fire caused a home to burn down; however, the GVFD prevented any injuries. She reported that the average age in Gerlach was around 57 to 60 years old, and while there were younger individuals moving to Gerlach, they had full-time jobs and needed training. She said that 87 percent of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) owned land was in District 5, with very little occupied by homeowners or ranchers. She pointed out that the County received over \$4 million from the federal government, due to unused BLM land, to support fire services in neighborhoods surrounded by federal land that could not pay for it. She recalled that ACM Solaro held a meeting with the community, who provided feedback about wanting necessary health and welfare services because there were many aged individuals in Gerlach. She did not recall

the three-month gap without an EMT being discussed with the community members. She was not happy with the three-month gap and agreed with Mr. Bierle's comments.

Ms. Tina Walters noted that Gerlach was part of Washoe County and should have fire services and EMS like the rest of the area. She agreed with Vice Chair Herman's comments regarding the agreement being a temporary solution. She hoped that a longer-term solution would present itself. She recalled that she volunteered in 2016 when discouraged volunteers quit. She indicated that the current volunteers would love to work with the County to create a long-term solution and thanked ACM Solaro for his continued hard work.

Royal Ambulance Inc. Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) John Rey Hassan thanked ACM Solaro and Vice Chair Herman for their work on the agreement. He asserted that Royal Ambulance Inc. was dedicated to working collaboratively and in partnership with all stakeholders and agencies to do what they could to support Gerlach. He explained that Royal Ambulance Inc. appreciated the Gerlach community and relayed that providing critical services was a unique opportunity. He pointed out that Royal Ambulance Inc. had no desire to take over the area and displace volunteers. He said that the goal was to work collaboratively and do what they could to be part of the community. He indicated that Royal Ambulance Inc. had been in business for over 20 years and performed over 100,000 responses annually in the Bay Area. He reported that Royal Ambulance Inc. employed over 900 EMTs, paramedics, and nurses and served at several major events and sporting venues. He thought the agreement allowed Royal Ambulance Inc. to leverage its industry knowledge, experience, and operations to help support a community in need. He mentioned that the three-month gap was a proposal due to financial constraints, and if the BCC would like to approve an extended plan, there would be no issue in providing an EMT for the three-month gap.

Chair Hill recalled that staff provided a detailed report of Incline Village taxes and services. She explained that the report said that the County was supplementing Incline Village and Crystal Bay, which was new information that she shared with the community. She wondered if a detailed report for Gerlach could be performed while the contract was discussed to find out how much of what the County provided was captured. She thought it would be beneficial to have a holistic financial outlook that would allow the BCC to develop a long-term plan. She assumed that Gerlach had not reached their tax cap. ACM Solaro confirmed that Gerlach had not reached their tax cap.

Commissioner Garcia said that \$4.5 million in grant funding was received in 2024 but was not earmarked for anything specific. She asked for a better understanding of how the funds were spent. She wondered if they could designate funds for Gerlach.

Chair Hill mentioned that it seemed like Vice Chair Herman wished to move forward with the agreement, with further BCC discussion in the future. Vice Chair Herman confirmed Chair Hill's assumption and believed that there was a lot of work to do.

Commissioner Garcia noted that speaking to the BCC's congressional delegates would be beneficial. She understood that nothing at the federal level was certain; however, a future bill draft request (BDR) could provide advocacy for the community.

Commissioner Clark expressed that Ms. Nash, Mr. Bierle, and Ms. Gambrell had good questions. He referred to Ms. Walters' comments regarding BLM land and indicated that a certain percentage of the funds should be allotted to Gerlach because federal lands made up a large portion of the area. He explained that extra charges on Burning Man tickets or donations during the festival could be beneficial for the GVFD. He felt that money could be allocated in the budget for specific Gerlach fire services. He supported assisting the County's rural areas in any way he could.

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 approved.

25-0426 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Public hearing and possible action to: (1) consider a report of each property delinquent on its utility charges and the amount of each property's delinquency, along with any objections to the report; and, (2) After considering the report and any objections to it, determine whether to adopt the report and correspondingly adopt Resolution 25-037 to collect certain delinquent utility charges on the tax roll. All Assessor Parcel Numbers of affected properties are listed in Resolution 25-037 accessible as a linked attachment on the agenda on the county commission's webpage [total delinquent amount of \$225,547.75].

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro said the process was done annually. He explained that individuals with delinquent charges were moved to the tax roll after the County attempted multiple times to collect payment. He mentioned that the Board had the opportunity to hear any objections from the public.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be considered.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be considered.

