

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

JULY 16, 2024

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 10:02 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:

* * * * *

Chair Hill rebuked the political violence and mass shooting experienced by former United States (US) President Donald Trump and the victims present during the incident. She indicated that such acts were disturbing and not how residents of Washoe County conducted themselves. She noted a public meeting was in progress and declared that the Board must conduct the business of the County. Chair Hill announced she would run the meeting very seriously. She communicated her expectation for decorum and courteous conduct from everyone in attendance. She instructed those in attendance to treat one another with respect. She asked the public not to raise their voices or deliver personal attacks. Chair Hill indicated that she would recess the meeting if she observed any of the referenced behavior. She mentioned she planned to take breaks throughout the meeting and asked everyone to be prepared for that. She stated that she was responsible for maintaining decorum per the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting rules and Robert's Rules of Order. She quoted former first lady of the United States (FLOTUS) Melania Trump, reminding those present that every politician was a man or woman with a loving family. She asked that everyone in attendance behave based on that point.

* * * * *

24-0483 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Invocation.

Chaplain Ginger Howell from the Great Basin Chaplain Corps provided the Invocation.

24-0484 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Public Comment.

Ms. Gaia Brown said she had lived in Washoe County for 23 years and thanked the Commissioners for their service. She supported the democratic process, particularly the Board's reconsideration of the mandate to certify the recent election recount results. She cited an article from the *Reno Gazette-Journal (RGJ)* from July 10, 2024, and Chapter 293 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). She stated that the law clearly commanded the Board to certify the recount results. She spoke about the Book of Mark in the Bible and discussed Mark 12:29. She said the use of the word shall in legal situations meant the action was required. She posited that certifying the recount results would help restore civility in the political climate, which was needed in consideration of recent events.

Ms. Gale Townsend mentioned she heard the district attorney (DA) state at the previous Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting that a Commissioner must have substantial reasons for voting against a recount or election. She declared that she had not heard any substantial reasons to vote against the recount certification. She spoke about her experiences as a poll worker and said she was hired by the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office that year. Between the presidential preference primary (PPP) and primary elections, she spent 22 days as a poll worker and had never doubted the validity of Nevada's elections. Her experience as a poll worker reinforced her belief that elections were fair and the ROV Office did an excellent job. She stated that staff at the ROV Office were committed to facilitating every eligible person to vote and were dedicated to nonpartisanship. She was never threatened as a poll worker and was always treated courteously, for which she thanked everyone in Washoe County. She encouraged anyone who doubted elections to observe the process; she believed they would see that elections were accurate. She did not have faith in hand counts and shared that she had been involved in data processing that was performed by hand. She said the process took a long time and was never accurate. She was glad the Board reconsidered the vote to certify the election recount results.

Mr. Drew Ribar expressed concern about elected representatives being expected to vote a certain way. He stated that voting was a form of expression protected by the First Amendment of the United States (US) Constitution and Article 1, Section 9 of the Nevada Constitution. He mentioned that he spoke with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark. He could not imagine the pressure Commissioner Andriola was under, and he expressed compassion for her situation. He indicated that threats were issued to certain Commissioners to force them to vote a certain way. He questioned why entities from the executive branch of government would threaten members of the legislative branch and why they would file a lawsuit to force a writ of mandamus and a vote. He believed those questions posed further questions regarding election integrity. He spoke about people's ability to question elections. He discussed the word shall and the voting options available to Commissioners. He cited Article 1, Section 9 of the Nevada Constitution and stated it was very clear that the law could not tell Commissioners how to vote. He urged Commissioners to question the events taking place.

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still said she was a County resident who had observed the events of the previous BCC meeting. She referred to a DA's previous statement that the law dictated a recount must utilize the original election's counting method. She discussed that a voting machine utilized a paper scroll that the voter could review, which was designed intentionally. She was a retired State employee who had helped administer fuel taxes. Two systems had been used because the mainframe could be corrupted. She said a computer program meant to fix an error could cause issues in other areas, and the slightest error in the wording of a program could have far-reaching implications. Ms. Holt-Still referenced a DA's statement that only a thumb drive could be used, but she contested that statement due to the system's use of paper. She thought someone should compare the paper scroll results to the computers' results throughout the process. She did not think this was being done because the county relied solely on computers, which raised questions about the situation. She posited that it was essential to perform checks and balances prior to granting approval and asserted it was the only way to ensure accuracy.

Ms. Alanna Fitzgerald indicated that she was a long-term Washoe County and Northern Nevada resident. She thanked the Commissioners and staff for their work on people's behalf. She affirmed the need to certify the vote and honor the intent of those who voted. She expressed dismay that any elected official would find joy in disrupting the voting process through their personal choices because it affected voters and the community's well-being.

Ms. Linda Sinclair thanked the Board and shared that she was a former regional coordinator for track and field in the Junior Olympic Games. Part of her job was protecting the athletes' rights, which she could only do if the issues were within the law and her jurisdiction. She stated that she could not make decisions based on her opinion or her heart. She noted the demand for a hand recount at the previous BCC meeting and pointed out that it was contrary to State law because any possible recounts had to be conducted in the same manner as the election. She remarked that people had to approach the Legislature if they disagreed with the law. Ms. Sinclair mentioned there were also claims of mistakes, glitches, cheating, and omissions at the previous meeting. These issues should be reported to the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS), not the Commissioners. The Board's job was to certify the election results, not to investigate fraud claims. She declared that the Board would overrule the people's clear will if it did not certify the election, and she asked the Commissioners to certify the results.

Mr. James M. Benthin urged the Commissioners not to certify the recount results. He advised that they had to examine facts and not have blind faith. He noted that the recount request called for hand counting, not machine counts. He said machines and their programs could be hacked and felt the recount was flawed. He said the recount contract had been broken. Mr. Benthin stated that people were being defrauded and that outside interests placed the Commissioners under tremendous pressure. He claimed that a crime was committed and was being covered up, and he speculated that a soft coup had occurred. He believed Commissioners were pressured by foreign intervention to certify a fraudulent recount.

Mr. Nick Martin stated he was a 45-year resident of Washoe County and posited that the definitive way to prove who was correct regarding the election recount was to perform another recount. He said he received a lot of correspondence stating he accurately predicted former US President Donald Trump's assassination attempt. He thought the progression of events was obvious and that people were being railroaded. He previously watched a video of the president of the Teamsters Union adamantly siding with the Republican Party and former President Trump. He questioned why a hand recount would not be performed when it would easily solve the problem. He believed the events in Washoe County reflected occurrences throughout the Country. He declared that interference in elections produced mediocre leaders who fought for the homeless but did not ensure citizens could enjoy public spaces. He claimed those leaders used two-thirds of allotted infrastructure money to fund diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). He posited that the word equity had replaced equality and communism was synonymous with equity.

Ms. Janet Butcher announced she was there to support the constitutional republic. She stated that the SOS's website showed she voted in the PPP election, but she did not. She had voted during the caucus. She commented that she began working with computers in 1970 and knew what they were capable of. She voted at a local library on June 11, 2024, which appeared on local reports but not polling book reports. She inquired why the Commissioners were asked to vote on something that they were mandated to accept. Ms. Butcher said election workers were wonderful, but the problem was the process. She felt that anyone with a background in computers knew that writing a program had to be done properly.

Ms. Val White spoke about transparency and County ballot processing issues. She said election systems and equipment were certified prior to an election, and nothing should digitally touch the system after the election began because it would result in decertification. She asserted that a thumb drive was inserted into the election system on May 30, 2024, contrary to a statute that stated nothing should be entered into the system after early voting began. She said the system was decertified, but it was too late for a paper ballot recount. Ms. White declared that manipulation could easily occur within the election system, which she thought Mr. Robert Beadles and artificial intelligence (AI) had proven without a doubt. She commented that digital manipulation required fraudulent paper ballots for reconciliation, so paper ballots should be sequestered without the slightest chance of access. Because paper ballots were not sequestered, it was impossible to trust them. She thought the entire election should be redone and that ballots should be sealed immediately after processing and remain so until the certification. Ms. White said the ROV Office failed to communicate observation periods in advance. She believed guards should be used for observation after ballot processing, not the ROV Office staff. She claimed that nonpartisan individuals and Democrats were running the entire process and asked how anyone could trust it. She believed observations at polling locations did not indicate the integrity and legitimacy of the vote count. She mentioned findings on the Operation Sunlight website. She thought a new election, real transparency, and a new ROV department were needed.

Mr. B. Fulkerson announced he was a lifelong County resident and had actively participated in the area's civic life for more than 50 years. He spoke in favor of

election workers and veterans like his father and everyone else who worked to uphold America's promise of democracy. He opposed a multipronged attack on democracy and those who undermined the democratic system by sowing chaos, fear, and confusion about the election process. He said the Board's vote against recount certification was a display of election denialism that he did not agree with. He stated the claim that any election that did not result in a Republican victory was rigged or stolen was ludicrous and disingenuous. He posited that voter fraud claims had never been substantiated. He said the requested recount was completed, and people could not keep demanding recounts simply because they did not like the result. He urged the Board to defend the sanctity of elections and uphold the will of the people who wanted their votes to count. He asked the Board to certify the election recount results and stated that democracy depended on it.

Ms. Joni Hammond referenced comments made at the previous BCC meeting regarding irregularities and improper handling of the machine-tabulated recount. She requested that a hand count be conducted because it presented many advantages. She stated that the law did not dictate that someone should certify a vote if there were errors and irregularities. She said that if a hand recount matched the machine recount, people who requested the hand count would be silenced. She indicated that one of the Commissioners' duties was to examine facts through public testimony or writing and vote according to their conscience, as stated in the prior meeting. Ms. Hammond said the Nevada Attorney General (AG), the SOS, and the DA's Office threatened Commissioners if they did not certify the vote, which she thought was odd. She requested the specific rule that stated Commissioners were required to certify the election. She questioned what would happen during the upcoming general election.

Ms. Kelly Stevens displayed documents, copies of which were distributed and placed on file with the Clerk. She remarked that threats were being discussed and the past 72 hours had been tumultuous. She inquired if anyone knew that Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Mary Kandaras refused the media access to observe the recount. She stated that the media did not report on what happened. She pointed out that a man in the audience previously mentioned that poll workers were doing a great job and that the Board should certify the vote. She said the man was dismissed by interim ROV Cari-Ann Burgess at the end of the previous BCC meeting. Ms. Stevens discussed a post on X, formerly known as Twitter, and stated that Chair Hill and Commissioner Garcia received funding from a man who positioned a GoPro on her while she observed the election process, even though she was a private citizen. She commented that the GoPro was intended to harass and intimidate her, as was a lady who appeared with two novels that contained intimidating titles. She said the Democratic Party was not one of peace and prosperity.

Chair Hill and CDDA Kandaras reminded the audience that disruptions that prevented the Board from conducting the County's business would not be tolerated. CDDA Kandaras noted that interruptions included positive or negative responses.

Mr. Bill Miller read from a document, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He asserted that people were dying from the effects of global warming.

CDDA Kandaras advised the audience that further disruptions would force the Board to take a recess.

Mr. Roger Edwards said he was a 50-year Washoe County resident tired of hearing cliches and extreme comments. He remarked that America was warned it would freeze 30 years ago but was now being informed it would perish due to high temperatures. He felt it was unfortunate that the Commissioners were forced to vote on an item that was merely procedural because they knew they were unable to make an impact. He disclosed that he had served his Country since August 1965 and would do it again even though some of it felt like wasted time. Mr. Edwards pondered how someone could feel that doing what their constituents wanted them to do was a waste of time.

Mr. Beadles provided documents, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He declared that Agenda Item 22 should be tabled. He said dozens of election violations were filed with the SOS's Office per Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 293.025. He noted that some violations demonstrated illegal thumb drive use in the tabulation room. He said Ms. Burgess previously stated that someone would be terminated if that occurred. Mr. Beadles mentioned a witness, photos of the violation, and an election violation report. He discussed two additional election violation reports that were filed with the SOS's Office. One was from one of the world's most sophisticated AI supercomputers, and the other was from one of the world's smartest mathematicians. He said the results of both reports asserted that the election was a fraud based on the County's data. Furthermore, 20 to 40 percent of the election consisted of fake votes. This led to undeserved and inaccurate candidate wins and losses, and it impacted every voter. Mr. Beadles commented that neither the Commissioners nor the press had ever proved him wrong; they just called him names. He said this was another opportunity to prove him wrong. He suggested that a legitimate third-party entity should be used to investigate the reports. He posited that the election should be investigated and redone. Mr. Beadles said the law stated the Commissioners had to vote, not that they must vote yes or no. He declared that the Commissioners should stand up for their constituents, do what was right, and conduct a new election without machines. He asserted this was within their power and announced that they could not certify the vote when they knew there were allegations of fraud. Any advice to the contrary was inept. He posited that Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards was correct when he advised the Commissioners to vote their conscience at the previous BCC meeting. Mr. Beadles encouraged the Board to vote their conscience and properly represent their constituents that day. He noted he sent an email containing all the pertinent information to each of the Commissioners.

Mr. Charles Elliott said he had been a lifelong resident of Washoe County, and he discussed mixed messaging surrounding the effects of global warming. He believed God had everything under control and that the planet would be fine. He was happy that Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam attended the BCC meeting, and he wished Sheriff Balaam would more closely examine events in Washoe County. Mr. Elliott was displeased and shocked at the corruption he believed was taking place within the County's boards. He thanked Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark for their heart and hard work despite the pressure they received from a cabal. Mr. Elliott declared that the Republican caucus

demonstrated the success of the earliest form of voting, and that hand counts were completed in one night. He stated that he wanted to adopt some voting procedures used in other countries. He commented that corruption precipitated a lack of appreciation for the Commissioners' positions on many levels.

Mr. Terry Brooks recited an original poem about social interaction at work and its relation to homelessness. He stated that people learned a lot from their coworkers, including varying opinions and views. He praised the benefits of a diverse workforce because it exposed individuals to a wider range of topics. More interaction with coworkers allowed people to feel more comfortable expressing their views. When someone lost their job, they lost both income and social interaction. If someone became homeless and unemployed, they lost out on regular social interaction and potential interaction with customers. He stated that social interaction played a major role in people's lives, and people experiencing homelessness were deprived of that experience.

Mr. Jonathan Belfort spoke about a claim he filed with the County the previous day, which he felt related to some other public comments. He mentioned several Washoe County employees that were listed in the complaint. He claimed that a County employee had conspired with a Wilcox Ranch property owner to file false complaints and threats of liens on his property. He said this resulted in demands to vacate his property, without available alternative housing arrangements. Mr. Belfort stated his request to renew his building permit extensions was delayed for almost 30 days and was arbitrarily refused. He described the content of his complaint and cited NRS 197.200. He said the County allowed fraudulent liens to be placed on his property's title.

Mr. Richard Wilson remarked that he purchased a Wilcox Ranch property in the Warm Springs area and had experienced many problems since. The issues included misrepresentations, fraud, threats, fraudulent liens placed on his property, lack of road maintenance, and embezzlement totaling over \$100,000 by Wilcox Ranch Homeowner Association (HOA) members. He said the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) had been notified of the issues on several occasions but had not taken any action, nor had the DA's Office acted. He stated that the Board ignored the situation, and it had to be corrected.

Ms. Renee Rezendes pointed out that ADA Edwards had previously advised the Commissioners to vote their conscience, which they did, and it caused tumult. She wondered if it was because the ROV Office could not sustain a hand count. She said the AG and SOS were both elected officials and asked if Commissioner Clark was able to threaten them with removal from office and criminal action, as they had threatened him. Ms. Rezendes stated Mr. Beadles entered a \$50,000 contract for a hand count that was not performed. She inquired why Mr. Beadles was not informed prior to the recount that it would not be conducted by hand. She questioned where his money went and asserted that it should be returned to him because he was not complicit in breaching the contract. She believed the election recount results should not be certified because they posed many problems. Ms. Rezendes compared Commissioner Andriola to Esther and encouraged people to look up the story of Esther if they did not know it. She hoped Commissioner Andriola would accept her invitation to get coffee together. She criticized the act of making

threats towards Commissioners who took a stand. Ms. Rezendes said the BCC was meant to be an open forum that represented each Commissioner whether someone agreed with them or not. She encouraged the Commissioners to review the available information and vote honestly.

Ms. Marsha Berkbigler said the events of the past week were frightening. She believed people should not be shot just because someone did not agree with them, and she discussed a comment that US President Joseph Biden made a few days before former President Trump's attempted assassination. She commented that negative rhetoric throughout the Country played a role in the assassination attempt. She noted she researched commissions and declared that the current Board was the most publicly dysfunctional BCC in Washoe County's history. Ms. Berkbigler stated that as a former Commissioner, she and former Commissioner Bob Lucey strongly disagreed on many items. However, very few people were aware of it because they conducted themselves professionally in order to carry out the people's business. She remarked that many people attended the BCC meeting that day because of the \$150,000 paid to conduct a hand recount. Ms. Berkbigler declared that the Board would have fewer issues if it truly cared about its constituents' voices. She felt that Dillon's Rule was a problem and suggested that a bill draft request (BDR) be prioritized to eliminate the impact of Dillon's Rule on the County. She said Dillon's Rule allowed certain elected officials to instruct the County that it did not have the right to vote how it wanted to, which was wrong. She advised the Commissioners to take a stand and respect themselves and their constituents.

Mr. Wayne Cates provided a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He said he was a lifelong resident of Washoe County. He disclosed that he voted at the Northwest Reno Library during the 2020 election, where he was incorrectly told that he had already voted. He contested the information and signed an affidavit stating he had not previously voted. He asserted his knowledge that fraud occurred in 2020 because his vote was stolen. Mr. Cates explained that he attended the previous BCC meeting to present data from 2020, demonstrating that 95 percent of the Country's registered voters had voted. He posited that current events were an offshoot of the election in 2020 because certain people thought they could get away with the same unethical behavior. He said that former President Trump had the most powerful intelligence agencies in the world at his disposal as president and saw the 2020 election coming. Mr. Cates noted that former President Trump declared his election was stolen, and he posited that the indictments against former President Trump were intended to keep him from attaining the presidency again, as well as to prevent him from enacting justice on those who deprived voters of their rights. He mentioned that he filed a criminal complaint against AG Aaron Ford for not doing enough to uncover fraud and allowing a clampdown on voters' voices.

Ms. Allyson Ford observed the accusations made against the Commissioners regarding dysfunction, corrupt behavior, and comparisons to the former Premier of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin. She felt that people who died in the Soviet Gulags would find the comparison extremely exaggerated. She posited that the SOS and Nevada Legislature were the proper paths for a remedy. She indicated that substantiated

issues could be directed to those entities in Carson City and that the County did not have the authority to remedy the situation, which was clearly stated by law. People who did not like the law could lobby to change it, and she was not sure why Commissioners were being pressured at the County level. Ms. Ford stated that even if a private individual paid for a recount, there was still a cost to Washoe County voters. She said this included their trust in the integrity of the process, which was what unsubstantiated accusations were working to undermine. She declared that the Commissioners had the opportunity to restore confidence by following the law and resisting intimidation. She asked that they honor Washoe County residents' votes by certifying the election results.

Mr. Troy Regas provided documents, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He discussed the Reno Toy Run (RTR) and said the charity performed an annual disclosure of where its funding went. He noted that the RTR received many letters from its sponsors, which he had distributed to the Board. He described the RTR's toy sort and mentioned pictures that showed all the toys it received. Mr. Regas stated that the RTR's members distributed toys throughout Northern Nevada and that all members did whatever was needed to ensure toys and contributions were supplied. He said the RTR had become political due to recent events and its reputation. He had attended BCC meetings for one month and thought it was sad that ballots could not be properly executed, yet the Board could certify an election. Mr. Regas questioned if a proper count could be conducted if someone's name was left off a ballot. He said he did not observe the Commissioners' jobs being completed, and he remarked that they should represent the public. He expressed discontent that some Commissioners' jobs had been threatened for not voting how they were expected to, even though the public had voted for them.

Mr. Matthew Chutter noted that his comments pertained to the package of proposals regarding zoning in Spanish Springs and the North Valleys. He read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Melody Chutter explained that she was nearly deaf and mentioned allowances made by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). She stated the BCC said new water wells were not required for future development in 2020, yet it was currently making that proposal. She questioned if multiple water wells would be created for high rises and if the public could trust what the Board said. Ms. Chutter stated that groundwater depletion had already occurred in the area. The Board's planned density increases could worsen issues for those that the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) excluded from its planning map. She mentioned a previous proposal regarding peak zoning that did not include input from fire or water departments. She stated that professionals previously mentioned the area lacked infrastructure. She felt the Board's actions could not be ignored and cited evidence that demonstrated increased suicide rates in overpopulated areas. Ms. Chutter posited that relaxed zoning would cause irreversible harm to the environment, the community, and people's well-being. She accused the Board of pandering to developers and ignoring input from others. She spoke about the potential of children's future inability to play, ride horses, or drive offroad vehicles and stated they would instead turn to criminal activities out of boredom. She asserted that people, especially seniors, were deterred from

attending public meetings in various ways. Ms. Chutter thought it was insulting to speak to people appeasingly, and actions spoke louder than words. She was against affordable housing and believed citizens who previously fought against it would fight again. She indicated that a presentation by Washoe County planners showed homes with character, but the homes lacked individuality and architectural distinctiveness. She noted that someone was denied approval to build a farm, which demonstrated values opposite of what she wanted to see. Ms. Chutter declared that overdevelopment was dangerous, reflected poor planning, would affect everyone, and had to be voted down. She pointed out that certain proposed changes would likely aggravate the density increase implied in the zoning changes. She expected the development plans to transform the formerly rural boundary area into a poster child for unsustainable behavior.

