

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

April 15, 2025

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair

Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair

Michael Clark, Commissioner

Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner

Clara Andriola, Commissioner

Janis Galassini, County Clerk

Eric Brown, County Manager

Mary Kandaras, Chief Deputy District Attorney

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 10:00 a.m. in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

25-0236 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Mr. Richard Snow, a resident of Sparks, said he was optimistic and addressed two dire situations in Lemmon Valley that required the County's attention. He mentioned that he called Washoe County Code Enforcement on three separate occasions. He said he had been barred from the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting for two years for his behavior. He wanted to address 440 Cameo Court. He noted that the homeowner of 440 Cameo Court filled in an approximate 60-foot-long section of the ditch. He added that another approximately 80 feet of the ditch was filled with rock, cement, and tree stumps, which he felt would prevent drainage and could flood his property across the street. Mr. Snow indicated that the homeowner built a fence that exceeded the allotted 42 inches, and he alleged the Washoe County Code (WCC) stated that a corner view could not be blocked. He said the homeowner had also built onto his house three different times using substandard materials, without a building permit. He moved on to his next issue, 350 Aristocrat Way. He mentioned that four years ago, he met with Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro, who created a folder that was provided to retired Chief Deputy Greg Herrera. He felt that nothing had been done since that time. He said the County's response was that COVID-19 (C19) restricted them from completing that job. He thought that since C19 had passed, it was time for the County to take care of his issues. He said when the County sent him a tax bill and he paid, he felt there was an implied contract. He stated that since he had paid his taxes, the County should do their part and fulfill their obligation to take action in a timely fashion.

Mr. Drew Ribar discussed the library and thought it was magical how the funding seemed to appear after political signs had been posted at the library. He felt public employees were not supposed to post political signs around the library. He told the Board that if they were voting, they needed to ask themselves how the funding magically appeared. He wondered if it was logical to spend money that was meant to build something long-term for the public, and instead use it for payroll. He asked if that was what the public wanted. He questioned if that would benefit public employees or the public that those employees were supposed to serve and said it would be a question the Board would need to answer. He explained that he had nearly 10,000 pages and 3,300 documents, but sent the Board approximately 463 pages, which were part of his lawsuit against the County for the library's actions. He thought it showed that librarians were not really librarians who helped people find information but were political partisans who were no longer open to everyone. He speculated that access to the public had been cut off, and if someone were a member of a certain political group or held certain political beliefs, they would be welcomed in the library, and if not, they would be excluded from the library. He mentioned that actor Kirk Cameron had a reading program that could be accessed in the library. He felt that Washoe County Library Director Jeff Scott laughed about that program as he spent taxpayer money on the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, asexual, and other identities (LGBTQIA+) programs. He said he could not understand why the LGBTQ programs were promoted, and thought Kirk Cameron's programs were criticized and joked about by the librarians. He alleged there was a group of people in the library that were not open to everyone, and if they did not like someone, they would be excluded. He indicated that was his reasoning for his lawsuit against the County. He hoped the Board would take that into consideration as they reviewed the budget and he asked if money should be spent that way. He wondered if the library was being used as intended, or if it was a political apparatus to push an agenda.

Mr. Terry Brooks recited a personal poem about poverty from another point of view.

Mr. Ilya Arbatman displayed and read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Rosie Zuckerman displayed and read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Susan Meuschke said she was a lifelong library patron and supported funding for the library. She mentioned that libraries were an ongoing part of her life as a child growing up in a rural community. She added that the monthly visit of the book mobile was a highlight and provided access to the world outside of her small community. She said that as a college student, before she carried a computer in her pocket, the library was a place to study and access the information needed to earn a degree and establish her career. She explained that after she moved to Washoe County more than 40 years ago, her library card kept her entertained, educated, and engaged with weekly visits to her local branch. She stated that during the pandemic, she discovered the convenience of Libby, the online application, which allowed 24 hours per day access to the library's electronic books from

the comfort of her home. She said she was a volunteer with the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) Foundation Tax-Aide Program, and added that the library provided space needed for low-income seniors and others to access no-cost assistance to file their taxes. She suggested that the library provided an essential service for many constituents of all ages, and she said that although she preferred to support an increase to the library budget overall, she supported funding for fiscal year (FY) 2026.

Ms. Tara de Queiroz thanked the Commissioners for ensuring that librarians were not going to lose their jobs. She said newer librarians had been fully trained to serve the people in Washoe County, and it would be a tragedy if they lost their jobs. She mentioned it was her understanding that the budget was balanced at the cost of the new North Valleys' library and asked the Commissioners to find funding for that library. She felt that North Valleys was the most underserved part of the County. She said that over the past year, there had been countless stories from adults who went to the library as children and it changed their lives, because it was either the only safe place they had, or they could discover a new world in books. She hoped that library magic could happen for more children who lived in the North Valleys and they would have the opportunity to walk to a library after school or get dropped off on the weekend to discover the world of books, or if they needed a safe place to go.

Ms. Gail Townsend thanked the County Commissioners for their hard work and the County staff for finding a way to keep the library funded at least until October. She did not feel the need to repeat stories that had been shared regarding the importance of the library being an essential service that served everyone in the community, from birth to death. She sympathized with the North Valleys' predicament and felt they deserved a better facility. She recalled that in 1994, when the expansion fund was created, she was a resident in Spanish Springs, and watched libraries be built while the Lazy 5 Regional Park remained undeveloped because funds were used towards the Bartley Ranch Regional Park. She thanked the Board for their efforts to fund the library.

Ms. Candace Powell thanked the Board for the temporary library funding using the original Washoe County Question Number One (WC-1) funds that supported libraries for decades. She said she had taken time away from work to speak on behalf of working families who could not attend at 10:00 a.m. on a Tuesday but relied on libraries, especially the extended hours and programs. She thanked the Board for recognizing those essential services and hoped the temporary funding was the beginning of a long-term commitment to libraries.

Ms. Ann Silver, volunteer Chair of the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees (LBT), mentioned that she attended the previous meeting and listened to many residents who addressed the need to maintain regular library hours and personnel. She added that the library system was a highly valued attribute in the community. She said that she wanted to see the library system thrive by providing books, resources, learning opportunities, programs for adults and children, bilingual and legal assistance, technology, and other services to everyone. Although she could not speak on behalf of her fellow trustees, she explained that the LBT had not fully vetted the library budget, nor did they

have a comprehensive understanding of whether efficiencies could be found, or greater effectiveness achieved. She said the libraries had excellent librarians, all of whom dedicated their expertise to managing libraries with their teams, and she applauded each of them. However, due to the failure of WC-1, she requested additional time to fully review the budget as submitted by the Director to allow a better understanding of library utilization, hours, and other operational aspects of the library system. She added that those were the duties of the LBT, and their obligation was to understand and approve the budget. She requested that the BCC allow time to ensure that 23 personnel were not unnecessarily impacted, and fully understand the revenue and expenses in a more detailed manner. She said the LBT had spent over 75 hours in public meetings and admitted that she desired a greater understanding of how best to reconcile the library and County budget deficits when balanced against the need for the library to serve residents as intended.

Ms. Naseem Jamnia, a resident in District 3 and local author, shared her appreciation for the library budget for FY 2026. She cautioned the BCC not to become complacent. She urged them not to assume a secondary position while waiting for the LBT, who recently demonstrated a fundamental lack of understanding of the library budget process, to approach them. She addressed library funding costs and said that per the Washoe County Manager's report, the library would be funded for the next FY, the remainder of the library expansion fund. She said the use of the General Fund to supplement the library budget was offset with the reallocation of the expiring library fund expansion fund tax. She thought that funding the library budget came at the cost of a new library in the North Valleys in District 5 and wondered why certain Commissioners were not more concerned. She explained that anyone who visited the North Valleys' library would know it was a small storefront in a shopping center that was widely used by the surrounding community. She felt that as the area grew with housing and business developments, it was essential to support the community with an adequately funded, independently housed public library. She thought there had been rhetoric at the BCC and elsewhere that portrayed the public library as fiscally irresponsible with large occurrences of controversy, but she did not want the focus to be lost. She explained the issue was not specific to Washoe County but a national one. She reiterated that across the Nation, public libraries had been defunded and became battlegrounds for ultranationalist, totalitarian ideologies. She indicated that public libraries were some of the last informal gathering spots left in society, a place where anyone, regardless of background, identity, class, or political views, could access resources for free. She believed keeping public libraries funded and accessible to all was a vital part of keeping democracy alive at a time when it was deeply threatened. She thought discussions of pausing services must not encompass the library, which was essential for communities. She felt that calling for an independent audit when the library had successfully undergone countless County audits not only undermined the expertise and time of the County staff but also added unnecessary expenditure. She thought that benefited those who sought to defund the public library and deny Washoe residents, and more broadly, residents across the Country, freedom of information. She believed that savvy Commissioners would appreciate that the upcoming 9.4 percent increase of General Fund property tax revenue was in no small part due to the Library Expansion Fund. She said offsetting the County's budgets came at the cost of making sure libraries flourished instead of just surviving. She did not want there to be a

misconception and stated that the FY 2026 budget was a temporary fix. She acknowledged that lean times were ahead and appreciated the hard work of the Board. She said prioritizing the library would prioritize democracy.