25-0427 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 5 (Administration and Personnel) by revising provisions related to citizens advisory boards (CABs). These updates include amending various sections: to clarify that the purpose of the CABs are to advise the county commissioner in whose district the CAB is located, as well as the county

commission, on matters of concern within Washoe County's governmental jurisdiction; to require that the geographical boundaries of the CABs fall within a single commissioner district; to update provisions related to board membership, such as allowing persons residing within one mile of the geographical boundaries of the CABs to serve as board members, requiring applications to be kept on file for one year rather than 3.5 years, and requiring the terms for alternates to align with the terms of board members; to remove a prohibition on CAB members from concurrently serving on the County's planning commission and/or board of adjustment; to amend various provisions to comply with current Nevada open meeting law requirements and remove provisions duplicative of state law; to update provisions related to enactment of bylaws; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1739, Bill No. 1927.

Chair Hill asked if the Board needed a staff presentation on this agenda item, and it was determined that no presentation was needed.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Heidi Soper greeted the Board and introduced herself as the Vice Chair of the Sun Valley Citizens Advisory Board (CAB). She noted that she had several topics to discuss quickly. She understood that the Board wanted to change CABs to be within the district of only one Commissioner. She explained that the Sun Valley CAB was within both Districts 3 and 5. She asked why the Sun Valley CAB was the only one that was expected to comply with those changes, as she had been told that there were two other CABs that were also within multiple districts under different Commissioners that were not expected to make that change. She hoped that such matters would change, as she believed what would be suitable for one CAB would be good for all of them. She asked the Board to clarify the language in the meeting's agenda regarding extending CAB boundaries by one mile to allow bordering residences to participate in CAB membership. She asked whether those residences within the border would be included in the CAB. She stated that while the agenda notes indicated that those residences would be included, that language did not align with what Commissioner Garcia had told her when they had spoken on the matter. Ms. Soper acknowledged that she might have misunderstood Commissioner Garcia. Ms. Soper noted that while the acronym *CAB* would continue to stand for *Citizens Advisory Board*, she wondered what the CABs were advising their Commissioners of. She explained that she would understand what CAB members were meant to advise Commissioners on if CABs had developers to inform them of their projects, discuss land use issues, or explain the use of taxes. She noted that nothing similar to those actions from developers had happened. Ms. Soper reported that the Sun Valley CAB was informed during their previous meeting that their meetings were being changed, which she supposed was due to the County budget. She explained that the Sun Valley CAB met on the first Saturday of every month at 10:00 am. She recounted that during their previous meeting, members of the Sun Valley CAB were informed of the change to their

meeting format and were able to vote on what day they preferred to schedule subsequent meetings on. She emphasized that many members of the CAB were upset by the change, as a significant portion of those who attended the Sun Valley CAB meetings were seniors who did not like driving at night. Ms. Soper expressed that she was afraid that the attendance of Sun Valley CAB meetings would suffer as a result. She hoped that Article 4, Section 5 of the CAB bylaws would be followed, as nobody on the CAB had been involved in implementing that change. She noted her certainty that such changes did not happen often. She explained that the CAB had not informed the public of the meeting format change at the previous Sun Valley CAB meeting, as the change had been informed by the Commissioner Support division, which was not in accordance with the CAB bylaws. She opined that former Senior Activities Coordinator Bill Sero would be very missed. She noted that Mr. Sero always smiled and encouraged every senior citizen in Sun Valley to do the same.

Ms. Pat Davison greeted the Board and introduced herself as a resident of District 5 and a member of the North Valleys CAB. She noted that she would not repeat any comments she had made previously. She opined that it was unfortunate that the minutes were not yet available from the May 13, 2025, BCC meeting, which included the first reading of Ordinance No. 1739. She explained that she felt surprised when she saw that the two-page written comments she had submitted at the BCC meeting held on May 13, 2025, were not included in the public input attachment on that item's Staff Report. She noted that the people she knew who lived within her area had little connection to the County besides building permits, snow plowing, and occasionally calling the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO). She opined that the CABs provided a way for the Board to reach out to neighborhoods and communities to make a direct connection rather than waiting for the citizenry to come to the County. She supported the new statement describing the CAB's purpose as assisting, advising, and collaborating with Commissioners because she believed it was progressive and respectful of the residents and businesses impacted by the County's elected and appointed decision makers. She remarked that the CAB bylaws also emphasized their role in informing the community. She noted that the CAB bylaws were provided to her by Media and Communications Program Manager Candee Ramos. Ms. Davison hoped the role of informing the community would not be eliminated during transitions into other factors of the effort to reorganize CABs. She suggested that another meeting be held in the following one to two years to evaluate how the CABs were doing and to determine whether they were assisting, advising, and collaborating with the Commissioners, to continue in their role as providers of information. She commended Ms. Ramos for quickly responding to the questions she had voiced about the CAB the week prior. She thanked the Board for their attention and for listening to her remarks.