Ms. Susan Howell was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Sandee Tibbett agreed with SOS Cisco Aguilar's statement that it was unacceptable for any public officer to undermine voters' competence. She asserted that was what SOS Aguilar and AG Ford had accomplished by weaponizing the Nevada Supreme Court and bullying the Commissioners to vote against their beliefs. She said their behavior was unacceptable and should not be tolerated by Washoe County or Nevada voters. She declared that the actions taken by three Commissioners were respectable and honorable, and they did not deserve to be pressured into obedience. Ms. Tibbett inquired what would happen if the Commissioners stood by their original vote to not certify the recount results, and she pondered if they would fear for their families' well-being. She posited that the death of Judge Larry Hicks was not an accident. She said the democratic process was undermined by corrupted public officials who desperately tried to keep themselves in power to cover up their treasonous acts. Ms. Tibbett commented that innocent people had nothing to hide and did not behave as though they were desperate to control the narrative. She criticized members of the County's leadership. She stated the ROV had a duty to voters and candidates to conduct a clean and fair election. She remarked that County Manager Eric Brown was obligated to properly supervise the ROV and that the Commissioners had to safeguard the integrity of the elections. Commissioners also had a duty to investigate when presented with overwhelming evidence of irregularities, which most voters wanted.

Ms. Elise Weatherly invited the Commissioners to laugh and, more specifically, to laugh at her. She claimed to know why actor Tom Selleck did commercials and said she had brain surgery and chemotherapy in 2015. She knew that everything worked for the good of those who loved God and were called according to God's purpose. She said she loved God because God loved her first. Ms. Weatherly considered herself a role-playing game (RPG) program created to examine and test herself. She recounted a dream where she was trying to tell an arrogant man the truth, and he did not listen to her, so she found another person in a nice pantsuit and asked him if he wanted her to compliment his pantsuit or tell him a scorpion was crawling up his back. She said she opted for the message about the scorpion. Ms. Weatherly advised to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. She desired the truth, even if it hurt. She discussed a man who listened to a song about another man who led women in worship at a church in Reno and did pornography on the side. She said God would not be okay with that, but man would.

She remarked that a separation was taking place. She announced that her treatment from the Reno Justice Court (RJC) and the Highland Ranch HOA was corrupt and unfair. She said no one could be against her if God were for her.

Ms. Lynn Chapman self-identified as a lobbyist and said she was the Vice President of Nevada Families for Freedom. She stated she had been an unpaid citizen lobbyist at the County, the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Board of Trustees, and the State Legislature since 1987. She asserted that the Board existed to represent the people. She said that consumers expected to receive the item they paid for and were vocal when they did not. Ms. Chapman noted some Commissioners had been threatened and were instructed to alter their votes. She declared that was not how a representative government should work, and it was unacceptable. She shared that a voting machine changed her vote three times during a presidential election a few years prior. She asserted that the machine changed her vote and that it had to be removed. Ms. Chapman was shown to a different machine but noticed that voters were still using the other machine. She commented that strange things were occurring surrounding voting, and Commissioners must do the right thing. She asked them not to certify the recount results and to investigate.

Zeus, no last name given, provided a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He spoke about children and the RTR. He mentioned the iron cross and commented that it was stolen and adopted by the Nazi Party as a swastika. He said the iron cross represented love to Buddhists. Zeus stated the back patch he wore as a member of Bikers Against Child Abuse (BACA) had significance. He explained the meaning of the colors and symbols found on the patch and asked if anyone found it offensive. He said a police officer found it offensive when stopping him on his motorcycle for going three miles per hour over the speed limit a few years prior. He mentioned that he was held at gunpoint. He spoke about being kicked out of Renown Health when visiting a dying brother because he wore his patch. Zeus stated he was informed he would be arrested for trespassing if he did not remove it. A few months ago, he attended an organ donation hero walk for a sister's deceased child but was told he could not be present at the public hospital with his patch. He stated that the Board's donation to the RTR was a good thing that had been made into something bad because of a picture of a piece of cloth that the Germans misrepresented as a symbol of hate. Zeus asserted that no part of the Northern Nevada Confederation of Clubs (NNVCOC) was in support of hate. He spoke about a flyer for BACA's event on Saturday and invited the Commissioners to attend and witness what the motorcycle community stood for. He said he played music all day, and there was a raffle, barbeque, and children's games. He asked the Board not to deny the donation to children during the meeting, as children did not understand political parties or voting. They understood Christmas and love, which the RTR and the donation were for.

Mr. Cliff Nellis said he had lived in Washoe County for 49 years and supported the RTR. He hoped the Board would vote to keep and perhaps increase its donation to the organization. He was shocked at the reaction to Commissioner Andriola's decision to vote with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman at the previous BCC meeting. He reminded the Commissioners that the DA had advised them to vote on their conscience and asked why there had been a massive reaction from the SOS, the AG, and

the Nevada Supreme Court. He pondered why some Commissioners received threats since they represented the people. Mr. Nellis hoped they did not get fined or impeached. He posited that the Democratic Party was an organized crime syndicate that controlled the County. He stated that 95 percent of County employees had liberal political views. He desired an affirmative action program to ensure an appropriate number of conservative individuals were placed in public offices. Mr. Nellis believed there was fear of conducting a hand count because it would reveal corruption and manipulation in the voting machines. He remarked that Mr. Beadles had proven the existence of corruption in multiple ways, yet the courts refused to examine the evidence. He thought a hand recount of the entire election was appropriate. If that was not possible, he posited the entire election should be redone.

Mr. Scott Finley read from a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Mary Denney said she was a Washoe County mother, grandmother, and business owner. She declared that her heart was broken and that people should be allowed to disagree in America. She mentioned the recent assassination attempt on former President Trump and said God was watching, even though not many people wished to discuss God. She commented that people wanted to demonize former President Trump and Mr. Beadles, business owners who spent thousands of dollars attempting to save the Country. Ms. Denney did not agree with people who thought the recount should be unquestionably certified because it set a negative example for children such as her granddaughter. She believed the election should be conducted on paper and hand counted. She thanked some Commissioners for doing the right thing and said God would prevail. She said she had been demonized for doing the right thing, which happened when someone stood up for truth. Ms. Denney said members of the military and police officers made a vow to honor the Country. She compared this to what she and the Commissioners were doing despite being bullied. She advised the Commissioners to stand tall because God would remember everyone who did the right thing.

Mr. Walter Nirenberg applauded the three Commissioners who voted against the certification of the recount in the recent election in light of discrepancies reported. He encouraged all Commissioners not to certify the canvass of the recount agendized that day. He recalled hearing there was pressure, including fines and impeachment, imposed on individuals who did not vote in favor of certification. He viewed that as wrong and did not understand why the Commissioners would be forced to certify. Mr. Nirenberg reasoned that if the election were honest, fair, and transparent, there would not be anything for elected officials to be afraid of. He reminded the Commissioners they should be of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Phil Harrison proposed a solution to the election integrity problem he perceived. He described that he was a poll worker and did not see any problems at the polling sites, but he theorized problems occurred out of the view of observers. For example, when data storage devices were delivered to the ROV. He said in light of distrust from some people of the voting machines and the digital count, the paper trail of every vote that was cast could be a good tool for audit and reconciliation of votes. He questioned why that

paper trail was not being used. Mr. Harrison acknowledged that a hand count of ballots might not work, but he felt that the combination of the machine, paper trail, and physical ballots would provide three methods of verification that would be about as accurate as possible. He volunteered his time with other people to go through the paper tapes generated by the voting machines and do a physical count. He thought that process would help regain the constituents' trust.

Mr. Greg Krause introduced himself as a 40-year resident of Washoe County. He stated his appreciation for the opportunity to address the Board. He determined many people in attendance at the BCC meeting that day were concerned about the security and accuracy of elections. He clarified that his comments were not about the recent recount but were more about the future and the inevitable difficulty the ROV would face after the November 2024 election. Mr. Krause predicted some very disappointed voters, regardless of the outcome. He encouraged the Commissioners to continue doing their jobs as faithfully to the law and the process as possible. He recalled that people had questioned the fairness of elections for the past four or five years. He noted the Dominion Voting Systems machines used by the County had specifically been a target of suspicion. He listed people's concerns, including that the machines changed votes and that the entire election was hacked. He reasoned concerns were justified after hearing things like that from prominent people. Mr. Krause thought voters needed to be reminded that the issue had been comprehensively addressed when Dominion brought a major lawsuit against the Fox News Channel (FNC). He reported that the FNC was unable to prove there were problems with the voting machines, and instead, Dominion was able to prove that the FNC had knowingly presented false allegations to its viewers. He posited that the FNC had paid \$187 million to settle out of court rather than deal with a public lawsuit where they would be further embarrassed. Mr. Krause added that Newsmax, another right-wing proponent of election conspiracy theories, was also sued for defamation and defended themselves by adding a disclaimer to say they did not think the machines miscounted the votes. Mr. Krause asked Commissioners to represent the hundreds of thousands of voters, 70 percent of whom polls showed supported the voting machines and process.

Ms. Pam Roberts said she did not envy the Commissioners position, whom she applauded for listening to the constituents who attended the meeting and provided public comment that day. She appreciated the consideration Commissioners gave to each speaker, regardless of their political stance. She noted the applause in the Commission Chambers was sometimes disruptive and initially prevented her from hearing her name when she was called to speak. She added that there were people sitting in the Commission Chambers talking loudly about the public commenters, which interfered with her hearing the proceedings as well as she wanted to. Ms. Roberts emphasized the importance of listening. Regarding the election certification, she stressed the importance of all the Commissioners following the law. She thought it was important that elections be transparent, and she surmised that if there was election fraud, it would be within the jurisdiction of the courts to arbitrate it. She remarked that the courts had dealt with election fraud concerns since at least 2020 and possibly before that. Ms. Roberts expected they would continue to deal with similar concerns. Her interpretation of the process was that all the Commissioners had an obligation to certify the recount. She stated the recount had to

happen in the same manner as the first election, and she understood that while there was not a complete audit, the ROV did routine sample checks to verify that what was recorded in the computer lined up with the paper trail. She affirmed her faith in the existing election process.

Mr. Mike Hart articulated his broad distrust of elections. He said when Commissioners certified an election, they said they believed it was a fairly run election with no mistakes and no fraud. He emphasized the value a person placed on their name and signature, and he determined that full confidence was a prerequisite to the certification of an election. He called on the Commissioners to provide access to the paper version of the recount to validate what the Board certified. Mr. Hart warned he would request the resignation of any Commissioners who improperly certified the election. He commented that the recent election and recount could be considered a case study, and he affirmed it was important to review the problems and not allow them to happen again. He contended that the preservation of the confidence of the citizens in elections was paramount.

Mr. Kenny Curtzwiler spoke in support of the RTR, which he advised was a charity event by the NNVCOC. He disclosed he was not a resident of Nevada but was a resident of South Lake Tahoe, California. He said his roots in Nevada ran deep. He recounted instances of family tragedy and described his pride in his personal and family history of military service. Mr. Curtzwiler communicated his commitment to the area, the success of his business in South Lake Tahoe, and how much his business had given back to the community over the years. He shared that in 1997 he joined a motorcycle club called The Brotherhood, which comprised military veterans and local business owners. He reported that the Brotherhood had joined the NNVCOC and had been active in Northern California and Northern Nevada for over 27 years. He said the RTR, like any other nonprofit organization, needed volunteers and donations to further its mission. Mr. Curtzwiler added that the purpose of the RTR was to help give local children toys that they might otherwise not have. He noted that even though he lived in California, the NNVCOC and the RTR included members of The Brotherhood in its outreach work, which enabled The Brotherhood to help the community's children. He stated that in 2023, the RTR gave \$5,000 to Christmas Cheer, which provided toys and food for people in need in South Lake Tahoe. Mr. Curtzwiler said the RTR had given more than \$25,000 to Christmas Cheer over the years. He also related that in 2023, over \$120,000 was raised and given back by the RTR to various local charities. He emphasized that the RTR was run entirely by volunteers, and nobody received compensation for their work. He thought it was wrong for the Commissioners to deny help to the RTR because of misconceived perceptions and unfounded rumors about the biker community.

Ms. Julie Adams thanked members of the biker community for everything they did. She divulged that she was a poll worker during the last presidential election and recalled many issues that were brought to the Commissioners' attention. She said there was a large number of people who reported that they never received a ballot. She felt that despite years to correct the issues, the issues had not been adequately addressed. She encouraged the cleaning of voter rolls. Ms. Adams compared the lack of process improvement in government against her work in the private sector, where she speculated

people more readily dug into problems and resolved them. She sought confirmation that all votes were counted correctly and reasoned meetings would be much shorter if voter confidence were restored.

Ms. Carol Cooke thanked the Commissioners for their patience in the meeting and for their reconsideration of certifying the canvass. She reminded everyone about the rule of law, which provided clear governance but could be changed. She reasoned that Commissioners had no power to question the results under the law, regardless of their personal views. She stated that certification of the canvass was a purely ministerial duty for them, though she noted many other components of their jobs were not ministerial. She wanted the Commissioners to certify the vote and focus their energies on other non-ministerial components.

Ms. Betty Thiessen recalled advice from ADA Edwards the prior week, which indicated the Commissioners could choose to vote either for or against certification of the canvass according to their conscience. She requested that the Commissioners who voted against certification the first time vote against it again. She pronounced her full support of the RTR and remembered a donation made in 2023 to a group that admitted to teaching communism, which she thought was much worse than someone wearing a swastika patch. She asked the Commissioners to vote to preserve the donation to the RTR.

Ms. Val Kay displayed an image. She introduced herself as a former resident of Washoe County who became a Douglas County resident. She perceived the failure to certify the canvass as a short-lived victory. She commented on the importance of trust and believed trust was eroded when the Commissioners recanted their votes. She considered possible motivations for Commissioners to vote as they did.

Chair Hill paused the proceedings to remind Ms. Kay that public commenters were required to direct their comments to the Board as a whole rather than individual Commissioners.

Ms. Kay concluded that ample evidence had been presented to prove fault with the elections.

Ms. Christiane Brown applauded the patience exhibited by the Commissioners. She supported the certification of the vote. She opined that a BCC meeting was not a reality show or a wrestling venue, and as such, she found the vitriol, shouting threats, and baseless accusations shameful in the Commission Chambers. She contended that the three Commissioners who voted against certifying the canvass fully understood that the certification of election results was a duty and not optional. Ms. Brown theorized their actions had nothing to do with personal courage. She declared that people asking them to vote against certification encouraged Commissioners to break the law. She said that contrary to the belief of many passionately misinformed speakers, exercising free speech did not give people the freedom to disobey the law. She claimed that hand counting was not allowed by law in Washoe County at that time, and the Commissioners did not decide that. She speculated that dissenters were complaining in the wrong venue. Ms. Brown

suggested directing complaints to the ROV, going through the legislative process to get a proposed change on the ballot, or both. She noted if there was a proposed change on a ballot and it did not pass, the results of that vote would have to be accepted, as that was democracy. She argued that the refusal of Commissioners to certify official election results was not the commendable act of free speech defiance that supporters wanted to believe. Ms. Brown viewed it as a shameful charade of governance and an act of political theatre. She supposed that the people who disputed the non-discretionary duty of the Commissioners to certify the election clearly did not understand that duty. She opined that the purpose of the meeting that day was not to pass laws but rather to carry out an administrative procedure the Commissioners agreed to carry out when they were sworn in. She determined the only purpose for certifying the election was to sow distrust, spread disinformation about the voting process, and disrupt free and fair elections. Ms. Brown said it was time to end the theatrics and get back to the business of governing.

Ms. Debbie Hudgens claimed the American people and the citizens of Washoe County had been lied to. She felt COVID-19 (C19) revealed the extent of those lies. She recalled information and protocols regarding C19 that she questioned. Ms. Hudgens stated the election in 2020 was stolen. She remembered watching videos that supported her convictions. She summarized the events that led her to lose confidence in the government and elections. She spoke about the assassination attempt against former President Trump and expressed her admiration for him. She encouraged the Commissioners to stand up for the people they represented.

Mr. Robert Devin was not present when called to speak.

Mr. Bruce Parks pointed out what he perceived as a problem with being labeled an election denier. He theorized it was easy to pretend there was no problem if people were unwilling to listen to the evidence. He shared that it had not yet been possible to find a judge willing to enter evidence into the record, which he viewed as spinelessness on the part of the judges. He declared that until the evidence was on the record and heard in front of a court, he would maintain that there were problems. Mr. Parks said it would be easy to absolve the current ROV of responsibility for any problems because of how some previous ROVs managed elections. He proclaimed that a hand count was allowed by law and offered that there were procedures in the SOS's handbook on how they were to be conducted. He recalled the SOS was closely involved with elections in Nye County, and detailed procedures were outlined for counting, including the types of gloves and pens to use. Mr. Parks commented that on February 8, 2024, the Republican Party held a caucus, after which 12,554 votes were processed in two and a half hours. He said paper ballots, cast by voters with identification, were counted that night in full view of anybody who wanted to watch. He viewed that as an example of transparency. Mr. Parks imagined that with longer than two and a half hours, more votes could have been cast, and he theorized those votes also would have been counted that night. He contended nobody in Washoe County was more aware of the logistic requirements involved. He was confident he could get volunteers to assist with elections, which he said would not cost the County anything. He requested a parallel hand count in addition to the machine count in the upcoming

general election. He asserted it could be done, was legal, and the Commissioners could make it happen.

Mr. Derek Morse urged Commissioners to approve the results of the recount election. He observed there had been two election cycles with court cases not only in Nevada but across the Country. He declared that there had not been any credible evidence of substantial fraud or irregularities that would change the results of the elections. He stated elections were safe and fair and noted the problem of people trying to undermine confidence in elections.

Ms. Cindy Martinez displayed documents. She spoke about the \$10,000 donation to the RTR that was on the agenda for discussion that day. She identified herself as a retired Category I sworn Nevada peace officer and mentioned she was familiar with the associations and affiliations of NNVCOC members. She communicated that her view had changed from when she was in law enforcement and was subjected to different scrutiny. Ms. Martinez said that now, as a fellow citizen protected by the First Amendment, she shared the concern of NNVCOC members about their constitutional rights being infringed upon. She disclosed her fundamental disagreement with the parameters of NRS 244.1505 because she did not believe taxpayer funds should be discretionary. She thought Commissioners and any elected representatives were responsible for the good stewardship and appropriate use of taxpayer money. Regardless, she maintained the money had been appropriated to the RTR and should be given to them. Ms. Martinez asked the military veterans in the Commission Chambers to stand and noted they had all sworn an oath to protect, uphold, and defend the US Constitution. She held the First Amendment protected free speech, free assembly, and free association. She said it either protected all citizens or none and felt it was grossly inappropriate for elected representatives to coerce the withdrawal of the money delegated for donation to the RTR. She expressed her intent to speak separately with her representatives about her opposition to NRS 244.1505.

Ms. Emy Miranda self-identified as a paid lobbyist for Make the Road Action Nevada. She disclosed that she had lived in Reno her whole life. She thanked the Commissioners for taking the time to listen to all the public commenters. She said it was not easy with everything that had been told to them, and she appreciated their patience and kindness. Ms. Miranda conveyed her concern about the decision of three Commissioners to refuse to certify the recount of the primary election. She observed that action, influenced by external pressure, obstructed the democratic process. She believed the right to fair and certified elections was fundamental to the US Constitution, and she found it disheartening to see that right compromised for political gain. Ms. Miranda urged the Commissioners to correct the situation immediately by certifying the election results and ensuring that the voters' voices were respected and upheld.

Mr. Marc Radow thanked everyone present for bringing up important and relevant issues. He said he was a 45-year resident of Washoe County and attended the meeting that day to comment about the misallocation of County assets, specifically parks. He warned the County was about to trample on residents, homeowners, and taxpayers. He mentioned the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission, which acted in an advisory

capacity to the BCC. Mr. Radow described his concerns about a proposed soccer stadium in stage two of a three-stage process. He listed the three stages as negotiation, contracting, and construction. He reported the project was already in the contracting stage, and citizens were not adequately informed. He noted the drastic increase in land value in the area and was against the proposed lease of County-owned land in South Reno along Wedge Parkway to a private user. Mr. Radow thought the lease rate of \$1 per year for 20 years was not in the public's best interest, who would no longer be able to use the land freely. He theorized that proponents of the project would argue a stadium was needed in Northern Nevada. He countered that a private development was already underway for a stadium in North Reno along US Highway 395 and Parr Boulevard. He informed there was a hearing scheduled at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 24, 2024, regarding the South Reno stadium proposal. He recommended people attend and express their opposition.