Ms. Suzanne Williams said she was a mom, grandma, former teacher, and school speaker and had traveled everywhere imaginable. She mentioned that when she spoke to various groups, she realized the importance of libraries on the human level. She mentioned there were students whose lives had been changed by one book or one librarian who knew enough to hand that student the right book. She said she utilized the South Valleys' library and could use the meeting rooms, ask a librarian a question, and if she could not find her book on reserve, someone could help her find it. She thanked the Board for possible funding for the libraries, and she reflected on prior discussions of how libraries were put in a position of needing it. She felt wholeheartedly that allowing access to information and learning to love reading was the key to a strong and growing community and County. She said she did not want the library employees to feel unappreciated. She explained how her sister taught her to print her name so she could get her first library card when she was four years old, and now, as a senior, she voiced how important the library was to her. She said the Board had the option to continue funding the libraries, and she hoped they would.

Ms. Janet Butcher said she was pleased when WC-1 was placed on the ballot. She defined that sunset meant something would end and noted that Clark County attempted to do something at the Legislature, which resulted in discussion about sunset. She opined WC-1 was new, although it was possibly not how the money was allocated. She said the County was not being mandated to take that money and put it into a certain thing. She explained WC-1 was placed on the ballot and thanked Commissioner Andriola, stating that the people should vote on the matter. She indicated that when the people voted, it was not that they did not understand, and someone alleged that WC-1 had been rewritten. She said it was unclear to her how people could not understand. She believed there were pros and cons and was unsure if those who had written the pros understood what had been written. She felt that when they spoke about WC-1 and said they did not understand, she thought they had understood. She said when someone spoke out regarding Library Board Trustee Gianna Jacks the first time that it was discussed that WC-1 would be addressed, she thought was brought up in a Trustee meeting by Frank Perez. She said some of her comments were taken out of context, regarding what was said about taxes increasing. She mentioned that Chair Hill had mentioned it was time to discuss taxes and thought an April Fool joke about increased taxes would be funny. She indicated that taxes were going to increase and there were budget problems. She said she had listened to a library staff member misinform the legislators about the type of books that were being challenged in the libraries. She felt the community had been shut down, BCC meetings had been halted, and individuals had run from the dias because of the content being read. She thought that some had stood up at the legislation and said there was nothing wrong with any of the books being provided to underage people.

Ms. Meredith Ford spoke in favor of funding the library and mentioned a book group sponsored by the South Valleys library, where 15 individuals met monthly.

She described that typically a book group was an excuse for good friends to get together to relax with a glass of wine and spend a few minutes discussing a book and an hour or more sharing personal stories or issues. She believed that because they met at the library, neither of those things happened, and the group was more formal, similar to taking a class. She said her group would form a circle of tables where they could put the notes and discuss their book. She explained that each month they rotated leaders and would take turns speaking. She mentioned that often they shared excitement, praise, criticism, and arguments when they read aloud, while they questioned, shared opinions, and laughed. She believed that because they were at the library, they stayed with the theme of the book rather than wandering into side topics. She described the library as a welcoming place, where the librarians were always friendly and helpful, and there was a serious sense of value and respect for books. She added that they carefully considered the books for the hour and a half that they were together. She noted that prior to joining the book group, everyone visited the library often. She pointed out that when each member saw the notice to join, they were drawn to the idea of book discussions, and not just to socialize. She explained that their book group became friends over the years and connected through the library. She said it made her feel grounded and pleased to be part of the small group. She thought that was something that most people did not know the library offered, and she felt it was extremely valuable.

Ms. Vaungaylyn Zarcone thanked the Commissioners for their tireless work and the many hours spent listening to the public. She said she came before the Board as a lifelong lover of all libraries from her small hometown to Washoe County for the last 20-plus years. She thanked the Board for being champions of the library in every way possible and supporting the assets that served the community in many ways. She said her personal experience was learning about everything in the world and not just things she already knew, loved, thought, and felt, to help see the bigger picture. She explained that for over 30 years, the two percent allocation was groundbreaking and visionary. She stated that it fueled programs, resources, and spaces, making the County stronger, smarter, and more connected. She said that as a new chapter was entered, one no longer bound by a specific allocation, she was incredibly grateful for the Board's willingness to continue and improve that legacy in bold new ways. She thanked the Board for finding a temporary funding solution that had already been identified, which left time and space to thoughtfully shape what would come next. She believed wholeheartedly that the Board would continue to invest in the community in beautiful ways through libraries, not just because of what they had done, but because of what they made possible for every person in the County. She thanked the Board for their leadership and continued commitment to libraries.

Ms. Penny Brock displayed and read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She said, Senior Advisor to the President, Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) out of Washington, D.C. had launched a new branch in the State of Nevada and in Washoe County. She stated that Washoe County's Registrar of Voters (ROV) had better prepare for the quantum voting system (QVS). She mentioned that when she reviewed the budget, she was unable to see what had been included for elections. She felt taxpayers had a right to know how much was allotted for elections for the next FY.

Ms. Trista Gomez, a fourth-generation Nevadan, said she worked and paid local wages for her business and helped local buyers purchase homes. She thought that the County faced tax increases. She explained that she and her children had been lifelong supporters of the libraries. She said the County had made decisions that would require consideration for the budget. She alleged that Korn Ferry raised every County employee to the top of their pay scale, which she felt was unsustainable, and had no revenue to support it. She stated that Senate Bill (SB) 319 would increase the income of firefighters to Reno Fire Department levels, whose staff she thought were the highest paid, and she doubted they would take a cut in pay. She said the County faced a severe structural deficit. She displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and explained that based on her document, \$74,000 was the median income based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but \$51,000 was what ZipRecruiter showed to be the average wage. She said the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) recently required a significant increase, and although taxpayers did not receive a guaranteed pension, Washoe County employees did. She felt taxes would be increased for local buyers who already could not afford to buy houses. She thought that decisions needed to be made to restructure and cut costs, similar to what businesses and corporations had done. She said that increased costs and taxes for local families would further inhibit their ability to buy houses and live in the same area where their families lived and had grown up. She believed that those were important decisions, and she indicated she had additional numbers that would be shared when time allowed. While she reviewed her document, she stated that PERS for a fire employee who made \$98,000 would be \$56,000 a year for one employee. She said the budget should be looked at, and the taxpayers who could not afford to live in the area with their families should not be burdened.

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

10:44 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

10:55 a.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

25-0237 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Andriola noted that she would expand upon her comment more during the discussion to be held on Agenda Item 7. She indicated that she had wanted to keep in line with her request from the previous meeting to have an independent third-party audit conducted for the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) through the oversight of the Washoe County Audit Committee. She requested that the Board provide a policy recommending that the WCLS Board of Trustees (LBT) officially vote on a budget as a recommendation to Washoe County before that budget was presented to the County. She acknowledged that there were many deadlines, such as for statutory requirements and compliance, and emphasized that she was not trying to complicate that. She opined that having that policy in writing was important. She deferred to the legal team to investigate where that policy would go and whether that would be brought before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) or elsewhere. She noted that she served on the Northern Nevada

Public Health (NNPH) District Board of Health (DBOH), and described that the procedure for that board was to officially vote to recommend that a budget go to Washoe County. She expected that the procedure would be the same for the WCLS. She noted that she would expand more on the topic when the time was right.

Commissioner Andriola indicated that she had one additional topic to discuss and asked whether they could talk about water. She expressed feeling that if anybody wanted to talk about water, she would likely ask that they put time aside to discuss the topic. She indicated that she had explored the subject of water in depth. She reported traveling to Tampa, Florida, and commended Mr. John Enloe for receiving a national award. She noted that she, Commissioner Clark, and others had traveled to Southern California to investigate the WaterReuse Association. She attested that Nevada was the number one State in the Nation that reused water at a rate of 85 percent, which she noted was something to be proud of. She described that she had been on a tour of Orange County, along with some tours in Tampa, Florida, where Nevada was highlighted, in addition to what they were doing on the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) Board of Directors, of which Commissioner Andriola noted she was a member. She said she would echo those comments during the TMWA Board of Directors' meeting later that week. She wanted to share that, as the achievement was amazing and something to celebrate.

Commissioner Andriola recounted that she had lived in the local area for a long time and that everyone often heard about water. She opined that those in the region were blessed in terms of geography, topography, aquifers, the amount of water, and incredible local talent. She reiterated that Mr. Enloe had received a national award and reported that everyone knew that gentleman as being associated with water. She stated that such an event was something to be proud of and thanked everyone who worked in that field. She noted that individuals just expected water to come out of the tap each time they turned it on. She opined that the quality and the reuse of available water and the direction they were headed with OneWater Nevada were things to be celebrated.