Mr. Scott Finley displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. Mr. Finley directly recited the language included in the document he submitted to the Clerk.

Ms. Susan Vanness introduced herself as a member of the North Valleys CAB. She wanted to discuss how others had said the North Valleys CAB could no longer afford to host meetings at the North Valleys Library. She inquired why that change had

specifically happened when it had. Ms. Vanness described a conversation between the individual who served as a coordinator for the North Valleys CAB, Office of the County Manager (OCM) Program Assistant Sally Johnston, and a librarian at the North Valleys Library. She explained that the librarian informed Ms. Johnston that the North Valleys CAB was no longer welcome to host their meetings at the North Valleys Library. She explained that the meetings had to be relocated to the Cold Springs Community Center, which she opined was nice but too far for everyone to commute to. Ms. Vanness questioned why that decision had been made when it had. She opined that the librarian should not have the right to dictate whether the North Valleys CAB could hold their meetings at the North Valleys Library. She noted that it had been mentioned that the CABs were too expensive, and she requested a document that listed the costs of the CABs in detail. She wanted to compare that document to one outlining the Washoe County Leadership Academy (WCLA) costs. She expressed interest in seeing how much money was being spent on each. She opined that the WCLA was great for those chosen to participate, and she complimented a presentation she had seen on the topic. She noted that some individuals were not selected or allowed to become involved in the WCLA. She reiterated her desire to see a cost analysis comparison that detailed the costs associated with the WCLA, as she believed that comparison would demonstrate a significant difference. She emphasized that the CABs were extremely important and speculated that the CABs cost approximately \$40,000 annually. She suggested that if reductions in costs were being implemented that impacted the ability of locations to host the CABs, those budget cuts should instead be taken from the funding for the WCLA. She noted that participants of the WCLA were being treated to dinners, outings, and visits to several places. She implied that if the CABs were unaffordable, the WCLA might also serve as an example of a program that could not be afforded.

Vice Chair Herman shared that her understanding of the ordinance and the action set to be taken on it that day represented only the beginning of the overall process. She asked Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson to approach the dais to answer her questions. Vice Chair Herman asked for clarification on whether the item being deliberated on was the final version of the ordinance.

DDA Gustafson explained that the item before the Board was a second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance, which meant that the draft they were voting on was the document's final version. She acknowledged that she had previously discussed other documents that pertained to CABs with the Board, such as the CAB bylaws, the CAB Handbook, and resolutions, all of which were being considered by staff to receive updates and amendments. She clarified that the action the Board was considering for Agenda Item 17 was exclusively for the second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending the Washoe County Code (WCC), which she described as the framework document related to CABs. Vice Chair Herman asked to confirm whether her understanding that there would be no changes to the WCC in the near future was correct. DDA Gustafson explained that whether changes were made to the WCC was up to the Board's discretion. She noted that if the Board were to approve Agenda Item 17, the ordinance would go into effect after ten days and would then be reflected in the WCC.

Vice Chair Herman remarked that some of the factors that had been mentioned earlier that day represented matters she had already felt concerned about, such as the fact that the proposed CAB regulations conflicted with the law due to how the CABs were formed from the legislation. She explained that she would not be able to accept what DDA Gustafson presented to the Board for that reason until it was clear to her that the Board's actions were not going against the original purposes and descriptions of the CABs. Vice Chair Herman acknowledged that while the proposed changes to the CABs were a start, she emphasized that she was not yet done with the matter. She reiterated that she would not be able to vote in support of the item, which she attributed to certain elements included in the documentation, as well as her agreement with the factual comments that others had previously made. She thanked DDA Gustafson for answering her questions.