Ms. Sherry Powell introduced herself as a Carson City resident. She found it interesting that many speakers that day quoted news sources but did not quote NRS directly. She said it was great that the SOS had been woken up. She spoke about the petition for a writ of mandamus filed by the AG. She stated that a writ of mandamus was not a threat but was simply a request for the court to address something. Ms. Powell shared her surprise at reports generated by Mr. Beadles, which said three judges were approached initially, and only one made a decision. She was concerned that two judges were being superseded, but she thought the escalation of the case to the Nevada Supreme Court was unlikely to provide clarity. She indicated the Nevada Supreme Court tried not to get involved in politics. Ms. Powell recalled seeing a video of somebody putting a Universal Serial Bus (USB) thumb drive into the back of a computer, which alarmed her. She cited information security problems the Casino Fandango in Carson City had as grounds for concern and theorized elections could be hacked. She divulged her view of the biblical character of Esther as a hero.

Ms. Kathy Kyte introduced herself as a citizen and a follower of Jesus Christ. She advocated for respect to be shown not only by citizens towards the Commissioners but also by the Commissioners toward citizens. She reminded the Commissioners that they served their constituents. She was concerned about the ideologies that informed the Commissioners' choices, which she speculated were different from hers. Ms. Kyte accused the Commissioners of proverbially tearing down the house built by the Founding Fathers. She warned of consequences for the wrong actions detailed in the Bible. She expressed her admiration for the biblical character of Esther, who she thought was a hero for her choices. She recommended that the Commissioners read the Book of Esther in the Bible if they were unfamiliar with it. Ms. Kyte acknowledged there was a choice to be made regarding the election certification. She advised against certification and listed reasons for her position, which included a lack of voter identification requirements and voter rolls that were not current.

Mr. J. S. McElhinney spoke about the word democracy. He opined that it was used often, but he thought people who used it had not read the US Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or the Declaration of Independence. He stated the word democracy was not in those documents. He remarked that the founders of the US hated both the word and the

concept of democracy. Regarding ballot counting, he offered the definition of insanity as doing the same thing the same way and expecting different results. Mr. McElhinney reasoned the only way to determine whether the original ballot counting method was accurate, honest, and fair was to perform a second count using a different method. He maintained the majority of people in attendance that day were asking for the ballots to be hand counted, despite what the rules or regulations recommended. He suggested the rules were not law and were not required to be followed. Mr. McElhinney declared that any rational, logical human being understood the need to use an alternative method when there was a question as to the validity of the first one. He said as Americans, people were free to use their intellect and make decisions based on their knowledge and conscience. He felt threats from the AG and the SOS to fine, remove, or jail Commissioners who voted their conscience shouted tyranny, dictatorship, and Marxism. He believed the Commissioners voted into office by constituents should not be removed by the AG or the SOS. Mr. McElhinney questioned where the authority to do so was written in the Nevada Constitution. He theorized the bullies were determined to get their way and hide what he thought was likely fraud and corruption in the voting process. He mentioned voting machines were removed in dozens of countries due to fraud or outlawed because of hacking concerns. He contended the Washoe County Republican Party demonstrated with its 2024 caucus that voting could be successfully conducted with identification requirements and paper ballots. Mr. McElhinney added that voting could be conducted in the precincts where voters lived, and the ballots could be tallied in hours. He recalled the entire process took less than four hours. He said it was less expensive than printing tens of thousands of mail-in ballots. He said he was a poll worker in 2022 and observed that on election day, most people simply voted on the machines but did not bring their regular or sample ballots. Mr. McElhinney summarized that voters did not trust the machines and wanted hand-counted ballots, especially when there was a recount of contested races.

Ms. Valerie Duvall thanked Vice Chair Herman and Commissioners Clark and Andriola for voting against certification of the canvass of the vote the prior week. She understood some Commissioners were under a lot of pressure. She advised that in Hong Kong, the central government often threatened fines or jail for business owners and local government officials who did not comply with orders. She perceived similar behavior from the SOS and the AG in response to the decisions some Commissioners made regarding the vote certification. Ms. Duvall said if people were curious about the kind of threats she cited, they could research Hong Kong businessman and politician Jimmy Lai, who she reported was jailed. She stated her admiration of former President Trump. She expressed her support for a new election and a hand count but added that if the Commissioners decided to yield to the expectation that they certify the vote, it was still their duty to clean up the election process immediately. She noted that many countries and states have decided against using voting machines. Ms. Duvall invited people to join her in a thought experiment in which she described a bank teller improperly tallying a customer deposit. She compared her example to the election process and called for transparency, integrity, and verifiability in ballot counts. She recommended the recent election be used as an opportunity to apply the lessons learned before the general election in November. She advocated for paper ballots and hand counts and suggested the removal of any people or processes that were questionable.

Mr. Bob Blackstock recalled accusations of being a socialist at a recent BCC meeting. He argued the truth was that he was a bonafide capitalist. He divulged his work for several large international corporations and said he had been a member of the Turnaround Management Association (TMA) and the Los Angeles Venture Association (LAVA), which he described as a very conservative association for corporate growth. Mr. Blackstock said he was a venture capitalist at one point and currently had his own technology business, which used his patents. He spoke about his education and work history, which included an engineering degree from Stanford, computer coding in multiple languages, and forensic technology analysis. With that background, he told the Board the information provided to them the prior Tuesday regarding AI was incomplete. In particular, he could not download the data purportedly used in that analysis; lacking that, it was impossible to reproduce that work. Mr. Blackstock reported a disclaimer with the analysis that indicated the model's response could be meaningfully changed depending on different inputs. He challenged the assertion that the material was provided by a world-renowned mathematician. He stated that the supposed expert took a few mathematics classes but never graduated. He questioned the wisdom of using one machine to prove or disprove the veracity of another machine. He also noted one of the machines that was used had been widely derided as unreliable and known to produce hallucinations. He queried how one could produce reliable results using that methodology. Mr. Blackstock declared several people at the meeting wanted the Board to vote in favor of the certification of the election results. He wanted those people to stand so it was possible to see who they were. He asked the Commissioners to please vote yes to approve the recount of the vote for the 2024 primary election.

Ms. Kit DiCarlo thanked the Commissioners for their time. She said she was a member of what she perceived was the greater majority of Washoe County citizens, who were not silent anymore and thought the election was rigged. She expressed her gratitude to Vice Chair Herman and Commissioners Andriola and Clark for not certifying and voting their conscience. She recalled Commissioner Andriola giving consideration to her vote regarding certification, which Ms. DiCarlo appreciated. She was concerned that some Commissioners had been bullied into submission by the government mandate to certify. She spoke about God and the Bible. Ms. DiCarlo reminded Commissioners that Nevada was known as the Battle Born State. She hoped the Commissioners would fight to not certify the election.

Ms. Penny Brock commented about the recent assassination attempt on former President Trump. She quoted a message of prayer and support for the Trump family from Mr. Tom Fitton, the president of Judicial Watch, a conservative, non-partisan educational foundation. Ms. Brock was concerned that the radical left had attempted to mass murder republican congressmen, as well as US Supreme Court (SCOTUS) Justice Brett Kavanaugh and his family. She thought proposed legislation and threats of prosecution had increased the risk of assassination of former President Trump as well as violence against his supporters. She said there were riots in the streets of Washoe County and disclosed she did not feel safe due to conduct of that kind. Ms. Brock disagreed with the suggestion that election complaints should go to the courts. She asserted Sheriff Balaam should address the issue. She reported in many counties across America, sheriffs were

investigating similar complaints and coming to the conclusion there was election fraud. She thought there was a duty to investigate further in Washoe County. She expressed concern that what happened in the primary election would happen in the general election. She did not trust the upcoming general election. She supposed if former President Trump won in every state except Nevada, it would further confirm concerns about election fraud. Ms. Brock encouraged the Commissioners to vote no on the reconsideration of certification of the canvass of the vote. She stated that although Commissioners were being told they could not vote against certification, she believed they could, and she reasoned the word vote revealed it was possible to make a choice of yes or no.

Mr. Buddy Miller stated he was a registered voter in Washoe County. He asked the Board to reconsider its unprecedented decision from the prior week to not certify the recount. He remarked that the refusal of the Board to certify the election results ignored the rule of law and the BCC's duty to canvass and certify the results. He felt that choice disenfranchised the voters of Washoe County, who should be the chief concern of the Commissioners. He mentioned as a consequence of that Board action, the AG filed a petition for a writ of mandamus with the Nevada Supreme Court to issue an order to compel the Board to certify the recount. He advised that certification was clearly a ministerial duty; it was not an exercise of broad discretion. Mr. Miller said the County boards, the Clerk, and the ROV determined what constituted a vote and the validity of the votes before the election results were presented to the Board. He held the duty of the BCC was to confirm those election results. He said the Board had very limited powers, and it was interesting that one of the earlier speakers asked the Board to support repealing Dillon's Law, which he described as a law that restricted the discretion of County Commissioners, City Council, and other similar governing bodies. He viewed that request as an admission that the Board had limited power, as designated by the Nevada Legislature. Mr. Miller suggested if candidates in an election disputed the results, they could seek remedy from the court. He reasoned courts were equipped to handle questions of fact and issues of law. He noted that Mr. Paul White, Ms. Lily Baran, and Mr. Mark Lawson had elected to do that. He acknowledged that Ms. Baran had voluntarily dismissed her lawsuit, and Mr. White's request for an injunction was rejected by Judge Gene Drakulich a few hours after the Board decided not to certify the vote. He asked the Board to do its duty, focus on what it was supposed to do, and certify the election results.

Ms. Deborah Mardon disclosed she had been a resident of Reno since 1964. She told the Commissioners not to certify the recount because it was done on voting machines. She argued the recount needed to be done by hand, which she claimed was what was agreed upon. She declared that certifying the recount results would be a sin against God, NRS, and all voters' rights. She speculated the SOS and the AG seemed to think they lived in a communist Country. Ms. Mardon pronounced this was the United States of America (USA), and people were the government. She advised people to obey the US Constitution as designed by the forefathers of the Country. She affirmed people believed in the rule of law and cited numerous reasons for her conclusion that a new primary election was required. Ms. Mardon felt it was outrageous to force Commissioners to change their votes. She believed the Commissioners who voted against certification were honest and trustworthy and represented their constituents. She concluded a completely new primary

election was needed. She urged immediate action to fix the problems and feared delays would prevent a satisfactory resolution before the general election.

Ms. Cheryl Parino divulged that she was working earlier that day but stopped her work to attend the meeting and provide her comments. She described her background as a certified public accountant, auditor, business owner, and, most importantly, a mom. She declared the lives of her children and the world's children were at stake. She said voting machines had been proven to be easily manipulated and susceptible to giving fraudulent results. She called for transparency, paper ballots, and a single voting day. Ms. Parino asked the Commissioners to vote against certification. She equated refusal to certify with bravery and perceived the effects of the vote as extending beyond Washoe County. She expressed concern about several locations and agencies that she theorized were threats to freedom. She emphasized the importance of hand counts and voter identification.

Ms. Teri Kolesnick stated she was an Assembly District (AD) 24 candidate. She expressed consternation about the division in the community. She remarked that during her political journey, she met Ms. Diane Nevada Moon Sullivan, a Democratic candidate for AD 26, whom she befriended despite their political differences. Ms. Kolesnick alleged that Ms. Sullivan received backlash from other Democrats because she refused to be endorsed by Planned Parenthood. Ms. Kolesnick asked the Board to stand on their values and do the right thing.

Ms. Pam Darr pointed out that the general election was coming up and hoped people would do the right thing. She thought the community was tired of issues with the elections. She said the Board should consider people's recommendations to utilize different County departments to help clean up the voter rolls. She suggested that the ROV ask candidates to sign off on the sample ballot before printing it because the community was frustrated that some people received incorrect sample ballots for the primary election. She recalled that as an election worker, she was intimidated by an individual who filmed her at a polling location. Ms. Darr opined that the RTR was a great organization and asked the Board to vote yes on its grant. She noted that she had questions about Agenda Item 22 and opposed Agenda Item 23. She claimed that apartments were unsightly and told a story about parking issues she encountered when visiting a fourplex.

Ms. Victoria Myer thought the Board should pay attention to the commenters. She said there were many problems with the elections. She opined that the Board should vote its conscience on the recount and hoped that the Board's vote would remain the same as the previous canvass of the recount vote. She declared that when the Board was tasked with a vote, it had a choice. She remarked that SOS Aguilar and DA Hicks claimed that the Board did not have a choice to approve the canvass of the vote. Ms. Myer alleged that threatening Commissioners with jail time, fines, or impeachment was illegal because, according to NRS, it was unlawful for one elected official to threaten another. She spoke about Nevada's Effective Absentee System for Elections (EASE),

which she noted could be found by navigating the SOS's website and typing EASE into the search bar. She asserted that Nevada's EASE was the first entirely online application and highlighted different services people could access through EASE. She stated that when people went through the EASE process, they could pick which election they wanted to vote in, and the only information they needed to provide was their name, the last four digits of their social security number, and birthdate. Ms. Myer believed the community should question the integrity of the EASE system and opined it was an insecure voting method.

Ms. Lessia Judd stated she was a survivor of human trafficking and discussed some of her experiences. She spoke about the election recount and the division in the community. She wondered when people would come together and support one another. She claimed she had friends in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, asexual, and other identities (LGBTQ+) community who were afraid of people with conservative political views and expressed discontent with the way she and others in her community were treated.

Mr. Alan Munson supported the Board's refusal to canvass the election recount. He stated there was a lot of evidence that voting machines had issues, which caused worry about the general election. He remarked that he participated in the Republican caucus, which he recalled was carried out with paper ballots in one night. He thought paper ballots worked and would give people confidence in the elections. He expressed consternation about division in the community. He did not think it was right that some Commissioners were threatened because of the way they voted on the canvass. He spoke about the Boston Tea Party, which he declared was Americans fighting against laws they believed were unfair. He opined that the divide in the community could be resolved if people had confidence in the general election.

Ms. Maxine Bradshaw spoke about the assassination attempt on former President Trump and thought that God protected him. She said some people felt he was the greatest president in history, and many insisted that he was the current president of the US because they claimed that the 2020 presidential election was stolen. She remarked that Mr. Beadles spent several years of his time and resources fighting for Nevadans. She declared that people stood behind former President Trump and the members of the Board who stood up for the people of Washoe County. Ms. Bradshaw asserted that people felt represented when the Board chose not to canvass the vote. She opined that it was never too late for someone to change their path, and they would know they were on the right path if they experienced peace. She quoted a Bible verse and stated that the truest vision was not what people saw with their eyes but with their hearts. She believed the Board had the opportunity to save Nevada's future with the way it voted and asked the Board not to certify the recount of the Primary election.

Ms. Roblyn Williams thanked Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark for standing up for their constituents. She said people wanted to know why Commissioner

Andriola planned to change her vote on the recount. She stated that she understood the legality of the canvass and noted that the Board regularly made and changed laws. She declared that the community wanted election transparency. Ms. Williams alleged that Board members claimed that requiring voters to show identification when voting was racist, and she believed that was the reason the Democratic Party had lost so many members of color. She remarked that she had taken a tour of the ROV Office the previous week and learned that the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC) had total access to the County's voter rolls the day after Election Day, even though the election was not yet certified.

Ms. Tawni Olson spoke in opposition to Agenda Item 23. She stated that she moved to Spanish Springs with her family to enjoy the rural nature of the community. She declared that her family regularly recreated outdoors. She opined that more buildings in the area would bring more crime, overpopulation, school crowding, stress on infrastructure, and increased traffic, all of which would negatively impact the quality of life for the existing Spanish Springs community. She suggested that instead of building more apartments, the Board should dedicate the property to more kid-friendly resources, such as a park or other recreational amenities to keep children busy and happy. Ms. Olson believed that more apartments would lead to more crime in the community and create an unsafe environment for her children. She remarked that there had been a lot of changes in recent years that she thought needed to stop. She asserted she was a former California resident who left for a reason. She said she was passionate about the subject because it affected the whole community. Ms. Olson claimed that the Board did not care about who was affected by more development.

Ms. Susan Vanness stated that the AG and the SOS used their positions as political weapons. She alleged that her Commissioner was threatened the previous weekend. She recalled that at the last BCC meeting she went into the hallway and was accosted by another attendee who was escorted out by security. She claimed that Vice Chair Herman had not voted to certify an election in the ten years she had been a Commissioner, and Ms. Vanness wondered why this election differed from the past. She opined that the AG and SOS could be removed from office and warned the Commissioners against changing their votes on the recount because it could be a trap to charge them with an ethics violation. She did not think people should threaten Commissioners.

24-0485 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown announced openings on the Washoe County Human Services Agency (HSA) Senior Advisory Board. He reported that the Senior Advisory Board sought applicants for one at-large position in District 4 and two alternate

positions from any district. He directed interested individuals to visit the Washoe County website for more information.

Commissioner Clark noted that some community members' distrust of election processes had lingered since 2020. He observed that people were divided on the issues and hoped for resolutions. He commented that three people had been in the Registrar of Voters (ROV) position within the past few years. He stated that although he did not get a ballot this time, he continued to receive ballots by mail at his address for an individual who had lived outside of the Country for many years. He said incorrect information was included on sample ballots, and he reported over 25,000 ballots were returned. Additionally, he theorized many people looked at ballots directed to the wrong name or address and simply discarded them. He disclosed a conversation with a fellow local elected official who told him about irregularities she observed during time spent in the ROV Office.

Commissioner Clark recalled there were 3,143 counties and 64 parishes in the United States (US). He supposed all those counties and parishes had elections, and he reasoned there were people in those counties with expertise. He suggested that some people could be hired to show the County the right way to conduct elections. He remarked that he could not personally hire the ROV or ROV Office staff, and he was not granted oversight of the size or location of the related office space. Commissioner Clark listed numerous other election-related considerations that were out of his control. He stated that the County Manager was the only person who possessed authority over the ROV. He reminded people that the County Manager was the most powerful unelected person in the County and was selected by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC.) He believed if the County Manager listened to both sides of the issues through citizen advisory groups (CABs) and town hall meetings, a way to make compromises could be identified to reduce the amount of time spent listening to citizens' complaints during the BCC meetings' public comment sessions. Commissioner Clark divulged that he had difficulty believing everything was being done correctly and recalled quotes from Manager Brown that pointed to dysfunction.

Commissioner Clark opined that when the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) and Attorney General (AG) perceived him as undermining public trust in local government, they overlooked a myriad of items that were out of his control. He added that those individuals needed to acknowledge their roles in eroding confidence. He believed elections should be simple and suggested restoring trust by listening to people at town hall meetings. He questioned whether the Commissioners were expected to vote on approval of the declaration of the canvass of the vote or if different wording in the directive would add clarity. He stated his intention to address County election problems, particularly voter rolls, in the upcoming legislative session. Commissioner Clark emphasized accurate voter rolls were foundational to effective elections. He shared his concern about initiatives to increase the number of voters, which he discerned had not achieved their purpose but had negatively affected the accuracy of voter rolls. He acknowledged some apathy on the part of voters but wanted the County to carry out the necessary actions to instill confidence. He recalled the close races, which affirmed that every vote counted. He thought persistent disputing among elected officials and the staff indicated a lack of leadership.

Vice Chair Herman expressed her gratitude for the support she received. She wanted Mr. Troy Regas to know she had requested a \$10,000 donation for the Reno Toy Run (RTR).

Chair Hill remarked that there was a great public comment session that morning. She announced the Board would take a break for lunch.

1:33 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

2:02 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

24-0486 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Recommendation to approve FY2025 University of Nevada, Reno Extension budget in the amount of \$2,819,570 as presented by Holly Gatzke, Area Director of UNR Extension. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) Extension Area Director Holly Gatzke explained that the budget had not changed much from previous years. She declared that she would be back in the fall to provide a detailed presentation on UNR Extension's programming and to introduce their newly hired Washoe County coordinator. She believed the new coordinator would help the UNR Extension engage further and deeper with the community, the Board, and the Cities of Reno and Sparks. She noted revenue had continued to increase as the organization received a portion of property taxes. Ms. Gatzke pointed out that UNR Extension also received an 11 percent cost of living allowance (COLA) increase, which allowed the organization to fill more vacant positions. She indicated that UNR provided State and federal funds to the organization. She noted that sponsored projects and other income were predominantly from grants. She highlighted that some of the grant-funded projects UNR Extension worked on were a wildfire training course at local high schools and training for childcare professionals. She spoke about a gap analysis the organization planned to perform to determine school service gaps that occurred during COVID-19 (C19). Ms. Gatzke asserted that staff expected those projects to continue into the following year. She claimed the Washoe County portion of UNR Extension's budget was largely used for salaries. UNR Extension worked extensively with youth in collaboration with the Washoe County School District (WCSD) and other nonprofits. She remarked that during the previous year, the program impacted 8,971 youth targeted in low-income communities; 54 percent of those individuals were Hispanic. She thought the program had effectively reached those youth and used hands-on activities to make a difference in their lives and futures. Ms. Gatzke stated that the UNR Extension added additional staffing to reach more students and mentioned that most of the increases in the budget were for salaries. She noted some new positions, such as a nutrition specialist who worked to educate people about healthy eating to manage chronic diseases. She opined that the new Washoe County coordinator was essential to ensure that UNR Extension was working to fill gaps and not overlapping with other departments' work. She pointed out that the budget was lean on operating costs and overhead expenses because all the program's money went into staffing. Ms. Gatzke said UNR Extension planned to

accumulate a building fund because the organization was outgrowing its current location and would need to expand to ensure it could continue providing efficient programming.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Gatzke and her staff for their work in the community.