Commissioner Clark stated that he had many comments he would work into the rest of the discussions during the meeting, especially when they reached the Fiscal Year 2026 (FY26) budget presentation. He noted he had many things he wanted to talk about at that time. He indicated his intent to comment on Ms. Ann Silver, a public commenter who spoke earlier at the meeting. He stated that one of the things people needed to realize was that Ms. Silver said she was a volunteer during her comment and personally gave of herself to serve on the LBT as the Chair. He opined that they should honor her request to reduce their pace and find out precisely what she would discover as she delved into the budget. He stated that people might not realize that Ms. Silver was a licensed attorney in the State, ran the Nevada Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation (DETR) for some years, was the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce, and was a very smart and a very fiscally responsible person. He reiterated that they should allow her to investigate that budget and report back to the Board so she could help them do their job with the proper information after having the opportunity to review that budget in totality, including employment, hours of operation, and anything else involved with the

library. He stated that they owed it to the citizens to listen to her recommendations after she had been given the chance to study that budget.

Commissioner Clark reported that he, along with the Assistant County Manager (ACM) acting as the County Manager at that time, had the opportunity to meet with the head of the Human Services Agency (HSA) office. He reported having asked some questions about the tragedy in Cold Springs. He noted that he had been contacted by several neighbors who said they had contacted Child Protective Services (CPS) regularly regarding that incident. He described that those neighbors had a feeling about the situation, and noted that they knew more about that than he did and were allegedly the ones who made the calls. He reported that when he asked the HSA about the situation, he was told that it was against the law for him to know that, and that they could not tell him whether they had or had not been in contact with that family, individual, or the address. He stated that nearly every time he asked the HSA a question, he heard that response telling him it would be against the law to give him the information he asked for. He asserted that from that point forward, if anyone who gave him that response was a department head and was not an attorney acting for the County, he wanted them to provide him the related Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) and their interpretation of that statute, so he could take that information to the District Attorney (DA) himself to have him provide a written evaluation.

Commissioner Clark emphasized that he would not be stopped by somebody's interpretation and clarified that he was not attempting to implicate any one person in particular. He pointed out that anyone could have their opinion about the meaning of a statute, and he desired to instead hear from an authority, who, he noted, for the County was the person in charge of that particular office and provided legal interpretation. He wanted legal interpretation provided by the committees and given to him to be verified by the DA's Office, headed by DA Christopher Hicks.

Commissioner Clark recounted that an employee with the DA's Office recently told him he could not be given information about who worked from home. He stated that he did not want to know those individuals' names, as he probably already knew them; he just wanted to ask questions he already had the answers to in an attempt to verify. He stated that they might have many people who worked from home, which he did not think was fair to those who had to be present in person at their job, such as those who drove snow plows, the deputy sheriffs, the firefighters, and all those who had to be there. He asked what kind of equality there was when certain people were allowed to work in other places in the luxury of their homes outside of the County and sometimes outside of the State. He noted that he only wanted to know how many people were involved in that particular portion of the County employees, but he was told by Human Resources (HR) that his knowing that would be against the law. He stated that he was an elected official and asked how he could ever make a rational decision about anything if it were against the law for him to know about that. He recounted that every time he asked a question, he was told that it was against the law, every time he requested something be included on the agenda, it was described as redundant, irrelevant, or he was told they did not want to do that. He noted that he asked questions and received answers that had nothing to do with the

questions he had asked. He described receiving an unrelated story as a response to his question as insulting. He noted that he just wanted to get that on the record.

Chair Hill reminded those she represented in Incline Village and Crystal Bay about upcoming engagement opportunities on the Tahoe Area Plan. She noted that there was a Zoom link on the website for a webinar scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 2025, at 5:30 p.m., as well as online surveys due May 2, 2025. She reiterated that there were a lot of opportunities to get involved online. She noted that there were also two in-person workshops, one scheduled at the Incline Village Library for April 21, 2025, at 5:30 p.m., and another set to be held at The Chateau at Incline Village on April 30, 2025, at 5:30 p.m. She encouraged them to look at the draft documents and hoped they could get involved.

DONATIONS

25-0238 **5A1** Recommendation to accept cash donations totaling \$56,956.74: [\$18,505.00 Lazy 5 Summer Music Series, Come In From The Cold, Pickleball nets, Rancho San Rafael improvements]; [\$80.74 from the donation drop box at the May Museum]; [\$30,553.00 May Foundation reimbursements for interpretive panels, memorial plaque]; [\$7,818.00 to the Arboretum for bricks, general maintenance and support]; and accept in-kind donations from the May Arboretum Society [valued at \$49,466.79]; accept in-kind donations from Peter Ting, individual [valued at \$3,000.00]; and accept in-kind donations from Timorothy Torrell, individual [valued at \$2,000.00] for Regional Parks and Open Space programs and facilities; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia thanked the May Foundation and the May Arboretum Society for their generous in-kind donations, as well as the individual constituents who helped with the regional parks and the County.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 6A1 THROUGH 6D1

25-0239 **6A1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed audit for the Cash Control Audit for the Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0240 **6A2** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed audit for the Cash Control Audit for the Washoe County Senior Services from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0241** **6A3** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed audit for the Cash Control Audit for the Washoe County Library System from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0242** **6B1** Recommendation to approve Nevada Public Libraries State Collection Development Funding in the amount of [\$36,037.00, no local match required] for a term retroactive from November 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025, for the expansion of library materials in the digital collection of Washoe County Library System; if approved, to authorize the Finance Department to make the necessary amendments to Washoe County Library System's Fiscal Year 25 budget to reflect the receipt and use of the grant funds. Library. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0243** **6C1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of \$7,097.11 in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Burning Man Project Donation account for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support the Family Planning Program, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0244** **6D1** Recommendation to approve the request to establish a bank checking account for the Comptroller's Department and approve the policy to accept Venmo payments from County employees only as described in the Washoe County Venmo account policy. No fiscal impact. Treasurer. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia disclosed that her sister worked for the Washoe County Library System (WCLS), and after consultation with the District Attorney's (DA) Office, she was not required to recuse herself from voting on Item 6B1. Chair Hill thanked her for her disclosure.

County Clerk Jan Galassini advised the Board that she received an email, which was placed on file.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock stated that the library received a \$36,000 grant and thought it had not been figured into the budget proposal when she felt it should have been. She mentioned that the library had been audited, and she was unsure if the Board had reviewed the audit report. She stated that it seemed that the Library Director did not pass successfully. She thought the audit report revealed questions regarding cash handling procedures. She felt that anyone who worked in the world of business would classify the top priorities as being customer service and financials. She added that taxpayers wanted to see responsibility from each department funded by taxpayers and felt the library was no exception. She said the Library Director was going to have his review, and she hoped that Ann Silver, Library Board of Trustees (LBT) Chair, and the LBT had reviewed the audit report. She mentioned the audit had not been signed off by any LBT members. She said that Commissioner Andriola suggested having a policy,

and she agreed. She questioned why Jeff Scott, Washoe County Library Director, signed off on the audit report, while LBT had not. She mentioned that she was unclear if the LBT received a copy of the audit report. She reviewed a document and could not locate any names of LBT that the document had been sent to, and wondered why they were omitted. She felt the situation was very serious, as were the small details, which was why she felt that Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) Nevada was reviewing Washoe County. She said transparency and accountability were important, and she felt like they were missing. She believed the public had a right to transparency and accountability, and that managers in departments needed to be fiscally responsible, transparent, and accountable. She thought it was important that they handled everything appropriately, whether it was customers, the Board, or taxpayers. She said accountability should be the main focus.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 6A1 through 6D1 be approved.

25-0245 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Recommendation to acknowledge status report and possible direction to staff on the County Manager's recommended Fiscal Year 2026 Budget (July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026) with estimated appropriations of approximately [\$1,064,408,656] which incorporates Board priorities of funding for existing contractual obligations, supplies, utilities, personnel costs, capital improvements and operations, and maintaining the County's assets and infrastructure needs, and direct the County Manager to return to the Board of County Commission with the certified Tentative and Final Budget for adoption at a public hearing to be scheduled on May 20, 2025. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager Eric Brown joined Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Abbe Yacoben, Budget Manager Lori Cooke, and Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro at the podium to present. They jointly conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Fiscal Year 2026 Budget; Agenda; Strategic Planning Direction; FY 2026 Financial Outlook and Recommended Budget; Fiscal Year 2026 Manager's Recommendations; Financial Outlook – Summary: General Considerations; Financial Outlook – Summary: General Considerations – Sustainability (two slides); Fiscal Year 2026 Total Budget Appropriations - \$1.06 Billion; Library – General Fund & Expansion Fund; Northern Nevada Public Health – Health District Fund; Roads Fund; untitled PCI charts and road photos; Fiscal Year 2026 – General Fund Revenue/Sources - \$539.2 Million; Fiscal Year 2026 – General Fund Appropriations - \$547.5 Million; FY 2026 Recommended Budget – Other Funds; Other Governmental Funds – Sources Totaling \$344.6 Million; Capital Improvement Highlights – Total \$44.2M; Capital Improvement Highlights – New Projects; Proprietary Funds – Totaling \$140 Million; Budget Summary - \$1.06B over 29 Funds; Next Steps; Thank you.