Commissioner Andriola expressed her appreciation for all of the hard work that was done on the item. She could not recall seeing those who commented on the item that day in attendance at the initial comprehensive explanation of the topic conducted during a previous BCC meeting. She wanted to clarify that certain items, such as Section 3, Subsection E, the allowance of participation from those serving on the Board of Adjustment (BOA), and other conflicts, were applicable when the document was initially created, but no longer applied to current circumstances. She attributed such matters to the fact that the ordinance had not been looked at in many years, so the actions proposed that day represented the process necessary to make the Code current. She noted that the proposed ordinance allowed no restrictions, meaning somebody on the Planning Commission (PC) and the BOA would be permitted to serve on the CAB concurrently with those positions. She explained that individuals had not been allowed to serve in both positions initially, as matters of development were previously brought before CABs for consideration, representing an inherent and potential conflict of interest with those who served simultaneously on both a CAB and the PC or the BOA. She opined that the proposed provision for removing such stipulations reflected an increased opportunity for anyone to serve on the CABs regardless of their involvement with the PC or the BOA. DDA Gustafson confirmed Commissioner Andriola's assertions.

Commissioner Andriola opined that a misunderstanding might be causing the belief that anything was being stripped from the CABs. She emphasized that the proposed changes instead offered increased opportunities. She asked whether DDA Gustafson agreed with her analysis, and DDA Gustafson affirmed that she did. DDA Gustafson confirmed that members of the PC and BOA could also serve as CAB members should the proposed Code amendments be adopted.

Commissioner Andriola opined that the proposed updates to the ordinance would more closely align it with its original meaning and the provisions that had been in place at the time of its creation. She asked if DDA Gustafson could confirm whether her previous statement was correct and represented the reason as to why updates had been proposed in the first place. DDA Gustafson noted that staff proposed amendments to the Code following the Board's direction to update the documents related to the CABs. She explained that staff began the process by considering potential updates to the WCC before suggesting specific amendments to the Code. She provided the example of the proposed

amendments based on the Nevada Open Meeting Law (OML), which had been proposed to either address sections of the Code that did not closely comply with current OML requirements or reduce portions of the Code that were duplicative of established OML requirements. She noted that there were other proposed edits to the Code that she considered as only serving to refine the document.

Commissioner Andriola explained that the ordinance was only the beginning of a larger overall process. She described what had already occurred in the multi-step process from the beginning. She recounted that the Board first had to vote on opening Chapter 5 of the WCC, which provided the legal authority to begin considering changes to the Code, such as the conflicting language regarding the OML that had since been rectified. She explained that after the Board had voted to open Chapter 5 of the Code, a first reading of the ordinance was held that explored almost everything related to the item in great detail. She indicated that they had progressed to the second reading of the ordinance, which was being discussed currently. She noted that no changes had been made to the ordinance since the Board conducted the first reading of the ordinance. DDA Gustafson confirmed that there had been no amendments since the first reading was brought before the Board during a BCC meeting held the month prior. Commissioner Andriola hoped there would be an opportunity for those who were in attendance, watching the live broadcast of the meeting, or viewing the recording of the meeting at a later date, to read the minutes or watch the recording of the first reading of the ordinance, as the discussion during that meeting went into great detail on the matter.

Commissioner Andriola asserted that she would support Agenda Item 17 because she believed it was necessary due to the Code's current language being written in a way she considered to be uncompliant. She explained that staff would conduct additional processes in the future to work on the other documents pertaining to the CABs, such as the CAB Handbook. She emphasized that those efforts would be announced and publicized, and no action would be taken without public feedback and input from the CABs in the spirit of complete transparency.

Commissioner Andriola remarked that reformatting the CAB boundaries to align with the districts represented by the Commissioners was particularly important regarding her district. She explained that she had constituents in her district apply to become members of her local CAB who were determined to be ineligible for membership due to how the CAB boundaries were written. She opined that the CAB boundaries were unintentionally exclusionary. She reiterated her belief that the proposed amendments being implemented into the Code offered more opportunities for everyone to participate in the CABs within the districts where they reside and work in a more collaborative effort with the Commissioners, who were dedicated to supporting their constituents with whatever issues that might be brought forward. Commissioner Andriola informed Chair Hill that she would support the ordinance as written, as she believed it provided the necessary clarity and legal compliance.

Commissioner Andriola thanked DDA Gustafson for her hard work, and DDA Gustafson echoed the sentiment. Commissioner Andriola acknowledged that more work was needed on the matter, as several additional steps were expected to occur.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-2 vote, with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1739, Bill No. 1927, be adopted and published in accordance with NRS 244.105.

25-0428 AGENDA ITEM 18 Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

25-0429 AGENDA ITEM 19 Announcements/Reports.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro said that he would be busy with Gerlach.

Chair Hill thanked ACM Solaro for his dedication to the project in Gerlach since he had worked on it for years.

Commissioner Clark requested information regarding Agenda Item 7, specifically regarding how the County disposed of surplus or used vehicles and equipment, and how they were sold.

1:34 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
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Brooke Kroener, Deputy County Clerk