Commissioner Clark appreciated Ms. Gatzke's updates on UNR Extension.

Chair Hill looked forward to speaking with Ms. Gatzke more about UNR Extension's building fund and considering if there were any possible partnerships that the Board could help the program leverage.

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 6 be approved.

24-0487 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Presentation and Update on FY 23/24 Fourth Quarter Status Report for the Washoe County Regional Detention Facility to include security of the jail, conditions of confinement, staffing and medical care of inmates housed at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Chief Deputy Corey Solferino conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Jail Status Report; Medical Information; NaphCare Medical Data (2 slides); HOPE Statistical Data (2 slides); Average Length of Stay (2 slides); FY 23/24 3rd Quarter Jail Data (2 slides).

Mr. Solferino indicated the numbers outlined in the agenda materials were the overview statistical data from the fourth quarter and some yearly totals. He stated that the next opportunity he would have to present would include a complete fiscal year (FY) statistical report. He informed the data that the WCSO gathered was intensive, and the WCSO conducted an in-depth analysis of the data.

Mr. Solferino reported that 3,630 inmates were booked into the jail during the fourth quarter. The average daily population was 1,064, which remained the same, and the average length of stay was 16.26 days, which decreased by three-quarters of a day from the third quarter. He revealed that 96 inmates were referred to the emergency room (ER) from NaphCare. He indicated there were three attempted suicides and no completed suicides. Mr. Solferino highlighted that the Inmate Assistance Program saved \$1,061,640 throughout the course of the year by diverting inmates from custody to programs and providing transportation to those programs. He stated that the WCSO prided itself on being progressive by providing programs and assistance to the inmates in custody. He conveyed the WCSO's understanding that most inmates would eventually return to the community

and that by providing them with more support and programs, the likelihood of them staying out of custody and becoming valuable community members increased.

Mr. Solferino spoke about the Bridge program, which was started under the direction of Sheriff Darin Balaam. He introduced Senior Office Specialist Timothy TJ Mills, who acted as the Bridge coordinator, to present an overview of the program. Mr. Solferino expressed appreciation regarding the Board's willingness to allow the WCSO to present such a program to bring attention to what actions were taken at the jail and the programs that were initiated.

Mr. Mills conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Sheriff's Office (2 slides); Assessment of Current Programs; Program Improvement; Introducing... the Bridge at WCSO; Implementation Plan; Screening Tool; Facility Dashboard; In-House Bridge at WCSO; Remote Bridge at WCSO; Community Partners; Future Prospects (2 slides); the Bridge at WCSO.

Mr. Mills summarized he previously served at the WCSO Programs Department and conveyed the significance of reentry to the WCSO. He stated that the purpose of reentry was not to help bad people responsible for harmful actions. He explained reentry was about giving inmates in the WCSO's custody, most of whom would be released back into the community, the resources to succeed. Referencing the photographs on the second slide, he shared a personal account involving his arrest 11 years ago and his reentry into the community. At the time of his arrest, he said he could not be trusted in the community and had hurt his loved ones. Mr. Mills stated that he had reached a point where he was hopeless and believed he was destined to perish or reside in prison. He divulged he was introduced to a reentry initiative, and the program coordinator perceived a quality in Mr. Mills that he gave up hope on, which was the value of his life. He clarified that neither the program nor the coordinator saved his life, but it gave him an opportunity.

Mr. Mills talked about touring the Washoe County Detention Facility for the first time with his supervisor, WCSO Detention Services Division Manager Ryan Hensley, during which Mr. Hensley described the facility as an amusement park of the jail. He specified the facility provoked a feeling of hope. He indicated that while the unit could elicit powerful emotional responses, he believed there was a realization that an emotional response alone was not sufficient for nearly anyone who visited it. He stated that the current programming model was not as effective as what could have been implemented because the current model was based almost exclusively on inmate self-referral. Mr. Mills said this was based on a flawed premise that not only were the inmates aware of the resources they needed to prevent them from recidivating, but if they were supplied with options, they could choose the correct ones. He indicated this premise was untrue and allowing inmates to choose their resources was inefficient in an environment with limited resources. He noted the WCSO and most other agencies in Washoe County operated with a restricted amount of resources. Mr. Mills emphasized inmate judgment was being used to determine resource allocation, which he said was illogical. He informed the WCSO's programming primarily comprised inmate-driven group therapy sessions, and that posed a concern because it was ineffective at reproducing outcomes. Additionally, the WCSO staff could

not predict the outcome upon completion of the program, and the results could occasionally be worse for inmates exposed to programming due to an exposure effect. Mr. Mills explained that exposing the wrong person to intensive programming could cause criminal thinking and behavior from an exposure effect. He posed the question regarding the qualities of an effective reentry program and outlined the tenets of one, which included it being evidence-based and data-driven. Furthermore, such a program would be tailored to an individual's needs. He clarified those needs could be determined by assessing the individual. The assessment would require details about the risk of recidivism in the community and the criminogenic needs of the individual. The program needed to be holistic to address an individual's assessed needs rather than provide the limited resources currently available. Mr. Mills indicated an inspiration for a program that successfully implemented the tenets he detailed: a reentry program in Allegheny County in Pennsylvania. He revealed that Allegheny County's program participants were 24 percent less likely to be rearrested, indicating such programs were effective.

Demonstrating the WCSO's vision for an effective reentry program, Mr. Mills introduced the WCSO's Bridge program and pointed out the clear foundational principles. He specified those details were rebuilding lives and strengthening the community. He emphasized that all decisions and actions carried out by the WCSO must adhere to those standards. Referencing the slide titled Implementation Plan, he divulged extensive research was completed to develop an evidence-based approach for achieving two primary outcomes, which were reducing crime in the community and increasing the safety and security in WCSO's facility. Mr. Mills assured those outcomes could easily be predicted based on supporting evidence from other agencies. He noted the implementation plan was visually circular because, with the Board's support and proper execution, the program would renew itself.

Mr. Mills identified the WCSO screening tool as the first foundational element of the Bridge program and highlighted the collaboration opportunities with some of the Country's preeminent research agencies on criminal justice research. The screening tool would be administered to inmates upon intake into a housing unit after viewing a short instructional video. The inmates would be mandated to undergo an assessment tool that would identify the risk of reoffending and their criminogenic needs. Mr. Mills clarified that the agencies he referenced were eager to partner with the Bridge program because of its revolutionary approach. He reported that the WCSO spoke with the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). The Bridge program would partner with the Department of Criminal Justice to establish a research site at the WCSO's facility with the School of Social Research and Justice Studies, Director Dr. Jennifer Lanterman. Mr. Mills clarified the purpose of the research site was to develop and implement the entire program, not just a screening tool. It would allow the staff to monitor and analyze data and publish the program's achievements.

Mr. Mills indicated that the program's second component was a facility dashboard and referenced the slide titled Facility Dashboard, which featured the interactive dashboard of the Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office (SLCo) in Utah. He informed the dashboard displayed at any moment for anyone who wanted to log onto the website. The

dashboard contained real-time data about the characteristics and needs of the detention facility's population. Mr. Mills spoke positively about the relationship cultivated with Salt Lake County based on sharing information and experiences, which he divulged and offered guidance on constructing the dashboard for the WCSO. He revealed that anyone in Commission Chambers could access the dashboard to guide discussions based on policy and resource allocation, changing the way decisions were made. The real-time characteristics and shifting needs of the WCSO detention facility's population could be viewed internally at any point, and the staff could target interventions accordingly. Mr. Mills stated that the dashboard would be built using the information gathered from the screening tool and the new jail management software system, which was currently in the process of being developed and implemented.

Mr. Mills announced the intent was for the Bridge program to develop a national model for pre-release reentry programming. He indicated extensive research was conducted to construct a program with in-person and remote components for the WCSO detention facility's population. The slide titled In-House Bridge at WCSO outlined the enrollment criteria for the in-person program, and Mr. Mills explained those criteria were selected because it allowed the staff to affect outcomes beneficially. He highlighted the criticality of positively influencing the outcomes, as the intention was to release the inmates back into the community. He said a structured, evidence-based curriculum was being developed for this program. Based on research for the program's current model, Mr. Mills revealed that 30 percent of the WCSO inmate population, by the nature of their classification and roommate restrictions, were ineligible to attend programming, which was identified as a concern. Through researching solutions, the Bridge program partnered with the American Community Corrections Institute (ACCI), which had produced evidence-based cognitive behavioral courses for more than four decades to address criminogenic needs. He announced the WCSO would launch a program this month that would deliver tablet-based resources to address the inmate population's criminogenic requirements. Mr. Mills mentioned the Bridge program intended to leverage its relationship with the ACCI to dissect some of the existing silos with the courts and supervision. He noted the ACCI partnered with the United States (US) parole and probation and justice systems throughout the Country to enable the probationers' and parolees' compliance with their programs. He indicated the WCSO was creating a research segment out of the ACCI's program to ensure detainees' compliance with their court-mandated obligations, effective supervision while in custody, and a successful integration into the community.

Mr. Mills introduced the community aspect of the Bridge program, which he described as its true backbone. He explained the WCSO could not manage the Bridge program alone, as reentry was a community issue and would require everyone to implement the program successfully. He said the WCSO was evolving into a reentry-related agency that every entity would seek to collaborate with. He assured the screening tool would indicate who in the WCSO's facility needed assistance, and the WCSO dashboard would be able to specify how many inmates were in need of help. Mr. Mills stated that using an evidence-based, structured curriculum would enable agencies to teach as subject matter experts. This approach would also facilitate carrying out additional assessments and developing case management profiles to support a positive transition into the community.

He indicated that every successful agreement with a new community partner would be accompanied by a press release and local news coverage, adding that the community deserved to be informed about the Bridge program's endeavors. Mr. Mills opined that because the community would be safer, it would feel safer. He noted there were family members and friends in the WCSO's custody and said community members would want their loved ones in custody to participate in the Bridge program because of its efficacy. He asserted the County should eventually become the national model for pre-release reentry programming, adding the County was on the cusp of achieving that. He stated that such WCSO divisions as the Detention Services Unit (DSU) and the Inmate Assistance Program (IAP), along with other agencies within Washoe County, would be enriched by the access to the data being gathered by the Bridge program as well as the resources it was introducing.

Mr. Mills concluded that a reentry program intervened in his life and helped him return to his father. He referred to a photograph on the thirteenth slide showing his father holding Mr. Mills's infant son. Another photograph showed Mr. Mills's two sons, and he attributed their existence to the reentry program in which he participated. He expressed his adoration for his sons and conveyed his desire to protect them through any means necessary. He summarized that the WCSO was offering an approach to provide his sons and their generation with a safer and more positive future. Mr. Mills thanked the Board for the opportunity to present on the program.

Chair Hill complimented the presentation and the Bridge program.

Vice Chair Herman commented that Mr. Mills' father was likely exceptionally proud of him. She noted the program was exciting and expressed enthusiasm in hearing more about it.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Mills for sharing his story and described it as a story of hope. She stated that Mr. Mills' account demonstrated how the community's investment in people led to their capacity to give back to the community. She was impressed by the ability to share the data with the public and invite community partners to provide their expertise. She believed providing partners and the public access was not always allowed within different local governments, so she applauded Mr. Mills for that aspect. Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Mills for attending the meeting.

Commissioner Andriola congratulated Mr. Mills for his success and efforts to help lead the way for many other individuals. She believed his story was incredible and thought having more positive stories related to addiction would be beneficial. She noted Mr. Mills' dedication to helping others. She believed ensuring the Bridge program was data-driven and it included measurements that could be quantified was especially beneficial. She thanked Mr. Mills.

Commissioner Clark congratulated Mr. Mills for turning his life around and said the Bridge program seemed to be a notable initiative. He complimented the WCSO and the operations at its jailhouse, as he spent several hours there a couple of weeks ago

observing food preparation, delivery, distribution, and cleanup. He thought anything involved with the jail was a positive investment in Washoe County's resources to keep people from reoffending. Commissioner Clark suggested that Mr. Mills contact the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce. He mentioned he awarded discretionary funds to the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Ann Silver for job training. He stated that Ms. Silver purchased uniforms, safety shoes, goggles, and other tools needed for employees of affiliated companies who were released from incarceration. Commissioner Clark emphasized the importance of job opportunities to earn an income and improve oneself, for which he stated the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce was an appropriate resource. He thanked Mr. Mills for his efforts.

Chair Hill mentioned that she and Commissioner Garcia had the opportunity to visit the Getting Ahead While Getting Out programs. She asked how such programs worked with the Bridge program and whether they were separate from the Bridge program. Mr. Mills indicated the Getting Ahead While Getting Out programs would still be involved in the Bridge program. He noted the Getting Ahead While Getting Out programs were evidence-based approaches. He divulged that the Getting Ahead While Getting Out classes would continue to be offered for in-person programming until Chaplain Travis Sharpe was ready to resign. Mr. Mills informed that the new enrollment criteria were slightly more restrictive because the two primary groups that self-referred into programming while incarcerated were low-risk and high-risk inmates, which could be problematic due to the exposure effect. Furthermore, due to the limited availability of resources, the Bridge program targeted the group with the highest likelihood to recidivate because there were more opportunities to change those outcomes.

Chair Hill asked if the participants who had to use the tablets were paying commissary funds as part of their programming in the jail. Mr. Mills clarified that the payment would be derived from the commissary trust fund and that the inmates would not be responsible for paying it. Chair Hill questioned if the Bridge program was working in collaboration with the Miami, Florida, model, noting the model for the program seemed similar. Mr. Mills spoke about Washoe County Behavioral Health Administrator Julia Ratti's work with Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) on the sequential intercept model (SIM). He explained that a WCSO program would typically exist in intercept points two through four, where the opportunity was available to change outcomes acutely. He clarified the Bridge program operated at every intercept point, and the community, data, and resource aspects would enrich every intercept point for more effective resource delivery. Mr. Mills revealed that the experts participated in such efforts with the Washoe County Justice Courts for a long period of time, and he said the WCSO had the opportunity to use their experience to apply it to the community.

Chair Hill requested that Mr. Mills continue to update the Board on the Bridge program. She expressed excitement about reviewing the WCSO's full report for the fiscal year and the continued discussions regarding methods to improve the jail's conditions and support people entering their next step into the community. She thanked Mr. Mills.

DONATIONS

- 24-0488** **8A1** Recommendation to accept a donation of one (1) 2024 Interstate 6x14 Enclosed Trailer valued at [\$4,900] from The Washoe County Mounted Horse Unit Auxiliary to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Mounted Horse Unit. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8A1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 9A1 THROUGH 9D1

- 24-0489** **9A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of June 18, 2024, and June 25, 2024, and the special meeting of June 21, 2024. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0490** **9B1** Recommendation to approve a request from the Greater Reno Community Ice Skating Association (GRCISA) to allow the association to secure financing on the ice arena building (financing will not include Washoe County land) for Phase 2 of their project as outlined in Paragraph 21 of the executed License Agreement for Operation and Maintenance dated February 14, 2023, contingent on analysis of financing documents and conditions that may be applied by the Washoe County Bond Counsel. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)
- 24-0491** **9C1** Request for Board of County Commissioner approval for changes made to the Washoe County Audit Committee's charter pursuant to Washoe County Code 15.545(6). Changes made to match updates to Washoe County Code. Changes include: removing the term limit for the Board of County Commissioner representative for the Audit Committee; explaining the role of the alternate member from the Board of County Commissioners; updating requirements for public members to serve; adding a provision that current Washoe County employees may not serve as public members; adding role of a vice chair; changing reviews of charter and Washoe County Code to biannual instead of periodic; adding the Chief Financial Officer as a participant; and adding professional standard that the Audit Committee complies with. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0492** **9C2** Recommendation to approve the reappointment of Charlene Hart pursuant to WCC Section 15.545 to fill the term beginning on July 1, 2024 and ending on June 30, 2028, for the Washoe County Audit Committee. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0493** **9C3** Recommendation to approve the annual schedule of audits, reviews, and workplan for the Internal Audit Division, which is required to be presented to the Board of County Commissioners for their approval

pursuant to Washoe County Code 15.560. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

- 24-0494** **9C4** Recommendation to acknowledge the Annual Report from the Internal Audit Division for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024. Washoe County Code 15.569.4 requires the Internal Auditor to submit an annual report to the Board of County Commissioners each fiscal year indicating the audits completed with the findings and recommendations. Audits/reviews include the Washoe County Clerk's Office - Board Records and Minutes Division, Washoe County Library System - Title Procurement Process, Washoe County Library System - Event Programming and Expenditures, Washoe County Sheriff's Office Fees, Washoe County Sheriff's Office Bail Procedures, and Cash Control Audit (Treasurer's Office and Clerk's Office). Also required is whether the corrective actions have been taken or if the areas of concern are still outstanding. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0495** **9C5** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed audit for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Fees from the Internal Audit Division. The purpose of this audit was to provide assurance that the risk and all areas of improvement are identified; provide assurance there are effective and efficient internal controls; and provide recommendations to improve the control environment. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0496** **9C6** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed review for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Bail Procedures from the Internal Audit Division. The purpose of this review was to provide assurance that the risk and all areas of improvement are identified; provide assurance there are effective and efficient internal controls; and provide recommendations to improve the control environment. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0497** **9D1** Recommendation to approve the use of General Fund Contingency in the amount of [\$100,000] to implement a "Transparency and Open Checkbook" website which will display Washoe County's vendor payments, expenditures and other financial information to the public and; if approved, direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget appropriation transfers. [Total fiscal year 2025 impact \$100,000; net fiscal impact \$-0-] and up to \$75,000 annually for subsequent years through the annual budget process. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Mr. Scott Finley was not present when called to speak.

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 9A1 through 9D1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9D1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 10 THROUGH 13, 15, 16, 17 18

24-0498 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to: 1) approve a Non-Funded Cost Share Agreement between Washoe County and the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest with an estimated Washoe County non-cash contribution of [\$215,510.00; \$209,310.00 in personnel costs and \$6,200.00 in light maintenance costs] over a 5-year period to allow Washoe County to maintain existing and future trails that cross both jurisdictions along the Sierra Front and to continue maintaining the Whites Creek, Thomas Creek Canyon, and Michael D. Thompson Trailheads; and 2) authorize the Assistant County Manager [Dave Solaro] to sign the Agreement on behalf of the County. Community Services. (Commission Districts 1 and 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0499 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Washoe County Juvenile Services Door Security Replacement Project, PWP-WA-2024-084 [staff recommends James F. Thomson, Jr. doing business as American Southwest Electric, LLC, in the amount of \$1,495,334.00]; and (2) approve a separate project contingency fund [in the amount of \$134,564.00] for the total construction cost not to exceed \$1,629,898.00. The project is located at 650 Ferrari McLeod Boulevard, Reno, Nevada, and the scope of the project is to upgrade the existing door controls, communication, and integration of the security camera systems at the Washoe County Juvenile Services Facility. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0500

AGENDA ITEM 12 Recommendation and possible action to approve the settlement between Kroger Company and the State of Nevada in the opioid litigation (State of Nevada v. McKesson Corp. et al., Case No. A-19-796755-B (Nev. Dist. Ct., Clark County) and execution by Washoe County of the “Kroger Subdivision Participation and Release Form” pursuant to the One Nevada Agreement on Allocation of Opioid Recoveries (“One Nevada Agreement”) previously agreed upon for participation in settlements (entered into on July 27, 2021).

The proposed settlement between Kroger and the State of Nevada is in an amount of \$26,718,162 before attorney’s fees are deducted and paid over a 10-year period. Pursuant to the One Nevada Agreement, Washoe County will receive an estimated annual allocation of \$100,043.47 for 10 years.

District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0501

AGENDA ITEM 13 Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$2,419,345] in both revenues and expenditures to the FY25 Mobile Crisis Response Team program within the Child Protective Services Fund (F228) and direct the Comptroller’s Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0502

AGENDA ITEM 15 Recommendation to deobligate previously approved allocations of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) for projects that have been completed under budget, been cancelled, or no longer need the previously approved levels of funding: District Attorney's Office Court Case Backlog Personnel by \$1,516,778.46.

Recommendation to approve transfer of collected 12% indirect on salary from eligible approved projects from January 1, 2024, through June 31, 2024, totaling \$52,817.83. These include Public Defender Personnel \$27,916.10; Human Services Agency Personnel \$8,828.58; Second Judicial

District Court \$4,734.54; Juvenile Services Mental Health \$4,685.64 and ARPA Admin Personnel \$6,652.97.