The following slides were not shown or reviewed, but they were included with the material for the item. They were referred to by Ms. Cooke as slides in the

Appendix. *FY 2026 Recommended Budget – Appendix/Additional Information; Financial Outlook – Summary; Fiscal Year 2026 Total Governmental Fund Appropriations - \$924.4 Million (two slides); General Fund Sources and Uses (two slides); Fiscal Year 2026 – General Fund Appropriations - \$547.5 Million; General Fund Appropriation Summary by Type and Function - \$547.5 Million; Other Governmental Funds - Sources Totaling \$344.6 Million; Other Governmental Funds - Uses Totaling \$376.9 Million; Property Taxes – Overview.*

Manager Brown shared his recommended budget for Fiscal Year 2026 (FY26). He reviewed the presentation outline shown on the *Agenda* slide. He showed the *Strategic Planning Direction* slide and established that the Strategic Plan for the County drove the priorities staff used to set budget objectives. As staff looked at the FY26 budget, they were respectful of the three priority areas affirmed by the BCC during the Strategic Planning Workshop on January 28, 2025. Manager Brown informed that after that workshop, staff accepted budget input from the 24 County departments, then set up individual briefings with each Commissioner to review the FY26 budget. He said that Commissioners communicated that they wanted to see a more aggressive stance on expense mitigation to address the budget deficits the County faced. Manager Brown reported that the budget presentation reflected that guidance. He displayed the *Fiscal Year 2026 Manager's Recommendations* slide and conveyed that service retention was the priority. He added that staff would focus on key performance indicators to ensure service quality. He recalled that the majority of Commissioners expressed that they did not want to see new taxes reflected in the budget, and he confirmed that direction was taken. He disclosed that discussions took place with all Commissioners to consider the potential use of the supplemental government services tax (SGST). He revealed that the feedback in those discussions was not favorable overall and resulted in the exclusion of the SGST in the numbers shared with the BCC that day.

Manager Brown showed the *Financial Outlook – Summary* slide. He noted that updated information about federal grants and funding was still being received, but he understood that even long-standing grant sources would be reduced or unavailable going forward. He said that he and his team were mindful of that as they planned for the future. He reiterated the County's focus on sustaining cost reductions to account for unstable revenues. He pointed out that, due to the high percentage of expenses devoted to personnel, there was no way to meaningfully mitigate expenses without taking some measures to control personnel costs. He invited Ms. Cooke to speak about the budget forecast.

Ms. Cooke displayed the first of two *Financial Outlook – Summary: General Considerations – Sustainability* slides and informed that the chart presented was shown to the BCC at a meeting on January 14, 2025. She said it represented a budget that was not proactive in mitigating identified risks, particularly in Expenditures and Transfers Out. She reported that there had been *true-ups* since the January 14, 2025, meeting related to property tax, which meant that actual numbers had replaced budget predictions. She stated that final numbers were received from the State at the end of March 2025. She conveyed that there had been some challenges in getting Consolidated Tax (c-tax) information from the State due to the modernization of their systems for data collection

and distribution. She showed the second of the two *Financial Outlook – Summary: General Considerations – Sustainability* slides, which represented the recommended budget. She pointed out the FY 2026 Tentative column, which she explained reflected the County Manager’s recommended budget and was the budget that would be submitted to the State. She said Revenues/Transfers In and Expenditures/Transfers Out had also been *trued-up*. She returned to the prior slide to exhibit improvements to the overall financial picture and noted that the Manager’s recommended budget brought the projected deficit within the policy level. She warned that deficits were projected to continue, but added that was not new. She advised that structural deficits should be evaluated, and reminded the BCC about the effect of substantial increases to the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) rates that negatively impacted County budgets. She said the PERS board generally increased those rates every two years.

Ms. Cooke read highlights from the recommendations listed on the *Fiscal Year 2026 Total Budget Appropriations - \$1.06 Billion* slide. She described that the General Fund was the largest fund and represented approximately 50 percent of the total County budget. She said multiple funds had costs associated with people, like Senior Services, Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH), Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS), and many Special Revenue Funds. She added that some Enterprise and Internal Service Funds also funded personnel. She advocated for ensuring sustainability across departments and noted that cost pressures like personnel and inflation impacted the General Fund and Special Revenue Funds similarly. She understood that the mechanics of the vacancy review process were being worked out. She revealed that the anticipated savings associated with the hiring freeze and reclassifications pause were approximately \$2 million through the end of Fiscal Year 2025 (FY25), and close to \$11.3 million for FY26. To illustrate how reclassifications could result in cost increases, she gave the example of an Office Specialist who might be considered for promotion to a Senior Office Specialist. She informed that Human Resources (HR) was working with the Finance team and County departments to establish how to accomplish all necessary work within the defined job specifications. She cautioned that once a reclassification was done, the pay increase was permanent. She recalled that conversations about the unsustainability of the Roads Fund had taken place over the past few years. She stated that when the budget was flat and there were insufficient resources coming in, less work was done. For example, instead of improving 100 road miles, only 50 or 70 road miles would be completed. She noted that the Special District Fund amounts in the FY26 budget were reduced to pre-pandemic levels. She advised that current data on personnel costs would be provided to the BCC to keep them well-informed. She said regular updates would allow Commissioners to see what was happening and if targets and goals were being met. She asserted that, from a fiscal management perspective, it was best to address trends, roadblocks, and issues as early as possible and pivot as necessary. That approach made it possible to track improvement and develop alternate plans if sufficient progress was not seen.

ACM Solaro showed the *Library – General Fund & Expansion Fund* slide and stated that the Library Expansion Fund was established to adequately account for the source and use of the \$0.02 of property tax that was dedicated to libraries during the 30 years from 1994 to 2024. He explained that, due to the vote of Washoe County citizens in

November 2024 to not renew the measure, no property tax was restricted to library funding in upcoming fiscal years. He articulated that the fund contained a balance that could only be spent towards the reason for which it was collected. The FY26 budget recommended that the fund balance be utilized and \$1.3 million be allocated from the General Fund to create a flat overall budget of \$18.4 million for the Washoe County Library System (WCLS). Additionally, he said the Library Board of Trustees (LBOT) and the Library Director were asked to work with the Manager's Office and the Budget team to provide an updated service delivery model for the WCLS that provided the scope of library services the community could afford. He recalled that the Commissioners and the LBOT chair had engaged in some discussions about WCLS services and funding.

Chair Hill asked what the General Fund allocation had historically been for the WCLS. ACM Solaro responded that the WCLS portion of the General Fund was approximately \$14.4 million. He explained that, up to that time, around \$4.4 million was generated by the Library Expansion Fund to pay for specific things at the libraries, including books to expand the collection and personnel to expand service hours. He reported that the balance of the Library Expansion Fund was approximately \$3.4 million. Chair Hill asked if the total allocation for WCLS was \$15.3 million from the General Fund. ACM Solaro responded that the total allocation for WCLS would be \$18.4 million for FY26, which was the same as the allocation for FY25.

ACM Solaro showed the *Northern Nevada Public Health – Health District Fund* slide and disclosed that, like the WCLS budget, NNPH was recommended to have a flat budget for FY26 with no reduction and no increase as compared to FY25. The proposed FY26 budget for NNPH was \$35.4 million. He reported that discussions between the County and NNPH finance staff had been productive. He added that more work was needed to understand and address future sustainability concerns, as NNPH also had a structural deficit within its Fund. He commented that additional pressures related to uncertainty around federal funding existed alongside rising costs and a historically flat General Fund transfer. He said that, due to concerns going into the future year related to the structural deficit, an increase of \$1 million to the General Fund transfer to support NNPH was recommended for a total General Fund transfer to NNPH of \$10.5 million. He informed that the General Fund transfer to NNPH had historically been approximately \$9.5 million.

ACM Solaro showed the *Roads Fund* slide and explained that the Roads Fund was a Special Revenue Fund created during the last large economic downturn to segregate those revenues to show the public where the funding from fuel tax went into the County budget. He explained that, prior to that segregation, those monies went to the General Fund. The Roads Fund was a way to contain those costs and better show that the fuel tax was being spent towards the operation and maintenance of roads. He said that Washoe County received just over \$0.032 from every gallon of gas sold, which was specifically to be used for the operation and maintenance of the road system. He noted that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), the Cities of Reno and Sparks, and the State also utilized fuel tax. He said the rate established in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) for the County equated to just over \$0.032. He described that operations and maintenance included roadside ditches, signage, striping, shoulder maintenance, tree trimming, and

other safety improvements. He informed that pavement maintenance accounted for a large portion of maintenance costs. He revealed that unincorporated Washoe County had 2,683 acres of pavement to maintain, which he described as roughly the size of the land between I-580 on the west, McCarran Boulevard on the south and east, and the Truckee River on the north. He reported that the BCC had a financial policy related to the Pavement Condition Index (PCI). The BCC PCI policy level was 73, and ACM Solaro disclosed that the PCI had slipped to 69 for a number of reasons. He showed visual examples of PCI levels on the *untitled PCI charts and road photos* slide and explained that the County wanted to keep pavement in the Good and Very Good condition categories. He said pavement in that condition was less expensive to maintain and cost approximately \$0.55 per square foot to preserve. He informed that residential roadways accounted for most of the time and effort invested by the Roads Department, and added that maintenance for some major roads was paid for with RTC funds. He noted that increased costs due to inflation would reduce the square footage of roadways that the Roads Department could repair. He elaborated on what Ms. Cooke alluded to about the impact of finite funding on maintenance and PCI. He added that when PCI decreased, the repair cost was higher. He said roads in Fair condition cost anywhere from \$0.83 to \$4.44 per square foot to maintain and repair, compared to \$0.55 per square foot for roads in Good condition. He summarized that over time, as less maintenance was done due to fiscal constraints, the condition of roadways would worsen. He projected that, with the current funding levels and inflation, 66 percent of roadways would be in a Failed condition by 2044, which was very expensive to reconstruct at around \$5.33 per square foot. He explained that the graph with the blue bars on his slide depicted the increasing maintenance gap. He warned that deferred maintenance grew over time. He recommended that an additional \$5 million be budgeted for the Roads Special Revenue Fund to keep up with some of that need while work continued towards determining the most sustainable funding source. ACM Solaro emphasized the importance of roadways and noted that one of the first things unincorporated Washoe County residents did when they left their house was drive on Washoe County roadways. He reiterated that the Roads Special Revenue Fund paid for pavement and associated expenses, like plowing and safety.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Fiscal Year 2026 – General Fund Revenue/Sources - \$539.2 Million* slide. She described that overall revenues were projected to increase by 6.2 percent. She said that increase was comprised of weighted measures. She explained that the property tax increase included the reallocation of the expiring \$0.02 that was previously designated for WCLS expansion. It also included a portion of the debt service rate, which she noted was adjusted downward as some debts were paid off. She reported that e-tax for the current fiscal year was estimated to be flat, but she disclosed that a year-to-date \$3 million reduction was seen as compared to the prior year. She revealed that there were outstanding issues and items at the Nevada Department of Taxation that, among other things, impacted the release of some funds when they modernized their systems. It was not yet known whether there was a timing issue or if the current status was a good gauge for future planning. She divulged that she had attempted to get clarification from the Nevada Department of Taxation, but had not been successful. She said that because the County did not have current data about taxable sales, they were being conservative in their estimates. Specifically, the budget was flat through the rest of FY25, which was equal to FY24. She

stated that there would be a 2 percent c-tax increase going forward. She calculated that the 9.4 percent increase in property tax and the 2 percent increase in c-tax resulted in a weighted revenue increase of 5.5 percent. She mentioned that the miscellaneous increase of 6.7 percent was a *true-up* based on pooled investments. Ms. Cooke explained that realized and unrealized gains and losses (URGL) were not budgeted, and she provided an example of a house worth \$600,000 one week and \$500,000 the next week. She said that because the house was not sold, \$100,000 was not lost, but on paper, the investment was worth less. The recognition of value changes was reflected in the County budget, and she established that it was difficult to estimate URGL until near the end of the fiscal year. She said pooled interest was about 1 percent of total revenues. She theorized that could triple if there were good results, which would help, but this would not solve the overall deficit.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Fiscal Year 2026 – General Fund Appropriations - \$547.5 Million* slide. She mentioned that there was more information about fund appropriation details in a number of slides in the appendix of the presentation. She shared that the presentation focused on the funds that were most asked about. She showed the *Other Governmental Funds – Sources Totaling \$344.6 Million* slide and explained that the category referred to other governmental funds, like NNPH and the WCLS Expansion Fund. No revenues were expected in FY26 for the WCLS Expansion Fund because there was no longer a tax allocation for it, but the remaining \$4 million fund balance was expected to be spent. She described that the slide represented an aggregation of many different funds, and more detail was included on slides 32 and 33 in the appendix. She showed the *Capital Improvement Highlights – Total \$44.2M* slide and noted that although infrastructure was a major expense, most of the projected spending for FY26 was for maintenance of existing assets, not for building new things. She said if Capital Improvement budgets were compared for FY25 and FY26, a large decline would be seen in that category. She elaborated that, in an effort to be more accurate, the way Capital Funds budgets were tracked was being changed. She stated that in the past, the budget of a subsequent year would appear to be unbalanced if project timing or expenditures were different than projected. She said FY26 was a pilot year for a new approach, in which the Finance Department would wait until the year closed, then include appropriations with the carryforward when the audit was complete.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Capital Improvement Highlights – New Projects* slide, which outlined the recommended new projects. She clarified that the projects shown were not the carryforward projects. She noted that there were one-time transfers from different funding sources for some projects. She specified that some General Fund transfers in the chart on the right side of the slide were from prior years. As an example, she said there were funding sources received through the State related to broadband expansion and reported that County Technology Services (TS) and WCLS worked on that expansion. She noted that the Davis Creek Rebuild project was shown, which had a funding source other than insurance reimbursements. She said the recommended General Fund transfer to Capital Improvements was \$12.5 million. She added that Capital Improvements requests typically ranged from \$20 million to \$25 million. She stated that the budgeted amount did not include TS and did not include Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space requests. The scope was limited to facility infrastructure and the maintenance of assets and

buildings. She disclosed that the County had over \$1 billion of assets. She informed that the budget included some recommended projects, including innovations from TS that were projected to improve employee efficiency. Ms. Cooke directed attention to other new projects on the right side of the slide and mentioned that many were related to the Regional Detention Facility. She said there was also a new Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space project to update the Lazy 5 Regional Park Master Plan. She explained that a 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with more project detail was usually brought to the BCC in a public hearing. She advised that the CIP would identify the carryforward projects and was a completely separate item for the Board's consideration.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Proprietary Funds – Totaling \$140 Million* slide and summarized that Enterprise Funds operated like a business. Internal Service Funds were services that the County provided that primarily benefited County employees. She said Equipment Services could be thought of as the vehicle fleet. She said Risk Management included workers' compensation benefits, unemployment, property and liability insurance, and health benefits. She outlined that Enterprise Funds included the Utilities Fund and the Golf Fund. She noted that Enterprise Funds were sustained by revenue generated from user fees and were not subsidized by the General Fund. She disclosed that those funds would follow the same recommendations as the County of no new positions or program expansions in FY26. She advised that work was still happening with the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF), but there was nothing new on the horizon for Utilities in FY26.

Ms. Cooke displayed the *Budget Summary - \$1.06B over 29 Funds* slide and said the chart on the left side of the screen showed the final FY25 budget, the tentative FY26 budget, and the variances. She explained that the large variance in the Capital Project Funds of \$108 million was what she previously referred to in her outline of the budgeting process change for that Fund. She noted that there could be a variety of reasons why the Special Revenue Funds appropriations were projected to be lower in FY26, including one-time items in FY25. She indicated that reduced Debt Service transfers revealed smaller outgoing payments because of lower debt, which was good. The right side of the slide showed the total budget by function, which grouped the budget by generalized categories. As an example, she described that the Welfare category contained the budgets for the Indigent Fund, Child Protective Services (CPS), and Senior Services. She reviewed the *Next Steps* slide and noted that the tentative budget had to be certified by the Nevada Department of Taxation. She said the 5-Year CIP was usually provided as a separate staff report to follow the budget item in May. She added that, per NRS, the 5-Year CIP and the Debt Management Policy would go before the BCC for approval before being filed with the State. Those items were also submitted to the Debt Management Commission and the Nevada Department of Taxation. She cautioned that if the County did not approve and adopt a budget, the prior year's budget became the budget for the upcoming year by default, which could be problematic for a variety of reasons. She informed that in that event, the Committee on Local Government Finance would have to approve any adjustments to the budget. Ms. Cooke concluded by noting that the appendix contained additional information on the assumptions that informed the FY26 forecasts.

Chair Hill asked when the *Fiscal Year 2026 Budget* presentation was published. Budget Manager Lori Cooke reported that she had finished the presentation that morning.