And, if approved, direction to the Comptroller's Office to make necessary net zero cross-fund and/or cross-functional budget appropriation transfers and unbudgeted transfers. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0503 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation to approve the three-year agreement and approve the payment for the Fiscal Year 2025 (July 2024-June 2025) software and support of the Palo Alto Networks for Maintenance and Support Services, in the amount of [\$558,438.74], for the Palo Alto Networks software maintenance and support. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0504 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to award Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 3226-24 for medical services - Sheriff's Office Personnel to the only bidder ARC Health and Wellness Centers, Reno, NV. in the estimated annual amount of \$396,434, (\$1,189,302 for the duration of the contract) and if approved, retroactively authorize, on behalf of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute a three-year agreement, July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2027, with the option to renew for two (2) additional one (1) year periods at the sole discretion of the County. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0505 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to 1) award Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 3223-24 for inmate medical services for the Washoe County Detention Facility to the highest scoring bidder NaphCare, Inc. in the amount of [\$13,502,694.24] for year 1, and [\$14,177,828.88] for year 2 and 2) approve the use of General Fund Contingency in an amount up to but not

to exceed [\$1,300,000] to increase expenditure authority within the Washoe County Sheriff's Office departmental budget for detention medical services for unbudgeted expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 and; if approved, retroactively authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute a two-year agreement, July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2026, with the option to renew for two (2) additional two (2) year periods at the sole discretion of the County and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget appropriation transfers as needed [Total fiscal year 2025 impact up to \$1,300,000, contract is fully budgeted for FY25]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

24-0506 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Discussion and direction to staff regarding potential Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) for the 83rd (2025) Session of the Nevada Legislature. The subject(s) of potential BDRs to be considered include changes to NRS Chapters 239 and 259 to clarify that certain records of a Medical Examiner/Coroner are public records and to clarify that certain records of a Medical Examiner/Coroner are confidential and are not public records, changes to NRS Chapters 239 and 293 to establish that records of voter signatures held by a County Clerk or Registrar of Voters for purposes of establishing or validating voter registration are not public records, to add to NRS Chapter 482 the requirement for the Department of Motor Vehicles, in cooperation with Washoe County to design, prepare and issue a specialty license plate for the support of programs benefiting the Truckee River, to submit a recommendation to the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System to amend chapter 432, Statutes of Nevada, 1999 to require the Reno-Sparks Convention Authority to grant to Washoe County a percentage of certain taxes collected from the rental of transient lodging in Incline Village and Crystal Bay to be used towards paying the costs of public transit to, from, and within the portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin located in Washoe County, and to submit a recommendation to the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System that they submit a BDR amending chapter 432, Statutes of Nevada, 1999 to impose a surcharge of \$4 on the per night charge for rental of transient lodging in Incline Village and Crystal bay to be distributed to Washoe County to be used towards paying the costs of public transit to, from, and within the portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin located in Washoe County. The Board may direct staff to pursue BDRs on one or more of the identified subjects or to

bring back information on subjects of other BDRs that the Board identifies as being in the best interests of the County for approval at a future meeting. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich displayed a PowerPoint slide titled Washoe County Bill Draft Request (BDR) Process for 2025 Legislative Session. She explained that the slide depicted Washoe County's current position in the BDR development process for the 2025 Legislative Session beginning in February. She sought the Board's direction because there were upcoming deadlines. She informed the Board she would first provide an update on the potential BDR topics that the Board gave direction on in April. She would then request the Board's direction on possible BDR recommendations related to the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System (TRPA Oversight Committee). She would then ask the Board to identify any additional BDR recommendations it wished to submit to authorized entities for sponsorship. Those recommendations would return to the Board at the August 20 or August 27 Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting in preparation for the September 1 BDR submission deadline.

Ms. Matijevich stated the Board provided direction to her in April on two BDR items related to public records: one related to the Medical Examiner/Coroner (ME) and one related to voter registration signatures. She reminded that as part of the voter registration BDR, signatures would remain as public records for inspection purposes at a Registrar of Voter's (ROV) Office or Clerk's Office. However, the ROV or Clerk's Office would not be required to provide copies of voter registrations as public records to members of the public. Per the Board's direction, she presented the two items to the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) Legislative Committee for its consideration to sponsor the topics, as both items were relevant to all Nevada counties. She reported that the NACO Legislative Committee discussed the items on multiple occasions and had given its support to both. She anticipated the committee would recommend the items for submission to the NACO Board of Directors as NACO BDRs at its next meeting. The NACO Board of Directors would consider the NACO Legislative Committee's recommendations at its July 26 meeting, and final approval of NACO's BDR topics would occur at its August 23 meeting. She observed that there was little time between that meeting and the September 1 deadline, which could impact the Board's current direction.

Ms. Matijevich noted that in April, the Board was presented with an agenda item regarding a specialty license plate to benefit the Truckee River. The Board expressed interest in the item but asked that it be held for consideration with the other items at the current meeting. She had performed additional research on the specialty license plate process and discovered the County did not have to submit the item as a BDR. Instead, it could submit an application to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the Commission on Special License Plates at that time. She recommended that the Board take this action because the goal would be achieved faster and would likely utilize less staff time.

Ms. Matijevich indicated two new items for the Board's consideration, which were BDR recommendations to the TRPA Oversight Committee. The first item would require a certain portion of existing room taxes to be redirected to Washoe County to support public transit. The second item would create a new surcharge that would also go to Washoe County to support public transit. Chair Hill asked if the proceeds from both items would only support public transit that entered and exited Incline Village and Crystal Bay. Ms. Matijevich clarified that the proceeds would support transportation to, from, and within those areas. The proceeds would not be allowed for transit not connecting to the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Proceeds could not be used exclusively for transit in California but for a broader transit system that transported around the entire lake. She stated the proceeds could be used for things like microtransit and airport shuttles from the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, which would allow visitors to visit Lake Tahoe without using a vehicle or rental car. She noted that the proposed BDR items were in response to an identified need for dedicated funding for public transit in the Washoe County portion of the Tahoe Basin, which did not currently exist. She said the Washoe County Taxes on Transient Lodging Act of 1999 set forth certain required taxes and their acceptable payment methods, and other room taxes were identified in Chapter 244 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). The first BDR item would take a portion of the proceeds from those taxes that were currently paid to the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA) and would require the RSCVA to grant that money to the BCC for use in public transport. Proceeds from the creation of a new surcharge in the second BDR item would similarly be granted to the BCC for the same use. She reminded that nightly surcharges existed elsewhere in Washoe County to benefit properties or programs serving residents and visitors. She said staff wanted to replicate that in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. She noted that the two BDR items would not be County BDRs. Rather, they would be recommended to the TRPA Oversight Committee. The recommendations were due at the end of the month, so if the Board desired their submission, it had to direct her that day. She discussed the Board's potential identification of additional BDRs for consideration at upcoming BCC meetings.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Matijevich for the information. She clarified that the proceeds from the new surcharge and reallocated taxes would only apply to the Lake Tahoe portion of Washoe County, specifically in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. She informed that American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds were currently used to fund microtransit in those two areas. Visitors could pay their fair share since they impacted the community. She noted that the County still had two available BDRs if any Commissioners desired to provide recommendations to Ms. Matijevich.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Matijevich for providing brevity despite the items' complexity. She stated she was familiar with specialty license plates and mentioned a requirement that a specialty plate must benefit the entire State. She was unsure if it was still a requirement. She explained that a condition also existed that required a certain number of license plate registrants to be maintained. She supported the opportunity and wanted to offer that information in case procedures would prevent the item from moving forward. She inquired when the BDR deadline was. Ms. Matijevich said the County's deadline to submit its two BDRs allocated by statute to the Legislative Counsel

Bureau (LCB) was September 1. Since that deadline fell on a weekend, the BDRs had to be submitted by August 30. She advised that if any Commissioners wanted to suggest BDR items, she would prefer their direction that day to allow time for her to develop the suggestions, return them for the Board's consideration, and submit them by August 30.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock said she did not recall the BDR regarding voter registration being discussed in April and requested to know who posed the idea. She discussed transparency in government and posited that elections had become less transparent. She believed it was wrong to omit voter signatures from public records. She asked the Board to eliminate the related BDR from the agenda item and suggested that mandatory voter identification or mandatory cleaning of voter rolls were better BDRs. She declared that other Nevada counties would appreciate the alternative suggestions. She stated that Democrats posed issues because Republicans voted for fair, honest, and secure elections while Democrats did the opposite. She questioned why a citizen advisory board (CAB) for election-related topics did not exist so that those topics could be discussed before reaching the BCC. She asserted that the public needed to see voter signatures at certain times and mentioned it related to cleaning voter rolls.

Mr. Robert Beadles thanked the Board for bringing the agenda item to the public's attention. He asked for additional clarity regarding the implications of the recommended BDR related to voter signatures. He inquired if it would prevent the ability to clean voter rolls. He stated that he provided former ROV Jamie Rodriguez and County Manager Eric Brown with a list of 43,000 people who should not be on the County's voter rolls, but it was not investigated. In March 2023, he provided Ms. Rodriguez with another list containing 11,400 people who should not be on the voter rolls based solely on tax and voter records. He commented that the NRS stated certain addresses could not receive ballots or submit votes. He said the emails he received in response advised that the recipients would respond within 90 days, but no action was taken. He stated that voter signatures were visible from outside of ballot envelopes. He declared he could obtain enough information from the envelopes to steal someone's identity. He asked that the Board deny the item if it meant that voter rolls could not be cleaned.

Ms. Renee Rezendes stated that the BDR recommendation regarding voter signatures did not make sense. She said that voter signatures could easily be used for fraud since they were visible outside the ballot envelope. She questioned why the signature had to suddenly be made private. She said the item should be denied if it would interfere with checking voter rolls.

Ms. Val White defined creep as something that slowly progressed until it reached its destination. She spoke about the BDR related to voter signatures and asserted that it displayed the characteristics of a creep because it would allow the ROV's Office to conceal information and prevent people from ensuring ballot signatures were valid. She questioned if the BDR would increase transparency, which she often heard the ROV's Office was concerned about. She did not think the BDR increased transparency nor encouraged assurance that elections were fairly conducted. She shared that she spent several hours observing the ROV's Office during multiple elections. She asserted that

signatures were the only method of ensuring a ballot was valid. She believed the current election system was not transparent because people could not validate the computers or programming used. She claimed that machines were intended to conceal information and said the ROV's Office recently obtained additional machines to verify signatures.

Ms. Victoria Myer expressed dissatisfaction with voter signatures not being a part of the public record. She posited that the potential BDR would make it difficult to associate voters with signatures. She mentioned Nevada's Effective Absentee System for Elections (EASE) and noted it allowed someone to vote online. She declared that EASE did not ask her if she was a robot, and she questioned its security. She said it documented that she voted in the presidential preference primary (PPP) election but did not. She stated she received six ballots at her house for people who lived in New Hampshire, and her neighbors received ballots for people who had never lived there. She asserted that NRS granted voter rights, which included an accurate sample ballot. She commented that she received her sample ballot after the election concluded and that it did not contain Mr. Drew Ribar's name. She declared that voters had the right to transparent elections and to complain about elections. She said the BDR would decrease transparency in elections. She requested that the Board provide additional explanations about the BDR and create a citizen voting committee.

Chair Hill asked Ms. Matijevich to clarify the BDR related to voter signatures and recalled that the Board had previously voted unanimously in favor of it. Ms. Matijevich apologized for any potential insufficient information. She explained that when the item was presented in April, the Board gave her direction to forward the BDR to NACO. However, the Board could provide a different direction that day. The BDR was a result of concerns about voting integrity and identity theft. It would clarify in election statutes and public records statutes that voter registration signature files would be available for inspection at either the Clerk's Office or ROV's Office, depending on the county. However, those offices would not be required to provide copies of voter registration signatures to members of the public. She observed that standing record requests were often submitted for ongoing pages or volumes, and someone could potentially request a copy of every voter registration signature. The proposed BDR stated that someone could come in person to view signatures because the law required that they were available. However, someone could not leave with a copy, which would be made very clear in statutes. She said there was no identifiable purpose in providing copies to the public.

Commissioner Clark noted that someone could obtain copies of documents containing signatures from the Recorder's Office and other sources. He compared the BDR regarding voter signatures to locking a front door but leaving a side door open, which was based on questionable logic. He stated that many other departments held documents with signatures, so the BDR would not prevent people from obtaining signatures if they truly wanted them. He stated it had been a problem during his tenure at the Assessor's Office. He specified that certain judges and law enforcement officers desired to conceal their identities, but other resources were available for public consumption in other departments. He declared that the proposed BDR might present more work without accomplishing its intended goals.

Commissioner Clark recommended that the County develop a BDR that ordered an automatic recount if an election resulted in a 3 to 5 percent difference in candidate votes. He said it would assist in certification and eliminate questions about tight races. It would also prevent people from having to spend \$50,000 to cure 15 ballots. He announced that a specific threshold and tolerance should be in place and suggested that the threshold should be between approximately 3 and 5 percent.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras mentioned that she received comments from the public regarding signatures appearing on envelopes during the last election. She informed that the County would be using the Secretary of State's (SOS) approved mail ballot during the upcoming general election. She was not sure where the signatures would appear. She suggested that the BDR might not have the desired effect and acknowledged that it would be for the Legislature to consider. She affirmed Commissioner Clark's point that copies of signatures could be obtained in other County departments. She mentioned she had been addressing the reason why signatures appeared on the back of a ballot envelope versus under the flap.

Vice Chair Herman confirmed that the County could submit two of its own BDRs during each regular legislative session. She thought that her priorities, such as a BDR concerning elections, were consistently disregarded. She expressed her desire to create BDRs that took care of everyone and that everyone could be proud of. She did not agree with some of the suggestions within the agenda item.

Chair Hill wanted to clarify the Board's desired actions with Ms. Matijevich. She stated she would motion to submit the two proposed BDRs to the TRPA Oversight Committee. She asserted that Commissioner Clark could make a motion on his BDR request and stated that other Commissioners could make a motion regarding any additional desired BDRs. Chair Hill asked Ms. Matijevich if the items submitted to NACO would be heard at its next meeting and therefore allow members of the public to express their concerns to NACO. Ms. Matijevich clarified that based on the Board's previous direction, she already submitted the two specified BDRs to the NACO Legislative Committee. To her knowledge, the committee was moving forward with the suggestions. She stated that if the BCC wished to provide a different direction, she could relay that information at the next NACO Legislative Committee meeting on Friday. She did not believe those meetings were open to the public. However, the NACO Board of Directors' meetings, where the BDRs would be considered, allowed opportunities for public comment. She pointed out that a voter's signature was held with their voter registration and essentially unlocked their ballot. She stated that those signatures could look different than signatures on file at other agencies, such as the DMV. She thanked Chief DDA Kandaras for providing additional clarification as it informed her communication with NACO. She stated the voter registration record contained a package of information that was not necessarily obtained in other departments. The BDR intended to eliminate one method of malevolently obtaining a package of information about other people. She declared that was why the BDR was determined to have merit when it was presented to the Board.

Commissioner Clark expressed appreciation for Ms. Matijevich's work and stated the ROV's Office sold the voter rolls, which were used for mailing election and campaign materials. He said someone could take the extra step to visit the Recorder's Office and obtain the name on the deed. He stated the BDR would not accomplish its goal of deterring devious individuals from obtaining a full package of information on people.

Commissioner Andriola mentioned that she and Vice Chair Herman served on the NACO Board of Directors. She thought it would be interesting to hear opinions from the other 16 jurisdictions since NACO, not Washoe County, would sponsor the BDR. She was interested in hearing the dialogue between all 17 counties before the BDR was dismissed. She believed more information was needed and the dialogue would prove to be helpful.

Commissioner Garcia supported the two items that would be recommended to the TRPA Oversight Committee. She stated she was very comfortable with the two items submitted to NACO and the specialty license plate submission. She supported Commissioner Clark's recommendation for a BDR that directed an automatic recount in close elections. She declared that research could be performed to identify thresholds that were used in other states.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered to recommend to the TRPA Oversight Committee a BDR recommendation on the existing transient lodging tax generated in Incline Village and Crystal Bay to Washoe County for public transit as outlined in Attachment B. It was further ordered to recommend to the TRPA Oversight Committee to impose a \$4.00 surcharge on the per night transient lodging in Incline Village and Crystal Bay towards public transit, as shown in Item C in the agenda packet.

Commissioner Clark thanked Commissioner Garcia for supporting his request for the BDR regarding an automatic recount. He said he was also interested in how other jurisdictions facilitated similar legislation.

On motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that research be initiated regarding automatic recounts in close election races for the purposes of submitting a Washoe County BDR to the Nevada Legislature during its next regular session.

Chair Hill recommended that the County pursue the specialty license plate through the DMV's regular process. She believed everyone was passionate about the Truckee River and would be interested in obtaining more funding to support it.

Commissioner Andriola asked if a motion was needed regarding the BDRs submitted to NACO. Chair Hill explained that the items had already been submitted. She stated that based on new information, Ms. Matijevich should explain to the NACO Legislative Committee at its next meeting that some hesitation existed about the BDR regarding voter signatures.

24-0507

AGENDA ITEM 19 Introduce and conduct a first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), in Article 319, (Short Term Rentals (STRs)) by modifying various sections in order to clarify maximum occupancy limitations associated with an STR permit; limit STRs to one per parcel in the Tahoe Planning Area; prohibit new STRs in accessory dwellings in the Tahoe Planning Area; clarify when an STR permit must be relinquished; remove requirement for an outdoor fireplace permit from the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District; allow for an updated STR permit renewal date via payment of a pro-rated renewal fee; remove the requirement for a signed notary for STR renewal applications; clarify that a new STR permit is required with each change of parcel ownership; grant a 30 day automatic grace period for renewals with a possible additional 30 day discretionary grace period that may be granted by the Director of Planning and Building; and clarify violation and revocation regulations; and by amending Washoe County Code Chapter 125 (Administrative Enforcement Code) to reduce the appeal period for STR stop activity orders from 30 days to 14 days; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

If supported, set the public hearing for second reading and possible adoption of the Ordinance for August 20, 2024. Virtual Public Comment Eligible. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1921.

Chair Hill requested a brief presentation from the County staff.

Planning and Building Division Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Short-Term Rental (STR) Code Amendments; Purpose of Amendments (8 slides); Possible Motion; Thank you.

Chair Hill requested an explanation regarding how the new language related to short-term rentals (STRs) per parcel would work for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). She further asked what a duplex would look like in that situation. Mr. Lloyd clarified the referenced provision would only apply to the Lake Tahoe Basin. Additionally, if an ADU was located on the property, a standard would be applied, establishing that the ADU could not be used as the STR due to the need for workforce housing in the Lake Tahoe Basin. He indicated a duplex would essentially be two units under one parcel, and in that situation, the property owner could choose the unit he or she wished to use as the STR. However, the property owner would not be allowed to use both units nor could the total square footage be used to calculate the occupancy for the STR.

Chair Hill asked about the possibility of property owners renting out individual bedrooms as separate STR listings or multiple bedrooms and a duplex. She also inquired if this would be allowed in the future. Mr. Lloyd indicated that the classification

would be a partial home rental in such instances and stated the staff would allow for that type of use. He added property owners could only rent out to one party at a time, so they could not rent a single bedroom out to one party while renting another to a different party.

Chair Hill entertained Board member comments and questions regarding the proposed changes; however, none were forthcoming.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1921 was introduced by Commissioner Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

24-0508 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Introduce and conduct a first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Article 438 Grading Standards, Article 810 Special Use Permits, and Article 902 Definitions to update provisions related to grading. The amendments include: deleting sections in Article 438 related to Grading Fees, Definitions, Grading of Slopes, Cuts, Fills, and Phasing and Stabilization of Grading; revising existing sections in Article 438 related to Scope, Required Permits, Exempted Work, Major Grading Permit Thresholds, Major Grading Permit Application Requirements, Minor Grading Permit Thresholds, Minor Grading Permit Application Requirements, Financial Security for Grading, Unpermitted Grading, Stop Activity Orders, Notice of Violations and Enforcement, Penalties and Procedures, Grading & Retaining Walls Within Setbacks, Drainage and Terracing, Erosion Control, Grading Inspections, Notification of Completion of Work, Grading Within Floodplains, Drainage Ways and Closed Hydrologic Basins; and adding sections in Article 438 related to Grading Standards and Rockery Walls; adding a section to Article 810 related to Determinations of Substantial Conformance for Major Grading; and revising an existing section in Article 902 to add and/or revise various Definitions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

If supported, set the public hearing for second reading and possible adoption of the Ordinance for August 20, 2024. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1922.

Chair Hill asked if the Board members wanted to see a presentation on the agenda item, to which no one responded affirmatively.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Ken Krater did not wish to speak.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1922 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

24-0509 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Discussion and possible reconsideration of June 18, 2024, approval of Commission District Special Fund disbursement for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 in the form of a [\$10,000.00] grant to the Reno Toy Run -- a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes – to support their mission of providing toys for children in need. If the board votes in favor of this item, it would result in its previous approval being rescinded and the funding would not be approved or disbursed. Manager's Office. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Hill noted that the County budgeted \$100,000 for each Commissioner to award to any non-profit cause that benefited the community. She requested that the item be placed on a Board of County Commissioners (BCC) agenda because the news media reported that a representative from the Reno Toy Run (RTR) wore a symbol containing the swastika and Nazi war eagle while attending a BCC meeting to accept the donation. She acknowledged the feedback from many members of the public and indicated that she researched the symbol, noting it was over 7,000 years old, it was used by many cultures, and it had many meanings attached to it. Chair Hill clarified she was not taking away from the swastika's cultural significance; however, former German Reich Chancellor Adolf Hitler unfortunately hijacked the swastika. She declared the swastika was transformed into a symbol of hate, racism, anti-semitism, sexism, bigotry, discrimination, and otherizing people who were different. She informed over 400,000 American soldiers lost their lives when fighting in World War II (WWII), and she shared that both of her grandfathers served in that war. One of her grandfathers served in combat against the Nazis, while the other fought imperialism in the Pacific, and they both battled against a totalitarian regime and what Nazis and swastikas upheld. Chair Hill stated that these regimes murdered and tortured countless people. She informed over 15 million people were estimated to have been killed, including those within the Jewish population, men, women, individuals with handicaps, the elderly, the sick, homosexual individuals, and over 1 million children under 8 years of age. The information detailed was the reason why she disagreed with taxpayer dollars being allocated to organizations that supported individuals who wore swastikas. Chair Hill wanted a Northern Nevada Confederacy of Clubs (NNVCOC) representative to answer a question she wished to pose.

Mr. Troy Regas was present to respond to questions on behalf of the NNVCOC. Chair Hill inquired about Mr. Regas's stance on swastikas and asked if members of his organization were permitted to wear swastikas. Mr. Regas expressed delight in being asked the questions. He clarified he was a member of the Hells Angels Motorcycle Club (HAMC) and informed there were HAMC groups residing in Germany. The HAMC believed the swastika was anti-semitic and did not allow it to be worn on any of the members' clothing because the members' conduct could affect the German charters. Mr. Regas opposed the swastika; however, he indicated that he also judged people based on the quality of their character and conduct during the span of 50 years. He said he had been acquainted with the motorcycle club called the Branded Few and had never met a

member of that club who was racist. He shared that he received a card with the four L's of life when he first met the Branded Few, which he estimated to be approximately 30 years ago. Mr. Regas claimed the Branded Few did not use the symbol to represent a swastika, but rather a bent cross, which he said was featured far back in history. A member of the Branded Few, who Mr. Regas recalled had attended a previous BCC meeting, had a grandmother who used the symbol in basket weaving before WWII, which Mr. Regas indicated was where the club's use of the symbol was derived from. He remarked that he would not be referring to the symbol used by the Branded Few as a swastika. Mr. Regas mentioned the Branded Few informed on the meaning of the eagle depicted on the jacket, which he revealed was strength. He commented that the NNVCOC and the RTR did not tolerate any type of hate toward any individual whatsoever and addressed matters in the group more effectively than the Board because they policed themselves. He asserted the NNVCOC and the RTR did not tolerate many behaviors around their clubs and assessed situations clearly, as justice was not blind on the street. Mr. Regas stated that people who acted inappropriately were prohibited around the NNVCOC or the RTR.

Chair Hill asked if members of Mr. Regas's organization could wear swastikas, to which Mr. Regas responded they could not. Chair Hill clarified her question pertained to the NNVCOC and requested that Mr. Regas provide a clear response. Mr. Regas said the symbol in question was not considered a swastika and accused Chair Hill of misrepresenting his responses, for which he expressed disapproval. He asserted he would continue to refer to the symbol as a bent cross because that was the term used by the Branded Few, and he refused to call it a swastika. He claimed the bent cross's and swastika's appearances differed. Chair Hill asked whether members wore the symbol regardless of how Mr. Regas defined it, and Mr. Regas responded that he did not recognize it as a swastika.

Chair Hill described the swastika as a sign of white supremacy, totalitarianism, and Nazism. Furthermore, she declared that she would not award taxpayer dollars to an organization with members who could wear swastikas, adding her choice was acceptable. She remarked that those in attendance would have to await the vote results on the matter. She wanted to ensure she spoke to Mr. Regas about the matter before proceeding with the agenda item. Chair Hill expressed appreciation toward Mr. Regas for attending the meeting and thanked him.

Commissioner Clark proclaimed his donation was clearly awarded to the RTR, which was a specific nonprofit with a board comprised of five individuals. None of the board members were wearing a swastika or bent cross. He agreed with Chair Hill's sentiments and acknowledged America rightfully fought and defeated Nazism, which he was glad for. He stated that his donation to the RTR was to gift toys to children who would otherwise not receive toys. Commissioner Clark pointed out the matter was similar to a BCC agenda item concerning the Karma Box Project, and during the meeting at which that matter was addressed, he had requested that research be conducted on the founder of the Karma Box Project. He was informed during the meeting that the County's funds were being awarded to the organization and not to the founder. He declared that the same rules should apply to Agenda Item 21.

Commissioner Clark noted the person sitting in the audience did not have any relevance to the voting, the County's spending, or the RTR's management, spending, or decisions. He said the RTR was separate from any individual and had accomplished positive efforts for several years, which was why the organization was brought to his attention. He believed donating to the RTR was an appropriate way to help the community and the community's children. He mentioned he did not conduct research on anyone's attire, nor was he aware that someone in the audience of the BCC meeting was wearing a swastika. He voiced opposition to any items related to Nazism and, referencing a small Isreal flag, said he had his flag to show who he supported. He mentioned that he granted a donation to Jewish Nevada at the same BCC meeting where the RTR was awarded the initial donation. Commissioner Clark questioned how his stance could have been interpreted as being in support of a Nazi organization when he supported Jewish Nevada at the same time. He pointed out that none of the five people who managed the RTR wore the swastika or bent cross, none of the meeting attendees had any control over the RTR board's decisions, and none of the meeting attendees other than the five RTR board members were responsible for anything taking place at the RTR. He noted the Board received letters related to the RTR and was aware of the RTR's positive work and satisfactory financial standing. Commissioner Clark was informed by former Volunteers of America Regional Director Pat Cashell that without the RTR's efforts, many children would not have had a Christmas. He hoped the matter would not negatively impact the potential for more donations to the RTR. He and Vice Chair Herman had requested an additional \$10,000 donation to the RTR for the current fiscal year (FY). Commissioner Clark stated the donation was unrelated to someone in the audience wearing something that the Board disapproved of and clarified he also disagreed with using the swastika. He hoped the other Commissioners would support him when voting on the agenda item to ensure that children who lacked resources could be given a Christmas. He added that the children did not care about swastikas and wanted to enjoy the holidays to the same extent as other, more fortunate children. He implored the other Commissioners to assist the RTR with helping the children. Commissioner Clark mentioned that the RTR's staff did not take salaries and pointed out that many nonprofits offered salaries and corporate credit cards. He said the RTR used 100 percent of the funds it earned for its cause to help children and veterans.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Drew Ribar said he wrote a check to the RTR every year for the past few decades. He commented that the RTR was no individual club, and the Branded Few was responsible for wearing the referenced symbol. He asked if anyone had visited the old Reno Downtown Station Post Office and revealed there were swastikas on its ceiling. Discussing hypocrisy, Mr. Ribar pointed out Reno Satanic delivered an invocation at a BCC meeting a few months ago, and he alleged a nonprofit was being persecuted. He noted the RTR's members were not paid, and none of the Branded Few members were seated on the RTR's boards. He said some Branded Few's members supported the RTR and donated their money. He stated that because the Branded Few was associated with the RTR in any way, there was a desire to take the money away from the children, and he compared the matter to Reno Satanic's invocation. Mr. Ribar questioned why there would be a desire to withdraw the funds from the children due to disliking someone else and believed the matter was hypocritical. He mentioned one of the Branded Few members who attended a BCC meeting was a Native American whose

ancestors weaved baskets before WWII and claimed the symbol in question was not affiliated with Nazism. He shared that both of his grandfathers fought in WWII. He divulged part of his family emigrated from Croatia and revealed his family was decimated by the Nazis. Mr. Ribar disagreed with the Board's approach to the matter. He said the matter pertained to helping children, not protesting a symbol. He thanked the Board.

Ms. Renee Rezendes referenced when Reno Satanic delivered the invocation at a BCC meeting, acknowledging that not all the Board members supported it. She claimed Nazism was related to Satanism and said the Board approved the Satanism without mentioning it was related to Nazism. She stated that the Board had not conducted research and was being hypocritical. She added that the Commissioners' input was not considerable and advised the Board that its members needed to do their research. Ms. Rezendes urged the Board to refrain from taking the money away from the children. She stated that she researched the emblem in question and that it was used in many cultures and religions. She claimed it did not mean what the Board thought it did and questioned why it would matter that the symbol was hijacked. Based on her research, Ms. Rezendes said the symbol was related to peace, prosperity, and harmony. She indicated that the dissenting feedback regarding the matter did not make sense and was hypocritical. She observed that the Board was determined and unwavering when it decided on an action, but she thought it needed to reconsider in this instance because the information that was shared was untrue. She acknowledged Hitler hijacked the swastika and added that those who truly loved America and Israel did not support that. Ms. Rezendes declared that she and other members of the public would not tolerate Nazism or anything that would promote Nazism in the United States (US).

Mr. Regas informed the RTR was managed by five people. He talked about hypocrisy and referenced allegations brought against an executive director of a local 501(c)(3) nonprofit. He added more women came forward with additional allegations, and more alleged victims feared retaliation. He pointed out an agenda item regarding the nonprofit being approved and indicated that it was hypocritical. He stated that the RTR was a bridge between the NNVCOC and the children who lacked resources and were discounted. He mentioned that without the RTR, the children being served by the RTR would not receive toys or money. Mr. Regas explained the RTR comprised approximately 200 businesses in Washoe County that helped donate to the toy run and declared that the RTR did not harbor animosity toward anybody. He professed the RTR's adoration for individuals from all backgrounds and noted that individuals from many different backgrounds participated in the RTR. Mr. Regas spoke favorably about the Branded Few, indicating it was a member of the NNVCOC for over 30 years, and he had not observed the Branded Few display hostility toward anyone. He remarked about loathing individuals based on their appearance, which he accused the Board of participating in. He mentioned the First Amendment of the US Constitution, suggesting that it be rejected, and accused some Commissioners of applying the First Amendment based on which parts they liked and disliked. Mr. Regas mentioned the lack of harmonious interaction between the RTR and the Board. He assured the RTR was a positive organization and was responsible for many beneficial initiatives, such as donating money. He indicated that many people participated in helping children and referenced the testimonies related to the RTR's

positive efforts. He inquired about any negative feedback regarding the RTR, noting there was none.

Mr. Kenny Curtzwiler referenced his feedback regarding the RTR and statements made about the RTR. Alluding to Mr. Regas's public comment, Mr. Curtzwiler indicated that he did not hear anything negative regarding the RTR. He noted the RTR's efforts were for the community's children. He displayed an online newspaper article from *South Tahoe Now* that was placed on file with the Clerk. The article included a photograph of the NNVCOC receiving a \$5,000 check signed by Santa Claus. He remarked that people who did not believe in Santa Claus did not believe in anything. Mr. Curtzwiler stated that the individuals who were photographed were the people who cared for the community's children and family members. He expressed disappointment regarding the lack of press the RTR received in Reno compared to South Lake Tahoe. He mentioned one of the Commissioners had requested the donation to the RTR to be itemized for reconsideration, which he said would deprive the community's children and children in California, given that he was from California. He mentioned he was a business owner who donated to the RTR for several years and stated that the RTR was beneficial to the community. Mr. Curtzwiler noted three votes were needed for the motion to rescind the donation and said it would be unconscionable if the Board voted to withdraw the donation. If the donation to the RTR was not approved, he cautioned the Board that the matter would need to be addressed with God and the voters. He pointed out that the NNVCOC consisted of voters in the area and declared that they did not forget these types of matters.

Mr. J.S. McElhinney was not present when called to speak.

Mr. Bruce Parks expressed disbelief that the matter was being discussed. He stated that socialism was responsible for the deaths of 150 million people within the last century. He asked how many Board members objected to the hammer and sickle or Chinese flags. He inquired about the absence of outrage regarding those items and suggested the Board feigned outrage to appease certain factions. Mr. Parks indicated that he and other members of the public were aware of what was happening. He claimed the Star of David on Commissioner Clark's Israel flag was a hate symbol among some populations, urging Commissioner Clark to ask any Palestinian individual. He talked about recently reading a story about a homeowner association (HOA) demanding that a veteran resident of the neighborhood remove his US flag because the HOA deemed it a hate symbol, which he said was ridiculous. Mr. Parks recognized the swastika was appropriated and was sometimes generally considered a hate symbol; however, he suggested considering the context. He observed too many virtuous people sacrificed their lives in defense of the US flag for it to be denigrated or called a hate symbol, and he believed anyone who disparaged the US flag or referred to it as a hate symbol did not belong in the US. He observed some of the taxpayers' funds had been squandered. Additionally, he noticed certain Commissioners had voted to allocate money to organizations they served on the boards for and remarked about a conflict of interest. Mr. Parks asserted it did not matter whether a Commissioner had a pecuniary interest related to voting on an agenda item because of their position on the Board.

Ms. Janet Butcher mentioned she attended the previous BCC meeting, at which she listened to the input from a gentleman describing the meaning of the symbol. She noted the attendees of that meeting might not have listened. She researched the symbol and indicated that she observed the symbol on museum artifacts. She believed it was nice that the donated money was awarded to a toy drive and said she did not give the donation much thought. Ms. Butcher expressed disbelief about the matter and noted that Board members' children had possessions of their own while other children did not. She displayed an image on her phone containing her father, who donated his time and efforts each year to act as Santa Claus for the elderly residents and children in the community. To ensure that underprivileged children had a pleasant Christmas, she challenged everyone in the community to contribute to the RTR, except for Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman, as she was certain they would do what was right.

Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She referenced the assassination attempt of former US President Donald Trump on Saturday, July 13, 2024. She viewed the agenda item as an assassination of toys for children and questioned why the Board would assassinate the donation for the children. She declared that this was wrong. Referencing the document, she said individuals with extreme left-wing views were attempting to harm an organization that had made positive contributions. She stated that they attempted to assassinate Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) Justice Brett Kavanaugh and his family. Ms. Brock referred to the document and added Democrat Party leaders proposed to rescind the donation through fanatical rhetoric and false allegations. She called the matter a sham prosecution and alleged verbal violence was directed at a positive cause to gift toys to children. She noted three Commissioners voted to donate to the RTR and wondered how they would vote on this agenda item. Ms. Brock asked why the other two Commissioners would vote in opposition to the donation since it was to provide toys to children. She urged the Board not to assassinate toys for children.

Mr. Fred Meyer alleged the Board was politicizing the RTR donation and defaming the NNVCOC members. He agreed with Mr. Parks's input during the agenda item. He was confident that everybody in attendance would stand up if they were asked to do so in favor of voting to award the donation. He implored the Commissioners, excluding Chair Hill, not to rescind the donation.

Ms. Havah Ahmad acknowledged that some of the Board members might recognize her and indicated that she was an attorney Commissioner Clark would occasionally consult regarding certain legal issues and different groups to donate to. She stated that the RTR was not an organization that she suggested to Commissioner Clark. The Reno Sikh Temple, the India Association of Northern Nevada (IANN), and a veterans group were among the organizations she proposed donating to. Ms. Ahmad stated that she was fairly involved in the community and expressed confusion regarding whether the vote to rescind the funds already spent was based on an individual wearing an item that the Board disagreed with. She understood the symbol was in poor taste and noted no one was fond of Nazi-related symbols. She clarified it was between an individual and his or her family whether he or she liked the symbol. She pointed out there were Reno residents who

collected Nazi memorabilia. Ms. Ahmad advised when a government entity was in the process of rescinding money that was awarded based on the discrimination of a group, the Board should consider whether another form of discrimination was taking place. She noted there were often discussions concerning drag shows, drag queen story hour (DQSH), and National Rifle Association (NRA) meetings at the libraries, which were historically allowed because the First Amendment did not permit a governmental entity to distinguish between items that it agreed or disagreed with. Ms. Ahmad observed it was apparent that some Board members disagreed with an individual wearing a Nazi-related symbol. She affirmed it was acceptable for members to disagree with the symbol in their personal lives, but while in the role of government officials, it potentially verged on discrimination. She recommended that the Board request Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Mary Kandaras's advice, noting CDDA Kandaras's knowledge of acceptable local government activity. She suggested discussing with the individuals in leadership positions in the NNVCOC to advise them to ensure that their members or affiliates were not dressed in a manner that would be offensive to the Commissioners when attending a BCC meeting. Ms. Ahmad said taking money away from children would raise the question of how that would be compensated in the community, as the Board knew that the RTR was providing a community service. She questioned how else the service would be provided if not through the RTR, since the children deserved it. She urged the Board not to vote to rescind the donation and encouraged the Commissioners to use their campaign funds to donate directly to the RTR. She thanked the Board.

Ms. Susan Vanness displayed a document and recounted attending a BCC meeting in July 2023, during which some people donated funds to Black Wall Street. She revealed she had been engaging in discussions with Black Wall Street volunteers and claimed the organization was the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA). She said she asked the Black Wall Street representatives at that meeting whether the organization was tutoring children, to which they responded in the affirmative. She added the representatives confirmed they were teaching the children communism after she asked if they were. Ms. Vanness clarified that two of the Commissioners, one of whom she believed was Chair Hill, submitted the agenda item related to Black Wall Street. She remarked that communism appeared acceptable and speculated that the County transitioned from socialism to communism.

CDDA Kandaras requested that the timer be stopped and asked that members of the public not interrupt. She acknowledged the length of the meeting and instructed the public to allow the public comment session to proceed without needing to recess the meeting so the Board could complete its business.

Ms. Vanness continued by stating that she was shown photographs when she interviewed some people at the Black Wall Street office. She said Black Wall Street was heavily involved with the Black Panther Party and indicated there were corroborating photographs on the Black Wall Street website. She questioned if Black Panther Party members were acceptable even though the attendees from the NNVCOC could possibly be denied funds to gift toys to young children.

Mr. Derek Shawk introduced himself as the Director of the RTR on paper, clarifying he introduced himself as such because the RTR consisted of a board of five members. He explained the board members organized the event with the support of over 1,000 volunteers. He stated that the RTR volunteers dedicated countless hours 12 months each year to coordinate a one-day event. He mentioned that, in contrast to some other local nonprofits, none of the board members or volunteers received compensation for their efforts. Mr. Shawk indicated that no one involved with the RTR participated in the event to receive accolades or personal benefits, adding they only benefited from the knowledge of helping underprivileged families during the Christmas season. He summarized the RTR was contacted regarding the Board's donation to the RTR and described the donation as a blessing. He conveyed the enthusiasm of the RTR participants about attending the BCC meeting to thank the Board and provide details about the RTR. Mr. Shawk observed the RTR appeared to have been ensnared in a political tug-of-war between Commissioners since the day the NNVCOC members attended the BCC meeting. He alleged the RTR participants were subjected to gaslighting by Board members in attendance in addition to media representatives. He disclosed his offer to converse with any member of the Board, the public, or the media, adding that he had provided his personal phone number to the reporter who had written an article describing the matter. Mr. Shawk revealed that no one affiliated with the Board or the media contacted him. He remarked that reporters in the past used to investigate stories before printing them and speculated current local reporters prioritized clickbait over proper journalism. He referenced a statement by Chair Hill during his previous address to the Board, during which she stated that she wished he would condemn all forms of hate. He affirmed that he and the RTR denounced all forms of hate, as hate was not welcomed in the community or the entirety of society. Mr. Shawk expressed his and other RTR board members' and volunteers' displeasure for having to make that declaration. Speaking on behalf of the different motorcycle clubs involved in the organization, he stated they were used to being discriminated against based solely on their appearances or attire; however, he did not expect discrimination to occur within the Commission Chambers. He acknowledged there were likely individuals who thought Mr. Shawk was addressing the Board at this time solely to salvage the \$10,000 donation. He clarified that, although the funds would benefit the RTR significantly, he was addressing the Board because he no longer intended to passively tolerate people's attempts to disparage the RTR's positive efforts spanning more than 40 years.

Ms. Cindy Martinez disclosed she retired from law enforcement on March 14, 2020. She commented that she would have responded in disbelief if the Board had informed her the day before her retirement date of her forthcoming advocacy for the NNVCOC's and the HAMC chairman's freedoms of speech, association, and assembly. She proclaimed her support for the First Amendment and underscored its purpose to protect everyone; otherwise, it offered protection to no one. She displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. Ms. Martinez complimented the document, a news article, and mentioned its headline was somewhat misleading. She summarized the article describing how the motorcycle club members organized in downtown Reno to protect the local businesses while riots were taking place, and she commended the members for their aid. She expressed dismay regarding Chair Hill summoning an organization representative to answer for a legally protected First Amendment activity. Additionally, she stated that

she rejected any notion that Chair Hill deemed this action appropriate as an elected representative. Ms. Martinez reminded the Commissioners that they had sworn an oath to protect the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights. She stated that the government did not grant the contents of the Bill of Rights but rather were endowed to the people by the creator, emphasizing they were inalienable. Furthermore, the Bill of Rights protected members of the public, including their right to engage in lawful activities. She indicated that the government's role was to respect the public's rights and lawful acts regardless of whether government representatives disagreed with them. Ms. Martinez emphasized the Commissioners were prohibited from infringing on the rights of members of the public. She opposed any vote by the Board during this meeting that would violate constitutional rights and possibly result in civil rights lawsuits, which she said would expose the citizens in Washoe County to liability. She requested that the Commissioners abandon the pursuit to rescind the donation. She thanked the Board.

Referencing Ms. Vanness's public comment delivered during the agenda item, Mr. Scott Finley indicated that he located the resolution she had discussed. He revealed the resolution was R23-66 and read it aloud. The resolution stated the Board determined that, upon the recommendation of Commissioner Garcia, \$2,500 would be granted to Black Wall Street. He remarked that it appeared the Board donated funds to a communist organization.