Chair Hill indicated that having a presentation that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) could not review ahead of the meeting put them in a difficult position due to the vague staff report. She believed that the BCC was being forced to decide when she thought they needed more details. She recommended organizing a special meeting before the next BCC meeting to discuss the budget. She noted that the BCC should be provided with information about all funds, including the details. She mentioned that it would help the BCC identify departments' increased need for general funds. She said that some aspects may be caused by personnel needs, while others may be from reduced State or federal funds. She understood that the BCC was still learning how federal funds would be cut; however, she thought the BCC should be able to monitor them. She referred to the *Financial Outlook – Sustainability* slide on page 7 and indicated that the BCC could investigate new ways to handle and analyze open positions. She said there was a lack of information regarding impacted departments and positions. She wanted to know how the projected \$12.3 million in vacancy savings were developed, what personnel savings accounted for, how the savings would be redistributed, and a breakdown of positions by department and funding sources.

Chair Hill noted that it was necessary to be transparent when identifying impacts because she had heard the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) would feel them the most. She mentioned she wanted more information regarding the recommended allocation of \$1 million to the Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH), and wondered if they or the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) were in a hiring freeze. She asked if there were Human Services Agency (HSA) staff members whose salaries were charged to the general fund for their work with the Cares Campus, Our Place, and Indigent Homeless Services. She indicated that she was concerned about the contingency fund and asked why it was needed. She referred to the *Financial Outlook – Sustainability* slide on page 8 and said that the contingency fund for \$12.4 million was built into the budget. She wanted to know why that amount was budgeted for FY 2025 when there were only two and a half months left in the FY. She asked if the funds were committed.

Chair Hill mentioned that departments could request new allocations from the BCC if needed. She felt that the taxpayers deserved transparency and found it offensive to ask commissioners to cut their discretionary funds when there was \$6.8 million in a contingency fund and while the Office of the County Manager (OCM) was not proposing cuts to their budget. She noted that she would not support cutting funds for essential cleanup, transportation, economic development, and overall investments in commissioner districts.

Vice Chair Herman commented that the BCC needed to consider the cost of the County's growth. She believed that the income was not enough to maintain growth and speculated that development should decrease. She indicated that the BCC needed to

consider making a new agreement to stop abatements or development; otherwise, she thought the County would continue to struggle.

Chair Hill agreed that growth needed to pay for itself and that the County was not structurally set up for more growth.

Commissioner Garcia asked for clarification regarding the vacancy review process. Chief Financial Officer Abbe Yacoben envisioned the process as a multi-departmental group that collaborated once every two weeks to discuss those issues and positions. She explained that the group would consist of representatives from multiple departments, including those led by elected officers and appointed department heads.

Commissioner Garcia requested to know the general sentiment regarding the hiring freeze. Ms. Yacoben noted that the hiring forecast was understood and expected, and that departments were concerned about the ability to continue their mission. She mentioned that the secondary review committee would work together to ensure all departments could execute their legal and board-mandated missions.

Commissioner Garcia wondered if the department heads were notified that the hiring freeze was effective immediately. Ms. Yacoben confirmed that the department heads were informed. She said an agenda item would return to the Board for formality's sake on April 22, depending on the current discussion.

Chair Hill felt that the BCC needed more information regarding the hiring freeze and requested detailed departmental input to make the best decision.

Commissioner Andriola thought receiving information regarding the deficit during a private commissioner budget meeting was helpful. She understood that the information was not finalized. She explained that when she asked what the target amount per department was, she was told no targets were given. She expressed concern because she thought it would be helpful for each department to have the ability to understand their personalized goal. She felt that a hiring freeze was an option but did not believe it was prudent. She asked the OCM to look at opportunities for all departments. She said that some departments were larger than others, with various levels of importance. She agreed that frugality was essential and thought that discretion should be given to the department heads. She believed that a review process was helpful but created bureaucracy because departmental needs would always be critical. She commended the County for not laying anyone off during the Recession. She thought that there was talent amongst the staff and that other options should be discussed.

Commissioner Andriola recalled County Manager Eric Brown indicating that the budget process was historically the same, which she felt was valid when the County was not experiencing a deficit. She felt that the County was in the business of delivering essential customer services. She thought that researching what statutory essential services meant was important. She felt the department heads understood that grants and federal funding always came with compliance requirements and that giving department heads the

opportunity to present to the Board was important. She mentioned that she was surprised by the lack of options after meeting with each commissioner independently. She recalled that there was a compliance deadline for reporting and that it seemed the BCC needed to approve the budget to meet that deadline. She voiced that the BCC would have to report the FY2025 budget to the State if there was no action. She expressed concern regarding the time constraints and the process moving forward. She believed there was an opportunity to add an ongoing agenda item to discuss the budget. Manager Brown confirmed the ability for a standing agenda item regarding the budget.

Commissioner Andriola asked Chair Hill and Manager Brown if a special meeting prior to May 28 was possible. She said that there was appreciation for the hard work involved in the budget. She believed that providing the BCC with the information they could study sooner would be beneficial because she felt it was difficult to analyze the packet at the time of the meeting. She reported that the BCC had a fiduciary responsibility that she took seriously. She mentioned that while the commissioners had independent meetings with staff, details were not provided. Chair Hill agreed that detail was not provided during the independent meetings.

Commissioner Andriola requested the implementation of a policy for the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) to vote on. She voiced that the results of the audit should be provided to the LBT. She realized that the timing was not aligned with that desire; however, she believed there was an opportunity for change. She thanked Manager Brown for the talent of Ms. Yacoben and Ms. Cooke and for their continued work with the LBT. She mentioned that she had watched most of the LBT meetings, and although some information was provided by Library Director Jeff Scott, she felt it was not detailed. She commented that the BCC was not a part of the LBT but the library budget was within the scope of the BCC's responsibilities.

Commissioner Andriola appreciated the explanations about reclassification because she understood that hiring and reclassifications were on hold. She believed that a department head should be given the approved budget amount and the liberty to work within the budget. She thought micromanaging department budgets slowed progress and added bureaucracy. She recommended that the desired funding levels be given to the departments, so they could decide what was manageable. She wanted to know where staff cuts would come from because there were statutory requirements for some of the funding. She requested to know what was considered essential and nonessential. She did not know how this request for information would be satisfied by June 1, 2025.

Commissioner Andriola knew that staff was talented; however, she believed the situation was challenging, disheartening, impactful, and uncertain. She said that she was happy that expansion funds were located but wanted to know when Mr. Scott knew that information. She explained that she did not want to lay off employees; however, the lack of a plan due to the failure of Washoe County Question No. 1 (WC1), which instilled fear in the community. She was concerned about the budget process in correlation to the BCC's timeline expectations. She hoped that the BCC could rely on the County Manager to provide the expected professional leadership in the future. She mentioned that the need

for cost-cutting was unfortunate, but options needed to be addressed. She believed the County needed to be prudent in moving forward and ensuring department heads were involved. She opined that it would be beneficial if department heads were aware of the County's accounting process because she thought it would create a stronger partnership. She asked for a budgetary line item for unfunded legislative mandates and commented on the uncertainty that created.

Commissioner Clark agreed with his fellow commissioners. He reported that he had expressed his feelings for months regarding the expected last-minute approvals. He believed that budget items were rushed and given to the BCC without adequate time for review. He wished that a major college could perform a postmortem study on the County. He noted that there was a consultant from Salt Lake City, Utah, who taught the commissioners how to talk at meetings. He said that the budget was a serious matter. He recalled a conversation with the Assessor, who informed him that the County had seen a historical increase in new properties, that were not subject to depreciation or tax caps. He said that the Treasurer told him that tax revenues had historically increased. He recalled an Orange County Treasurer invested county funds in Wall Street, which bankrupted the County. He opined that the Treasurer was investing money wisely. He communicated that the County was broke despite receiving the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funds and having the State's highest sales tax and gas prices. He voiced that when he asked Manager Brown why there was a lack of funds, Manager Brown said the County was spending too much.

Commissioner Clark thanked the department heads in attendance because he said the budget meeting was important. He believed that the department heads who collected money for the County should present budgetary options. He wondered why departments were not being rewarded for their efforts. He knew that all departments were important; however, he thought the departments that collected income should be considered. He believed that Administrative Assistant II Sue Dufva was one of the smartest people in the County, as she had participated in over 1,000 interviews, watched the budget at the Assessor's Office, and was a dedicated employee. He mentioned that Ms. Dufva reported the Assessor's Office had seven vacant positions. He believed supporting those who could find extra money was important. He indicated that the County was insolvent and that he did not support laying anyone off; however, he felt that if an employee were hired with temporary funds, they would only have a temporary job. He said there were individuals who wanted to discuss increased taxes, and said that bills continued to grow faster than revenue. He felt that it was disrespectful and created difficulty in departmental processes when the OCM did not provide funds to elected departments. He communicated that elected departments were expected to provide services and needed sustainability. He said that the elected officials had a certain level of expertise to keep their departments running smoothly.