Commissioner Garcia commented that motorcycle clubs were knowledgeable about the strong meaning of names, colors, and symbols on clothing when encountering members of other motorcycle clubs. She asserted that, while some symbols went unrecognized, the image of the swastika and the eagle photographed in Commission Chambers would invariably draw attention. She noted the public's comments pointing out the matter was about helping the children, to which she agreed, adding that was the context from which she was basing her decision. Commissioner Garcia was unaware of any situation in the community or the neighborhoods where such a symbol's meaning would be interpreted as something associated with generosity and kindness. She made a declaration describing several situations from which she would choose to distance herself and her children from a person who displayed or embraced the swastika symbol. She indicated that swastikas symbolized hate, racism, and violence in her family. She said swastikas elicited fear and always would. Commissioner Garcia remarked that people could continue speaking on the matter for as long as they wished, and she would respectfully listen to their perspectives. She declared that swastikas would never evoke feelings of joy within her. She acknowledged people's right to wear what they wished to, as well as the ability to accept a government donation for a charitable event for children while wearing a swastika. She clarified she was not telling people they could not conduct themselves in those manners and encouraged them to act upon their personal and organization's interests. Commissioner Garcia stated that she intended to act in her children's best interest and the communities she represented. She conveyed her unwillingness to condone normalizing the use of swastikas in any context. She communicated the Commissioners' understanding that they did not always support each other's donations. She noted Commissioner Clark had not voted in favor of one or two of her donation recommendations and added that she did not take offense. Given the new

information brought to her attention, Commissioner Garcia stated that she was using the agenda item to exercise her right to remove her name and her vote from the donation to the RTR.

Commissioner Andriola expressed appreciation for everyone's feedback. She indicated that the Board acted based on policy, and the RTR satisfied the conditions outlined in the policy. She pointed out that the Commissioners likely all participated in various membership organizations, and she believed the Commissioners' role did not involve casting judgment. She stated that the Commissioners were tasked with following the policy that was in place. She supported the initial donation of \$10,000 to the RTR. Commissioner Andriola mentioned her intention to possibly return to the discussion regarding discretionary funds at the end of the meeting. She expressed appreciation for how universal the interpretations of the symbol could be and commented that it was interesting to learn that it had other meanings. She advised the Board did not have a policy related to moral turpitude; therefore, she believed it would be in the Commissioners' best interest to abide by the policy in place.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 3-2 vote with Chair Hill and Commissioner Garcia voting no, it was ordered that the donation to the Reno Toy Run be supported.

4:19 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

4:40 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

24-0510 **AGENDA ITEM 22** Motion to reconsider decision not to canvass the recount made at Board of County Commissioners Meeting on July 9, 2024 and recommendation to declare canvass of the recount vote for the recount of the County Commission, District 4 Republican race (demanded by candidate Mark A. Lawson), and the recount of the School Board Trustee, District G At-Large race (demanded by candidate Paul D. White). Pursuant to NRS 293.387 and NAC 293.365, the Board is required to canvass the results of the recount, by which any errors within the election results are officially noted and the official results are declared. If approved, the Board shall order the Registrar of Voters to certify the abstract of the results and transmit a copy of the certified abstract to the Secretary of State. Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Upon Chair Hill's request to explain the purpose of the agenda item, Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Mary Kandaras stated that the Board would be considering the failure to canvass the returns of the recount vote that took place during the previous week. She noted the Commissioners were instructed to vote based on their consciences and indicated that, while that was generally appropriate in nearly every vote, it was not the case for a canvass. She cited Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 293.387 and defined the canvass process. The Registrar of Voters (ROV) was tasked with presenting the results of the election and any clerical errors, and the Board was supposed to take note

of the information presented. CDDA Kandaras clarified the Board was essentially file-stamping a copy of the canvass that would then be provided to the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS). She informed the SOS was the official election officer for the State, and the SOS and the Nevada Legislature enacted the laws related to elections requiring the canvass. She added the Nevada Legislature had that prerogative under the Nevada Constitution, meaning the Nevada Legislature could create laws to limit the powers of the Board. Furthermore, a county was a body called a political subdivision of the State, so it had the powers generally specified by the State. CDDA Kandaras announced the Board did not have the authority to determine whether any ballots cast were illegal or invalid, as that was for contest. She referred to NRS 293.407, which was regarding the legalities of any form of fraud and whether people who were ineligible to vote had voted. She stated that the Board currently did not have investigatory power, so the legal advice of the District Attorney's (DA) Office was to follow Nevada law and canvass the recount vote.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Stephen Hatch introduced himself as a lifelong County resident. He thanked the Board for reassessing the decision made during the July 9, 2024, Board of County Commissioners (BCC) special meeting and urged the Commissioners to certify the canvass of the recount. He commented that members of the public recently started attending the BCC meetings to levy attacks against the electoral process. He stated that there was an unmistakable difference between critically assessing the logistics of an election, including its successes and shortcomings, and sowing distrust in the entire electoral process. Mr. Hatch asserted that anyone who tried to cast doubt on the legitimacy of the elections either did not understand the complexities of running an election or purposely attempted to dismantle the Nation's fundamental democratic principles. He acknowledged the value of public comments but reminded the Board that public comments should be considered with a degree of skepticism. He mentioned he was unable to attend all the BCC meetings and was, fortunately, able to take time off work and arrange for his child's care to participate in the meeting. Mr. Hatch claimed that most individuals were preoccupied with work and caring for their families to address the Board on matters that were important to them. He recognized the eComment portal was a necessary upgrade that improved access to commenting, but added it did not resolve the issue he identified. Mr. Hatch attended the meeting to ensure his opinions were communicated and to convey the alarm shared by many County residents after being made aware of the decision not to certify the recount vote. He asked that the Board understand that he did not wish to seem as though he was someone who was arguing for his team in an aberrant sporting event but rather as an individual expressing concern for his community and his desire to ensure that legitimate votes were not being dismissed. Referencing a recent incident, he stated that the incorrect mail-in ballots were for Precinct 5020, which he claimed impacted 265 voters. He added the incident was due to an error that should not have occurred. Mr. Hatch said the ROV Office addressed the mistake well by acknowledging it, dispatching letters to those who were impacted, printing and sending new ballots to the affected individuals, and remedying the court issue. He declared that was the model for how government agencies should handle their faults, and he commended the ROV Office for its efforts. He said the public needed to recognize that the ROV Office's elections team overcame many challenges over the last few years, including high turnover and loss of institutional leadership and knowledge caused by vitriolic harassment. Mr.

Hatch believed the Board's decision not to certify the canvass of the recount vote resulted in harassment for the elections team, which he asserted would intensify. He thanked the ROV Office staff and leadership for their hard work and dedication. He urged the Board to strive for improvement for the sake of Washoe County's residents. He thanked the Board.

Ms. Beverly Dummitt was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Gail Townsend encouraged the Board to abide by the advice of CDDA Kandaras and certify the results of the recount. She stated that she listened to people's comments and read the information shared on a private resident's website, which she indicated was not evidence. She commented that the information was based on an assertion without evidence and did not provide a substantial reason for the Board to object to the recount vote. She specified that she heard a repeated assertion from the 2020 elections claiming that 1,500 deceased individuals had voted. She remarked that she was still waiting for the spreadsheets related to the claim as well as the names, death dates, and voting records of those deceased individuals. Ms. Townsend acknowledged that the Commissioners inherited the ROV Office's conditions and did not create them. She pointed out that in 2022, problems were uncovered, and a consultant was hired to do a study. She recalled when the County Manager presented the study to the Board, people were not given the opportunity to hear it. She said she obtained the study by submitting a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, and the study was currently published on the County website. Ms. Townsen recognized there were problems and advocated for seeking solutions instead of constant harassment and questioning of the voters. She hoped the Commissioners would approve of certifying the canvass of the recount. She thanked the Board.

Mr. Pablo Nava Duran was not present when called to speak.

Mr. Drew Ribar announced he would be addressing only one Commissioner, stating the outcome of the vote was based on that Commissioner's decision. Chair Hill instructed Mr. Ribar to address the entire Board. Mr. Ribar expressed appreciation for the referenced Commissioner's actions during the previous BCC meeting and understood the pressure that Commissioner was under. He introduced himself as a candidate for the Nevada State Assembly District (AD) 40 and alleged the County violated his constitutional rights. He stated that the Nevada Supreme Court case *Mack v. Williams* entitled him to remedy. Mr. Ribar claimed that everyone's constitutional rights were violated. Citing Article 2, Section 1A of the Nevada Constitution, he indicated that the County released sample ballots that were inaccurate. He remarked on how the Commissioners were ordered to follow a law that instructed them on how to vote. He encouraged the Commissioners to be strong and to allow the process to work. He suggested observing the outcome once the process was disrupted so the problems could be fixed. Mr. Ribar recalled the Board had been asked multiple times to review the paper ballots and questioned what the County was trying to conceal. He talked about observing the election recount process, during which the attorney present would not allow the media into the area where the recount was taking place. He referenced existing case law, *Fordyce v. City of Seattle*, and claimed the attorney violated the Constitution. Mr. Ribar said the media was allowed nearly anywhere the public was. He thought the Board received poor legal advice

based on that incident. He noted that the Constitution, which overruled the law, indicated that his name should have been included in the sample ballots. He declared that all Washoe County residents had a right to an accurate sample ballot and inquired about a possible resolution to the problem. He noted there were flaws in the election. He thanked the Board.

Mr. Robert Beadles commented that the Board was receiving poor legal advice. He referenced Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 293.365 and NRS 293.387 and asserted there was nothing requiring the Commissioners to vote in support or opposition of certifying the results of the election. He said Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards was correct. Mr. Beadles shared that he received a Pre-Logic and Accuracy Testing (Pre-LAT) report from the ROV Office in the morning, which he said was typically supposed to occur before the start of the election. He claimed the law was violated, and the Pre-LAT did not occur until after the election. He alleged the Pre-LAT report was in violation of the law. He explained the Pre-LAT was related to the parameters that the tabulators were set to before the election began, and the Post-LAT was completed at the end of the election. Mr. Beadles stated that a unique number should have been designated for each State Senate candidate, but the same three numbers were used for all of them. He indicated that this was done across all the races. He spoke unfavorably about this detail and said it was in violation of the law. He asserted the election should be deemed invalid because the Pre-LAT was not completed at the start. He alleged it appeared that Title 52, United States Code (USC) Chapters 20701 through 20706 were violated, as the Pre-LAT was supposed to be performed with the Board. Mr. Beadles further claimed he was informed by the ROV via email that Commissioner Clark performed his Pre-LAT alone, adding there were several pieces of corroborating evidence, including an Election Integrity Violation Report brought before the SOS pursuant to NAC 293.025. He said Commissioner Clark completed his Pre-LAT during the election and concealed the thumb drive upon entry and exit. He declared this was not how an election was supposed to be conducted. Mr. Beadles noticed issues with the cast vote record (CVR), and he ran the CVR through one of the most sophisticated artificial intelligence (AI) platforms available, which confirmed those issues. He mentioned one of the most intelligent mathematicians reviewed the CVR and affirmed it was flawed. He estimated that roughly 20 to 43 percent of fraudulent activity occurred during the primary election and emphasized the significance of this claim. He provided the definition of extortion and related it to the Commissioners being compelled to act upon their duty.

Ms. Val White claimed some people wanted the election results certified in order to establish a pattern of ministerially approving all elections. She cautioned that was the end objective of Democrats and non-partisans and concluded they wished to remove any possibility of opposing any election. She stated that, with election fraud firmly established statewide in all elections via the use of election equipment, Democrats and non-partisans were in control of all of Nevada's legislative seats. Ms. White said there was no possibility of appealing to State legislators to repair the elections, which removed the need for local certification, and she indicated that this was the final blow to election integrity. She speculated that signatures for voter registration might actually be the decisive blow to election integrity. She referenced NRS, stating that election errors should be identified and presented to the Board, and asked if the ROV alone was responsible. As a registered voter,

Ms. White stated that she brought attention to errors, examples, and evidence to the Board. She questioned why her evidence was not credible while the ROV's was. She stated that she previously cited a statute that she said should have resulted in the decertification of the election equipment and system. She asked if interim ROV Cari-Ann Burgess was the only individual the Board believed. She shared she was present at the election system observing window in the ROV Office lobby from 8:30 a.m. until 11:15 p.m. on July 2, 2024. She claimed to have witnessed five of the authority figures of the ROV Office spending at least five or six hours searching for mistakes they might have made during the recount. Ms. White suggested the possibility the ROV Office staff were desperate enough to alter the data after a 15-hour workday due to exhaustion. She questioned how the public would know for sure if the results were manipulated since they were not allowed to count the paper ballots, nor could they investigate the computer system. She displayed a map from the Heritage Foundation showing the election integrity rankings of each state in the Country and pointed out that Florida and its neighboring states had the best rankings. She recalled the Board repeatedly spoke about the terms best practices, outcomes, and evidence-based. She urged the Board to emulate the practices of the higher-ranked states and cease making Nevada the subject of ridicule nationally, as it ranked fiftieth in election integrity. Ms. White indicated that the Board was responsible for the rankings and inquired about whether the Board members were embarrassed. She stated that all the Board's decisions for every election integrity-related motion that was introduced resisted the motions.

Ms. Renee Rezendes cited NRS 293.387 and noted the Commissioners were required to canvass the votes on July 9, 2024. She quoted ADA Edwards, who advised the Commissioners that they were canvassing the vote that day and to vote based on their consciences. She questioned why some of the Commissioners were accused of unlawfully refusing to canvass the vote, referencing the writ filed by the SOS. She reported that Vice Chair Herman had voted in opposition to certifying the canvass of the vote for the preceding 10 years. Ms. Rezendes asked how Vice Chair Herman's vote on July 9, 2024, along with the other Commissioners' votes, could have caused such an uproar. She inquired whether the results were unsatisfactory to either the Board or the SOS due to the circumstances being unexplored. She noted there was other pending litigation and asked why the Board would want to ignore that litigation. She wondered if the ROV violated the law by disregarding the litigation against the County. Ms. Rezendes implored the Commissioners to vote based on their consciences, even though doing so might change the outcome because of the threats that the Commissioners had experienced. She expressed disappointment regarding some parties believing that bullying was the only tactic available to them. She requested that the Board consider Mr. Hatch's input with a level of skepticism. Ms. Rezendes divulged her vote was recorded as voting in the presidential preference primary (PPP) election when she voted in the caucus, and she stated that her neighbor did not receive a ballot despite being registered to vote. She mentioned she registered her neighbor; therefore, she was confident that her neighbor was registered. She shared an experience where she visited the library to deliver ballots, and at least two voting machines were inoperative. She said there was an opportunity to commit fraud when the poll workers were waiting for a mechanic to repair the machines. Ms. Rezendes asserted the machines should not be tampered with and spoke in support of using only paper ballots and hand

counting. Additionally, she advocated for limiting voting to one day as well as requiring voter identification (ID) and proof of citizenship. She asserted if the County and State judges had listened to evidence provided by a private citizen, the public would likely have received answers.

Mr. Cliff Nellis said he participated in a tour of the ROV Office and noted some improvements. He indicated that Ms. Burgess modified the ROV Office so members of the public could view the signature check computers and the public could see the scanners. He stated that ROV Office Media Production Specialist George Guthrie confirmed that the tapes were audited, contradicting Ms. Burgess's claim that the tapes were never reviewed. Mr. Nellis wondered who was right. He had asked a question regarding the remaining ballots that would have been returned to the ROV Office, and he said he was assured that the signatures were checked. He mentioned he heard from another individual that people could order batch signatures, and that person was trying to prevent that. He said the ballots could be matched with the signatures. He stated that the verification of signatures was the only security measure and voiced the lack of trust in the election system among some members of the public. Mr. Nellis proposed tabling the agenda item and performing a count of the paper ballots and the machine tapes as a solution, recognizing the Board was under significant pressure. He claimed the process would be completed in a week and added the Board could meet the following week to canvass the recount. He commented that it was simple, but the Board would not pursue that proposed solution because SOS Francisco Aguilar and Nevada Attorney General (AG) Aaron Ford knew the signatures did not match.

Mr. Scott Finley read from a document that was placed on file with the Clerk and thanked the Board.

Ms. Pam Roberts was not present when called to speak.

Mr. Bruce Parks stated that, as representatives of their districts, the Commissioners had a duty and an obligation to support and represent their constituents free from coercion, threats, intimidation, and extortion. He defined extortion as the use of unlawful pressure to compel a victim to provide something of value against his or her will. He declared once a person submitted to the threats, coercion, intimidation, and extortion, that individual was no longer operating under his or her own free will. Mr. Parks told the Commissioners they were obligated to better serve their constituents and instructed them to stand their ground. He criticized a statement from a DA's Office representative and indicated that he was just as capable of interpreting the law. He remarked that he knew how to read and did not need a juris doctor (JD) to understand what he was reading. Mr. Parks divulged he had a different interpretation, as did several of his friends who were lawyers. He commented that the Commissioners showed courage at the July 9, 2024, BCC meeting and urged them not to lose their bravery. He speculated the only reason why the Board would oppose hand-counting the election results was because of what it would reveal. He referenced a public comment he delivered earlier during the meeting asking that the Board direct the ROV to conduct a parallel hand count with the machines during the general election. Mr. Parks stated that the NRS granted the Board the authority to compel that

action. He recounted that the SOS's Office had involved itself in the last recount, adding that the SOS's Office had far exceeded its authority by doing so. He mentioned this year was an election year for some of the Commissioners. He thanked the Board.

Ms. Janet Butcher referenced a public comment she delivered earlier during the meeting, stating she voted on June 11, 2024, at the library in Spanish Springs. On June 18, 2024, her vote had not yet been recorded in the polling books; on June 21, 2024, it was still not registered. She pointed out that same-day votes in Clark County had been recorded. She referenced another individual's statement indicating that the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC) system knew who had voted the day after the election. Ms. Butcher questioned why the ROV Office did not know who voted. She recalled that in 2020, members of the public presented a list to the Board containing items related to the election processes that were incorrect. She talked about the County spending \$100,000 on a left-wing election group in 2022 and claimed the group wanted to assume control at the federal level. She added nearly \$300,000 was spent on a similar group and remarked that there were still issues with the County's elections after the fact. Ms. Butcher referenced Ms. Rezendes's public comment indicating that her vote was recorded for the PPP election. Ms. Butcher thought everyone had also been marked as having voted in the PPP election when they had not. Addressing computers, she indicated that anything could be programmed, emphasized how easy programming was, and mentioned she had 50 years of programming experience. She remarked that any competent programmer was aware of the possible outcome of a program. She questioned what was hidden if a program could not be audited or compared to something outside the computer system. Ms. Butcher expressed delight and astonishment over the Commissioners' votes during the previous BCC meeting and remarked that there were possibly 317,000 reasons why the Commissioners changed their minds.

Ms. Kelly Stevens commented that the matter was regarding certifying fraud. She said the voting machines used by the County were connected to Dominion Voting Systems, which she claimed was linked to Serbia. She declared that the Board wished to certify fraud during the meeting and was using a ministerial defense, adding that it was unacceptable. Referencing the discussion during Agenda Item 21, Ms. Stevens thought it was interesting that Chair Hill objected to gifting toys to children based on a symbol she found offensive. She displayed documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She claimed Chair Hill's leader had stated that crosshairs were inappropriate while the use of a bullseye on someone who was nearly assassinated was acceptable. Ms. Stevens inquired about the use of a bullseye and divulged she was bringing attention to that topic because Chair Hill was funded by the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN). A document she displayed included remarks from the PLAN leadership regarding the assassination attempt against former United States (US) President Trump. She noted that some of the Commissioners refused to pose for a commemorative photograph with the individuals awarded funds for disadvantaged children, indicating their bias. Ms. Stevens referenced a photograph. She revealed the photograph was of Chair Hill's campaign manager and, correcting a figure she initially shared, stated that Chair Hill paid the individual \$16,000. She claimed the individual was harassing certain people who were observing the constitutional process for free and fair elections, adding the process was not

democratic, as that would constitute communism. Ms. Stevens shared the names of people funded by the PLAN and pointed out that US Senator Jacky Rosen funded the Nevada State Democratic Party. She informed the PLAN political action committee (PAC) also donated to a particular group that funded Chair Hill and a candidate from the 2024 primary election. Ms. Stevens urged the Board to investigate CrowdStrike.

Ms. Marie Rodriguez commented that Washoe County was large; therefore, disagreements among individuals regarding certain policies and matters should be expected. Based on the complaints she heard during the meeting regarding using machines for vote counting, she believed implementing hand counting would likely result in similar complaints and demands to count the votes by machine. Ms. Rodriguez briefly alluded to comments about rights and inquired about responsibility. She noted that many people who demanded changes from the Board or blamed the Board for certain matters had been repeatedly told to address their grievances to the correct offices. She stated there were matters that the Commissioners were not responsible for and tasks they could not do. Ms. Rodriguez believed the oppositional response to certifying the election results was partially due to an organized attempt to pressure elected officials who were undesirable to a certain group to resign. She supported certifying the canvass of the recount, and it was her understanding that over 90 eComment responses expressed support for the certification of the recount.