Commissioner Clark asked how many outstanding NNPH fines there were because he opined that the fines were not being paid in a timely fashion. He noted that there were supposed to be roughly 400 apartments built on Dandini Boulevard three years ago, and explained that the County had lost \$5 to \$7 million in property taxes because the

property was stalled while awaiting road approval. He felt that the County was missing opportunities for income. He mentioned that the sewer and water capacities were going to be increased with road improvements near the Washoe County Detention Center. He commented that better roads were promised when the road fund was passed; however, he said the County was paying the State's highest gas tax, with only 3.2 cents of that going to road maintenance. He communicated that there were 357 new hires, which he was told was due to attrition. He wanted to know what the entry-level County employees received in their onboarding package. He voiced that the budget discussion should have started a month prior instead of at the last minute. He thanked Chair Hill and Commissioner Andriola for their comments.

Commissioner Andriola read from page 5 of the Staff Report regarding the levied property tax rate and asked what the County's total levied property tax was. Ms. Cooke indicated that \$1.3917 was the portion of the statutory maximum tax rate that was attributable to the County. She noted that individuals would pay a certain rate if they lived in the incorporated city, with a portion going to the State or other local entities like a General Improvement District (GID). She said that the maximum tax rate was \$3.64, but there was a two-cent override for the State during the Legislative Session bringing the maximum rate to \$3.66.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Treasurer Justin Taylor for being a part of the investment team and creating a contract with the State for investments. She did not understand how a hiring freeze could happen without the approval of the BCC. She mentioned that she was not encouraging hiring; however, she felt there was a need for further discussion. She asked Manager Brown to investigate other options to balance the budget. She commended the departments that were looking into generating revenue. She wanted to know when it would be appropriate for Clerk Galassini to conduct a presentation on the revenue her department was bringing in. She wanted to discuss options if there was a budget shortfall and wanted the details of the deficit and contingency fund to be addressed.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that information was presented to the Board at the BCC meeting in January. She voiced that it was clear that many aspects were out of the BCC's control, such as the flattening of the consolidated tax (c-tax), the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) increase, the economic conditions in Nevada and throughout the United States (US), the tough housing market, and the high unemployment rate. She commented that the OCM received criticism for many things the BCC did not have control of. She noted that she had a briefing on March 17 and April 1, 2025. She communicated that during the briefings each Board Member was notified that roads, the WCLS, the NNPH, and State Goods and Service Tax (SGST) had risen in priority. She said that it seemed the BCC would have preferred more detail, more frequent meetings, and a more comprehensive list of options to choose from. She opined that leaning on department heads was preferred. She explained that everyone had the chance to express their grievances; however, she felt that decisions needed to be made. She expressed that she was not comfortable with pausing progress.

Commissioner Garcia referenced the *Fiscal Year 2026 Total Budget Appropriations - \$1.06 Billion* slide and said that she wanted to table the hiring freeze, support roads, support NNHP with the desire to increase efficiency, and support the library budget. She noted that she had been supportive of the library before she was a commissioner and always would be. She understood her colleagues' concerns and was open-minded regarding the management of money and the involvement of the LBT. She explained that she was not going to discuss those matters at this meeting; however, she wanted to see the library funded. She mentioned that her fellow commissioners wanted an audit and the LBT's involvement, which she believed would happen, but she was not comfortable pausing library funding while waiting for change. She indicated that when a department or team member was struggling, the last thing to do was to remove resources. She would rather see the BCC recognize that the library was an area to focus on and find solutions.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Cooke for presenting because he understood that this was not a fun discussion. He noted that he appreciated the opinion and knowledge of staff, but he wanted other departments to explain the details that pertained to their offices. He referred to the *Fiscal Year 2026 Total Budget Appropriations - \$1.06 Billion* slide and explained that he was opposed to decreasing commissioner discretionary funds because he said the money helped the community and nonprofits. He reported that the library budget was around \$14 million; however, he said the citizens voted against funding the library. He indicated that due to his party, he was called an election denier. He recalled that he did not say he was against funding the library; however, the County was proposing to provide the library with the money that the voters denied. He asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Mary Kanderas to define a sunset law.

CDDA Kanderas indicated that a sunset law meant something was out of effect or no longer in effect. Commissioner Clark clarified that the law had a designated time limit. CDDA Kanderas confirmed there was a timeline designation.

Commissioner Clark explained that the library's 30-year time limit had ended. He said that the voters did not want WC1 to continue. He reported he was not in attendance 30 years ago during the creation of WC1; however, he speculated that the makers of WC1 probably argued that it would only last 30 years and then go away. He said that the County could not say the library budget was flat while providing an extra \$4 million. He noted that the budget should remain flat at \$14 million unless LBT Chair Ann Silver determined they needed extra funds. He mentioned that the \$4 million could be used elsewhere to hire employees. He did not agree with throwing money at a department for no reason. He indicated that he would not support the budget with only an hour or two to review the information. He voiced that department reports and further discussion were needed.

Commissioner Andriola thought clarification was needed. She mentioned that the \$1.3 million was directly related to additional funding, while the expansion fund made up the remaining amount. She voiced that FY 2027 would negatively impact the library with zero expansion funding. She noted that there was approximately \$3.7 million

in the expansion fund that was already allocated to the library. She indicated that even though the voters denied WC1, that money was already collected prior to the denial. She commented that she did not support the extra \$1.3 million because she believed the LBT should be given the opportunity to review their budget. She believed that the BCC was not there to determine the needs of the LBT. She communicated that Commissioner Garcia's points were well taken, but she was unwilling to support the \$1.3 million. She said that she would support no new positions, oppose the hiring freeze, any reclassifications, and the \$1.3 million library budget. She reported that the NNHP was looking into efficiencies and cost savings. She specified that she supported the NNPH funding and increasing road funding. She said that she did not use commissioner discretionary funds for nonprofits and deferred to her colleagues regarding discretionary fund concerns.

Chair Hill asked if the decision could be made at the April 22nd meeting after directions were given and allowing for a robust conversation regarding the hiring freeze. She indicated that many of the disagreements pertained to the library budget, which she wanted to support; however, she thought the \$1.3 million would not be spent due to the hiring freeze and potential cuts. She mentioned that if the BCC approved the budget, she was okay with tentatively providing the library with \$1.3 million. She said she understood the concerns of her fellow commissioners. She thought that the BCC needed a special session regarding the budget and asked what was needed from the Board at the current meeting to proceed.

Manager Brown thanked the Board for the input and believed there was potential for progress before the final budget meeting in May. He said that the OCM would locate a date for a special meeting.

Ms. Cooke reported that the main intent of the agenda item was to get direction from the BCC. She explained that while it was not the beginning of the discussion, staff needed further direction. She understood that there was a recommendation to implement follow-up conversations for more detailed information. She indicated that while the tentative budget was needed, the BCC did not vote on it and changes were possible between the tentative and final budget. She said that it was never the intention to provide the BCC with a vague budget; however, there were many pieces to the budget that staff did not know early. She informed the BCC that the State document could be posted after the meeting, which would allow users to see the general fund and departments, but they would not see any details outside of salaries, benefits, services and supplies, and capital funds.

Chair Hill asked if questions could be asked at the special meeting with the attendance of department heads. She explained that the State budget process was lengthy and detailed. She speculated that the County may utilize the State budget process during the next FY and that the BCC needed the appropriate amount of information. She knew that Ms. Cooke had a hard job, and she was not criticizing her or any single staff member; however, she wanted clarity and her expectations to be met. She believed that obtaining approval of the staff recommended motion would be difficult. She asked how the BCC should proceed.

Ms. Cooke did not think there needed to be an official action and believed the comments and feedback would be incorporated into the presentation for the next meeting.

Commissioner Garcia opined that the guiding light was maintaining services, no layoffs or furloughs, and stabilizing expenditure growth. She said that Ms. Cooke indicated that the best practice was to address budget issues as early as possible. She explained that the BCC was concerned and that they were not the only ones facing budget deficits. She recommended considering early retirement buyouts, adjusting franchise fees, looking at interlocal agreements, limiting attendance at events, buying tables to support nonprofits, conducting an organizational audit of all departments to combine teams where possible, eliminating duplicative efforts, opening new requests for proposals (RFPs) for big vendors, and pausing certain equipment and replacement processes. She noted that there were more drastic options that gave her pause because families and small businesses were struggling throughout the region. She hoped that the County would have plenty of time and information before recommending options such as increasing city fees for parks and recreation, and for fire inspections, eliminating sewer connections fee waivers for low-income development, lay-offs, and levying a new tax. She said that she did not have the privilege of serving a decade on the BCC like Vice Chair Herman. She thanked the team for their hard work, and she knew that the meeting was not easy; however, she was confident the County would find viable solutions to move forward in a positive direction.

Commissioner Andriola voiced that the best practices should be addressed as early as possible and thought that there were opportunities available. She communicated that efficiencies could be created out of difficult situations, leveraging resources, and by not performing business as usual. She wanted to recognize Manager Brown and the staff for having early meetings. She commented that she was not implying that this meeting was the first time she had been presented with numbers; however, it was the first time she had seen the presentation. She said that the County needed to look at other options when faced with a budget deficit. She apologized that the County was going through difficult times, but everyone was struggling. She echoed Chair Hill's sentiment regarding looking at the budget earlier with department heads.

Commissioner Clark expressed that he had meetings with Manager Brown and staff about the budget, and his position remained unchanged. He recalled that he was not allowed to record the meeting or take documents out of the room. He indicated that many of his suggestions were not implemented. He noted the presentation had slightly more detail, but his thoughts had not changed.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Janet Butcher indicated that the commissioners stated much of what she wanted to discuss. She believed that it was interesting that the \$3 million was in the expansion fund and asked why it had not been used. She mentioned that she may have misheard; however, she said that money was going to be cut from the WCSO, but not the library. She noted that she grew up in the library, learned how to read, checked out books, and loved the library; however, she believed that

if the library was not run efficiently, there was a concern. She recalled visiting the library and witnessing a display regarding book banning and the inappropriate books that were available to children. She communicated that some of the books were on display outside of the teenage section and she wondered why the County was using taxpayer money on pornographic material (porn) for children. She commended the budgetary staff for their work.

Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk and noted that the community repeatedly heard that the library would not receive money; however, they received \$12 million. She asked where the library's budget was. She said that the library budget and the LBT were not transparent. She mentioned that the County said there would be no new taxes, but she assumed, as a homeowner, her property tax would increase by three percent. She wanted to know if her property tax would increase, and if so, she said that it would be a new tax. She indicated that the library was receiving \$12 million, with an additional \$1.3 million from the general fund. She commented that they were receiving a large increase that she did not feel was right. She voiced that it was recommended to lower the Commissioners' discretionary funds to \$20,000, which she felt meant the extra funds would go to the library. She said there were many nonprofits that needed help. She believed that the library's budget was \$10 million two years ago and asked if the money was managed properly. She explained that the LBT's bylaws said that the LBT was to acknowledge the annual budget for the library and monitor expenditures. She stated that the policy existed and asked why LBT Chair Ann Silver did not have the budget information. She said there were concerns regarding Director Jeff Scott. She communicated the library expansion fund showed there was a carryover of \$3.2 million.

Ms. Valerie Wade thanked the County staff for their work during an extremely volatile and sometimes hostile environment. She explained that the County had experienced layoffs in the past during economic downturns, which she said always included the library and parks. She indicated the proposed budget felt like a win because the library would not lose funding, but she realized the budget allowed the library to keep money that was voted on by taxpayers 30 years ago, while denying the North Valleys a new library. She commented there would be no new library or change to library funding, and the two cents designated for expansion were used to fund other programs. She communicated those funds would end next year, Library expansion fund money that had been saved over the years for a North Valleys branch would be gone and the two cents would be absorbed into other programs. The library would be budgeted at the same level they were 40 years ago. She mentioned that she was opposed to having the LBT make budget recommendations instead of County staff. She noted the voters did not elect the LBT, but they did elect the BCC. She believed that no other department was treated that way, and that the library was singled out. She said that County finances were audited every year by an independent third party that the BCC selected, which provided a report that the BCC acknowledged yearly. She detailed that the reports were available to everyone on the County website. She felt that efficient studies had already been performed, and the difficulty was finding a vendor who held the same professional standard for unbiased opinions as an accounting firm did. She speculated that if the County located an unbiased

vendor who would be worth tens of thousands of dollars, it would not save money. She said if there was an efficiency audit, it should be performed on the BCC for transparency, accountability, and leadership. She indicated that in 2018, the BCC had \$235,000 in services and supplies, \$248,000 in 2021, and \$661,000 in 2024. She noted that it seemed easy to audit for efficiency and that the BCC's services and supply budget had doubled. She asked for the history of the food and travel line.

Ms. Tara de Queiroz questioned LBT Chair Ann Silver's statement regarding not seeing the library budget. She commented that those who attended every LBT meeting wondered if the LBT advocated for the library. She indicated that she had seen the budget presented in detail in multiple meetings. She recommended looking at the agenda, minutes, and recordings for those meetings because she said the budget was presented with Director Scott available for questions. She reported that she observed the LBT's lack of understanding of the information presented, while the same questions were asked repeatedly. She wondered why LBT Chair Silver indicated she did not have the information. She opined there was something political occurring that she was not able to understand; however, there were many in the community who were not willing to sit by while others were disingenuous. She felt that homophobia was the reason others wanted to defund the library.

There was no action on this item.

25-0246 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to accept a grant award from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, (BJA) FY24 Invited to Apply-Byrne Discretionary Community Project Grants/Byrne Discretionary Grants Program, Award No 15PBJA-24-GG-00250-BRND [amount not to exceed \$996,000.00, No County match required], to cover costs related to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Forensic Science Division Regional Rapid DNA Program, for the retroactive grant term of October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2026 and if approved, authorize Sheriff Balaam to retroactively execute the grant award documentation, and direct the Finance Department to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8 be accepted, approved, authorized and directed.

25-0247 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Discussion and direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by legislators, by Washoe County, or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues as may be deemed by the Chair or the Board to be of critical significance to Washoe County. Pending legislative bills can be located here:

<<<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025/Bills/List>>>.
Current bills the County is tracking that may be reported on or discussed are listed under Government Affairs at <<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>>. Due to time constraints inherent in the legislative process, a list of specific bills that staff will seek direction from the Commission on during this item will be posted on the web site under Government Affairs at <<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>> by 6:00 p.m. the Friday before the meeting. Due to the rapid pace of the legislative session, additional bills upon which comment may be sought from the Board of County Commissioners will be posted as soon as known. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Ms. Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, said that it was week 11 of the 17-week legislative session. She mentioned that to date, 1,093 bills and resolutions had been introduced, 13 had passed, and had become law. She stated that the prior Friday was the first major deadline for bill passage, which was the first House committee, where bills had to be out of committee in their house of origin. She said 281 bills failed to meet that deadline, and those measures would not continue forward. She noted two bills that Washoe County recommended to the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) did not advance past the deadline: Senate Bill (SB) 73 which would keep voter registration signatures available for inspection by the public but would not provide copies, and SB65 regarding public records of the Medical Examiner and Coroner's Office. She indicated that the next big deadline would be the following Tuesday, which was the first House Committee passage deadline where bills had to pass out of their house of origin. She mentioned that there were certain bills that were exempt from those deadlines. She said typically they were bills that had to do with the budget because the State was in its budget process. She added that those bills were often set aside and would be referred to either the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means or the Senate Committee on Finance. She stated they would then be processed once it was closer to the time they were finalizing the State's budget.

There was no public comment or action on this item.

* * * * *

Chair Hill announced that there would be a closed session after the last general public comment and announcements. She said the closed session public comment would be heard after the conclusion of that item.

* * * * *

25-0248 AGENDA ITEM 11 Public Comment.

Ms. Virginia Larmore said she was a constituent of District 2 and thanked the Board for their time and all that they did. She stated she was glad that she stayed for the entire meeting because she learned a lot. She explained that she respected the Board for their work, attention, and diplomacy. She said she did not want to keep focusing on the library, but would do so. She thought it was not unreasonable to ask that the library make cutbacks along with other departments. She felt that was fair. She trusted that when the Board emphasized the importance of utilizing department heads in those decisions, that was a great idea. She felt that when it came to the library, there was a problem. She said library department heads could only function successfully with the support of the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) and thought the LBT needed to be educated in what they were supposed to be working towards. She believed that, unfortunately, the LBT had proven multiple times that they did not understand the budget. She said that the public was forced to sit through a line-by-line, protracted explanation of the budget at the behest of the LBT. She stated that she was shocked to hear the LBT Chair admit that she did not understand the budget. She explained that the LBT was set to vote on an action item related to Library Director Jeff Scott's performance. She thought much of the negative language in his review accused him of mishandling the budget, a budget which had just been presented. She indicated that the problem was that judgments were being made related to budgetary efficiency when she felt that the full budget had not been released until recently, and the Chair of the LBT confessed that she could not understand it. She said it portrayed ulterior motives and a clear need for LBT training. She mentioned it should not surprise anyone that so many people from the library showed up because civic engagement was important. She commended her fellow citizens for showing up and supporting the library and proving it was an essential service, and that civic action could have an impact.

25-0249 AGENDA ITEM 12 Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Clark said that, based on sources, he believed there were outstanding health department fines that had not been collected. He stated if that was the case, he wanted to find out how many fines there were and those dollar amounts.

25-0250 AGENDA ITEM 10 Possible Closed Session for the purpose of discussing labor negotiations with Washoe County and/or Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District per NRS 288.220. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.) FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

1:27 p.m. The Board recessed to a closed session for the purpose of discussing negotiations with employee organizations per Nevada Revised Statute 288.220.

* * * * *

1:57 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
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk

Pending Board Approval