Ms. Penny Brock recalled that the motion to certify the Primary election results during the June 21, 2024, BCC meeting received a 2-2 vote on the Commission Chambers monitor and indicated the motion was denied. She added that nothing was said or done about the situation, and because the motion failed, the results were not certified. She expressed displeasure regarding the threat of jailing, fining, or removing the Commissioners from office if they did not vote to certify the recount results. Ms. Brock noted the commotion that resulted from the matter received national attention, and she mentioned she read several online news sources from other states. She declared the Board was on the radar and stated that there was an article written about the matter from The Federalist, in which one of the Commissioners was quoted. She read from the article, which indicated that the County was pressured to rubberstamp the election despite mishaps. The article further stated that after the Board refused to certify a recount result following multiple allegations of misconduct, Nevada Democratic officials wanted to force the Commissioners to certify the election anyway. Ms. Brock declared this was all coming from the Democrats. She continued reading from the article, which noted Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Andriola, and Vice Chair Herman voted not to certify the recount results after receiving public comments alleging suspicious behavior. The article quoted Commissioner Andriola as stating there were other instances when the Commissioners were informed about concerns regarding procedures and noted there were a lot of concerns regarding alleged mishaps that resulted in her decision not to certify the recount. Commissioner Andriola had also voiced her belief that the allegations warranted further investigation. Ms. Brock said the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) was obligated to investigate the claims. She encouraged the Commissioners to ask Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam to conduct an investigation. She mentioned that other sheriffs from different counties were investigating the elections, adding that they were alarmed by what

they were finding. Addressing the Commissioners, she read from a document that was placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Victoria Myer remarked about the emotionally charged public comments directed at certifying the recount results, expressing confusion about them. She stated that the public had a constitutional right to challenge elections, and the practice had been ongoing for decades by different political parties. She questioned the motives of those insisting the Commissioners vote to certify the results. However, she recognized the Commissioners' concerns, as a hand count of the ballots for some elections could expose problems. She mentioned some of the Commissioners were involved in the election process. Ms. Myer wondered why WCSO deputy sheriffs were present at the meeting and mentioned she was aware of the threats made toward some of the Board members. She hoped none of the threats would actualize and commented that Vice Chair Herman had never voted to certify the election results. She declared a vote was not valid if coercion was involved, as there was no choice granted when the only option was to vote in the affirmative. Ms. Myer remarked that a law requiring individuals to vote in agreement to a motion was not a law at all. She suggested considering some bill draft requests (BDRs) that implemented the use of paper ballots and hand counting and proposed a BDR for an automatic recount by hand counting paper ballots. She also suggested a BDR to cease using the election machines, which she said other states and countries had already done. She commented that hand-counting ballots was an easy process. Ms. Myer asserted the Board's job was to protect Washoe County residents' right to free, fair, transparent, and accurate elections.

Ms. Cindy Martinez shared that during her professional career at the Nevada Gaming Control Board, she was part of one of the seven divisions that reported to the board at the time. She said her division was considered the eyes and ears of the Gaming Control Board. She explained that her division oversaw the management of the operation and that the Gaming Control Board was responsible for policy and rendering decisions to a similar extent as the BCC. She viewed the Board as a governing body, while the various departments were regarded as the auditory and visual aids of the Board. Ms. Martinez mentioned she read the statute and the petition for a writ of mandamus related to the matter. She noticed no flexibility provided in the statute, and it did not assign an investigative duty. She appreciated a point raised by Ms. Joni Hammond's public comment during Agenda Item 4 about the language used for NRS 293.387. She described the language contained in the statute as problematic and noted the Nevada Legislature was the place to correct that. Addressing the allegations of violations, Ms. Martinez indicated that, based on her experience in investigations and regulatory enforcement, clerical and administrative errors and lapses in procedure were not necessarily criminal. She shared she was appointed to the Elections Certification Board in April 2024, and on May 22, 2024, she was present during the Pre-LAT. She affirmed the Pre-LAT was conducted before early voting commenced. She acknowledged other citizens were alarmed by occurrences they observed. She expressed concern regarding information possibly being misinterpreted and characterized as evidence of wrongdoing. Ms. Martinez requested that the Commissioners vote in support of the canvass of the recount so County Clerk Jan Galassini could complete her duties. She thanked the Board.

Ms. Galassini advised the Board she received emailed public comments which were placed on file.

Commissioner Andriola thanked everyone in attendance for allowing the agenda item to be considered. Reading a written statement, she referenced her input from the July 9, 2024, BCC meeting, at which she noted several concerns about the process before voting in opposition to certifying the recount results. Since then, she met with the ROV Office, and Ms. Burgess addressed Commissioner Andriola's concerns. Additionally, Ms. Burgess had assured Commissioner Andriola that those and future concerns would always be addressed with the attention and respect they warranted. The DA's Office provided clarifying direction on the nature of the Commissioners' duty to canvass the election returns since the July 9, 2024, BCC meeting. Commissioner Andriola received clarification that the Commissioners' action was ministerial only. She explained that from her perspective, the action was a declaration of the election results, including any errors noted, and all of the information was sent to the SOS. She indicated that the Commissioners' responsibility was to abide by the law. Commissioner Andriola announced that her clear understanding based on the legal clarification provided by the DA's Office further cemented her readiness to approve the agenda item. She added that in response to the vote during the previous meeting, the SOS's Office had emphatically articulated that the Commissioners' duty to certify the election results was mandatory. She informed that the SOS's Office sought a writ petition with the Nevada Supreme Court to compel the Commissioners to vote accordingly. Commissioner Andriola communicated her understanding that canvassing any election, as defined in the NRS, was a legal duty and afforded no discretion provision to refuse. She emphasized the necessity for citizens in America, Nevada, and Washoe County to do everything possible to restore faith and confidence in the elections.

Commissioner Clark read from a written statement. He apologized to his constituents and announced he was regrettably changing his vote. He acknowledged that many of his constituents might lose faith in him. He refused to refer to the Commissioners' voting on the agenda item as a vote because they were compelled to vote in a particular way. He was recently notified that the DA's Office and the AG's Office believed the Commissioners' vote in this matter was not discretionary, as it was a mandatory ministerial function. Commissioner Clark was informed that a failure to vote to certify the election could subject him to criminal prosecution and forfeiture of office; therefore, his vote on the agenda item was being made under extreme duress.

Commissioner Clark stated that, in compliance with NRS 293.387, he wished to separately note the clerical errors discovered and take account of the changes resulting from the discovery so the noted information represented the true vote cast. He requested the information specified be noted in abstract, including that the Washoe County Commission District 4 recount results indicated that Mr. Mark Lawson lost a vote; however, it was unclear if that vote was deemed unable to be cast or how that error occurred. Furthermore, the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Board of Trustees At-Large recount results showed that Mr. Paul White lost a vote, Ms. Diane Nicolet gained a vote, and Mr. Perry Rosenstein lost five votes. Commissioner Clark stated that no

explanation was provided to explain these losses or the video evidence demonstrating thumb drives being inputted into ROV Office computers, which he pointed out might have been a contributing factor to the difference in results. He indicated that the significant clerical errors present in the sample ballots and printed ballots, as well as the distribution of those ballots, might have been contributing factors to the different results. He advised the County should review its process in coordination with the SOS to ensure the correct individuals received their ballots and mentioned he was not delivered his own mail-in ballot. Instead, he obtained the mail-in ballot of an individual who did not reside in Nevada. Commissioner Clark reported that a local candidate and single mother, who refused her recount after receiving multiple threats, received several reports of ballots cast for her being uncured. He commented that the recount did not present information on any uncounted ballots in specific races. He noted the presence of a clerical error in the completion of the signature gathering, resulting in a candidate being unable to qualify for the ballot. He said the clerical errors might have contributed to the decrease in votes in the Washoe County Commission District 4 race. Commissioner Clark appealed to the Nevada Legislature and the elected State officials to devise an election process that the public could trust. He identified his ideal modifications to the process, including the County absorbing the cost of a recount in the event of a major issue occurring, such as misprinted ballots, and an automatic recount for individuals who lost by less than 3 percent.

Commissioner Clark asserted disenfranchised voters impacted parties and all elected officials. He spoke briefly about elected officials who ignored sexual assault allegations and the refusal of County Housing and Homeless Services to follow the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). He mentioned that these elected officials targeted a children's organization because of an unrelated member's attire. He encouraged the referenced elected officials to remember how they acquired their positions and support the constituents' votes.

Commissioner Clark concluded by clarifying he believed recounts of votes should be hand-counted and opined that only using a machine to count the votes would result in the same results being computed. He declared it was nonsensical, and he also suspected virtually everyone thought so. Despite his opinion, he indicated that his ability to act according to his role as a Commissioner in relation to canvassing the returns was restricted. Commissioner Clark specified that he must follow the law as written. He mentioned that, within days after the July 9, 2024, BCC meeting, he received a letter from DA Christopher Hicks stating that all the Board members could be subject to criminal prosecution and forfeiture of their positions in office if they did not approve the recount results. He was uncertain why DA Hicks believed it was necessary to intervene through such warnings if the results of the voting machine recount were not approved. He thought DA Hicks was notifying Commissioner Clark of the potential recourse if he did not approve the recount results based on threats issued by other government entities. Upon receipt of DA Hicks's letter, Commissioner Clark contacted his personal counsel to review the law, the subject, and the duties as a Board member. Although he and his personal counsel believed DA Hicks's threats of criminal prosecution were outrageously overstated and unnecessary, Commissioner Clark noted NRS 293.387 required him to report the numbers presented and declare the results. He clarified his duty, pursuant to the statute, was confined

to the recount computations. Nothing in the statute allowed a Commissioner to question the validity of the results, regardless of any irregularity in the recount or whether there should be a hand recount to ensure accuracy. He indicated that it was the citizens', the candidates', the legislators', and the courts' responsibility. Commissioner Clark hoped the candidates and citizens of Washoe County and the State would pursue changing how the recounts were conducted. He recommended that they do so by contacting their legislators and presenting valid challenges in court to maintain the integrity of the voting system, ensuring that the elections' results could be trusted. He directed the Clerk to enter the results.

Vice Chair Herman said she did not understand and indicated she was not shown when the law changed because, as a Commissioner, she proceeded with the intention to act accordingly for 10 years. She shared that her grandfather emigrated from Italy to Ellis Island in the late 1800s, and during the six months he resided there, he learned to love America. Vice Chair Herman mentioned her grandfather memorized the US Constitution and would recite it to her and her brother. He also taught Vice Chair Herman what he had learned on Ellis Island. She said her grandfather's parents moved to Seattle, Washington, noting the hardship experienced at the time due to the lack of employment opportunities. Vice Chair Herman recounted that at the age of 12 years, her grandfather stowed away on a sailing ship to Nome, Alaska, during the gold rush. She described her grandfather as her idol and added he taught her about life in America and the US Constitution. Vice Chair Herman divulged that her grandfather was the Mayor of Nome, Alaska, and he taught her about politics when she was a child. She remarked that she followed in her grandfather's footsteps by becoming a Commissioner and mentioned she swore an oath of office on three separate occasions to serve according to the Constitution. She indicated that she honored and respected the Constitution and applied it to all her decisions.

Vice Chair Herman commented that many citizens expressed concern about the County elections and lost faith in them, which she considered dangerous. She shared that this was one of her reasons for running for a local government position and referenced terms used for problems related to the elections, including the word glitches. She recounted how she attempted to bring forth an election integrity bill that would protect the people's vote and correct the procedures to develop a fair and honest election for Washoe County. Vice Chair Herman expressed doubt that there was any desire to ensure the safety and honesty of the elections. She stated that, after 10 years in the Commissioner position, she was informed that she was performing her duties inadequately and she could no longer follow her oath of office or protect her constituents' rights. She voiced her disappointment regarding the three people she speculated desired to eliminate her from the position when they also swore oaths to office upon being elected. She indicated that she read every description related to the meaning of the term canvass, and she was unable to locate anything consistent with what she was currently being told.

Vice Chair Herman conveyed her pride in being an American, but she thought being a County resident was becoming somewhat embarrassing. She noticed other people made similar remarks. She commented that there were hills to climb on and to die on, and she believed this matter might be one of those. She stated that her constituents

informed her about reports of fraud in the elections, and at the BCC meetings, she recalled that individuals repeatedly shared the hardships they experienced to get elected or to vote. Vice Chair Herman believed her duty was to protect the voters' rights by not certifying a faulty election canvass. She divulged that she filed complaints in the past and never received a response to them, which she said was somewhat expected. She clarified she was trying to do her job properly and declared that she could not vote in favor of approving the agenda item. She apologized.

Chair Hill thanked the Commissioners for their input.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Chair Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Vice Chair Herman voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 22 be approved.

24-0511 **AGENDA ITEM 23** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an Ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) by modifying various sections in Division Two-Area Plan Regulations, Division Four-Development Standards, and Division Nine-General Provisions, in order to update regulations related to allowed residential uses in the Spanish Springs Planning Area, maximum height restrictions in the Sun Valley Planning Area, multifamily parking minimums, bike parking, turf requirements, common and private open space, and definitions. These updates include modifying various sections to: remove Table C-1 which modifies allowed residential uses in the Spanish Springs Planning Area; remove a subsection limiting structures in the downtown Sun Valley Planning Area to two stories in height; update minimum off-street parking space requirements for multifamily housing; update requirements for bicycle storage by removing requirements for bicycle parking spaces, by adding design standards for short and long-term bicycle storage, by adding design requirements for bicycle racks, and by removing Figure 110.410.15.2 which shows bicycle parking space dimensions; remove the requirement to provide turf areas in multifamily developments of a minimum of fifty (50) percent of the required landscaping area; modify minimum size and dimension requirements for private open space in multifamily developments; add standards for turf areas provided as common open space for multifamily developments; and add definitions for short and long-term bicycle parking; and all matters necessarily connected therewith

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1726, Bill No. 1917.

Chair Hill asked if there was a desire from any Commissioners for a staff report on the item.

Commissioner Andriola said there had been a lot of confusion and clarified the item being discussed that day was different from the Affordable Housing Package (AHP) 2.5, which was also under consideration by the County. She stated that the County was still soliciting feedback from the entire community, including the Spanish Springs community, on AHP 2.5. She wished to ensure people understood the item being voted on that day was the set of amendments known as AHP 2.0. She asked the staff to speak specifically to Table C-1, which was being replaced for Spanish Springs.

Planning and Building Division Senior Planner Katherine Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WDCA24-0002 (Housing Package 2); Overview; Housing-Background; Sun Valley Height Limit Alternative; Findings; Recommended Motion; Thank you.

Ms. Oakley summarized the proposed changes and reiterated that a separate package, AHP 2.5, was being developed. She informed the County was still in that package's initial public outreach stage. She described that AHP 2.0 was focused on lowering barriers to various housing types, primarily through targeting development standards and Code requirements that County staff had heard were barriers. Regarding Spanish Springs specifically, Ms. Oakley said a table of uses, Table C-1, in the Spanish Springs modifier governed certain uses in specific zoning districts. She explained it differed from the table of uses that were in effect more broadly in the County. She stated that part of Ordinance 1726 proposed the removal of Table C-1, resulting in the table of uses that applied to the whole County being applied to Spanish Springs. She summarized the three changes. First, the permitting process for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) would be streamlined to match what was adopted as part of AHP 1.0, making permitting for ADUs much easier for properties where an ADU was appropriate. Second, the changes would allow people to apply for an administrative permit, a discretionary permit for duplexes in medium-density suburban (MDS) zones. She pointed out that allowance was already in the table of uses for the entire County. Finally, she added that people would be allowed to pursue a special use permit (SUP), another discretionary application for residential uses in neighborhood commercial zones. She explained the provision would allow mixed-use style development, as was allowed in that zone designation in the rest of Washoe County. She said those three changes would be functionally made with removing Table C-1 from the Spanish Springs modifier. She clarified that removing that table would not expand multi-family use into residential areas and would not rezone any properties; only the three changes she outlined would be made. She noted the rest of the changes related to Ordinance 1726 were itemized on the Overview slide of the PowerPoint presentation. She recalled a change made at the first reading of Ordinance 1726, which affected proposals for Sun Valley. She stated that the two-story height limit for Sun Valley would remain for most of the planning area and only be removed for the downtown Sun Valley corridor. She affirmed those changes were reflected in the version of Ordinance 1726 that Commissioners were presented with that day. She offered to answer any questions or discuss other portions further, but she discerned the areas she covered were what people were most interested in at that time.

Commissioner Andriola expressed her appreciation for the clarification provided by Ms. Oakley.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Bruce Parks opined that every time development was discussed, some key components were overlooked. He communicated his understanding that Washoe County was already beyond capacity for water treatment as one of those overlooked elements. He theorized that access to water was not a significant problem for most people in Washoe County, but it was a concern for people using a well. He said there were plans being formed that could affect well users by forcing them to drill deeper or become subject to metering. Mr. Parks expressed his adamant opposition to the removal of existing height restrictions on development anywhere in Washoe County. He speculated that the proposed changes would have repercussions for years and provided the example of a plan to build a multi-story school in Reno that he supposed would impact neighbors who enjoyed using their backyards for gardening and sunbathing.

Ms. Terri Rondulait was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Janet Butcher voiced her opposition to Ordinance 1726. She commented that regulations should be set according to the conditions in the area they governed, and she did not believe it was necessary for a Table of Use to be consistent throughout Washoe County. She provided an example of formerly being required to rent a home at a rate exclusively determined by other rental rates in the area, which did not account for significant repairs needed on the property. She disclosed that she moved to Spanish Springs to distance herself from the rest of Washoe County, and she hoped the existing regulations would be retained. Ms. Butcher listed examples of negative impacts of construction experienced by people she knew. She theorized some Board members were funded by real estate and builders and were therefore obliged to support the proposed changes. Ms. Butcher displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Pat Davison shared that she had been involved in the Code changes because she wanted to be part of the solution to the housing shortage confronting Washoe County. She communicated that she was not insensitive to concerns people raised about additional growth and development. She was concerned that affordable housing might be seen as undesirable rather than as a widespread community need. She did not want to see a population cap, an urban growth boundary, or a movement to stop growth emerging as a consequence of the AHP. She wondered if some discussion should immediately occur regarding how to share information and seek feedback from residents about how to solve the housing shortage. She suggested town hall meetings, citizen advisory board (CAB) meetings, homeowner associations (HOAs), the County newsletter, and public service announcements through local media could all be part of that effort. She was encouraged by the transformation of the Development Code to make Washoe County more attractive to residents and affordable housing developers who could provide solutions. She urged the Board to adopt Ordinance 1726 and asked them to consider directing the staff to start a public outreach effort.

Ms. Pam Darr expressed her dissatisfaction with rapid changes in the area. She believed there were too many people and inadequate infrastructure to support the growth. She said it reminded her of the population increase in Southern California that she

observed while growing up. She wondered if Washoe County was keeping up with the demand on the sewer system, and she recalled hearing a number of years ago that the system was at capacity. She shared a recent experience of seeing an unconscious person on the sidewalk in a nice area and reported that after that individual was removed from the area, that person's shopping cart remained there for approximately a month. Ms. Darr predicted the people who were positioned to profit from area growth would be happy and simply move away, and other County residents who stayed would be left with significant debt. She cited remarks from a previous president about how he wanted to put apartment complexes into middle-class suburbs to destroy them, and she was in disbelief, as she perceived that to be occurring.

Ms. Susan Vanness disclosed a conversation she had with Ms. Oakley, who she believed explained the item to her well. Ms. Vanness thought there was too much content included in the item, though she acknowledged some provisions had been removed from the ordinance since the first version was presented. She suggested separating more details out for closer individual evaluation rather than having so many bundled in a single item. She expected many North Valleys residents to stand up against proposals like the one before the Board that day. She expressed concern regarding commercial bunkhouses. She divulged a conversation she had with a man who she reasoned the County had likely contracted with. She theorized connections between development plans, changes to the roads in Lemmon Valley, and water being pumped out to American Flats. She was skeptical about the feasibility of the water filtration plans as proposed, particularly with the kind of development she thought would be constructed. Ms. Vanness spoke about future bunkhouse-style developments with centralized kitchens and very small living spaces. She did not think families would live in housing like that, and she speculated that those units were designed for undocumented residents. She believed there was more to the proposals, and she hoped the Commissioners would review them thoroughly.

Ms. Marie Rodriguez noted provisions in the proposal about bicycle parking and storage. She stated that she worked for the police department and had observed through her work that bicycle theft had increased. She advised designating space for indoor, locked bicycle storage in apartment complexes. She hoped plans were drafted with that in mind.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Vice Chair Herman voting no, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1726, Bill No. 1917, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

24-0512 **AGENDA ITEM 24** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and LC Highland, LLC, for Highland Village, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. WTM20-004). The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the first final map from November 16, 2024, to November 16, 2026, and to adopt amended conditions of approval (WAC24-0004). The

project is located north of Highland Ranch Pkwy. and north of Midnight Drive in Sun Valley. The project encompasses a total of approximately 54.6 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 215. The parcels are located within the Sun Valley Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 5. (APN: 508-020-41 and 508-020-43). If approved, authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1727, Bill No. 1918.

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 Ordinance No. 1727, Bill No. 1918, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

24-0513 **AGENDA ITEM 25** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and Mesa View Reno, LLC, for Sun Mesa, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. TM04-001).

The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the next final map from April 28, 2024, to April 28, 2025, and to adopt amended conditions of approval (WAC24-0005). The project is located along the eastern terminus of Sun Valley Drive and Rising Ridge Drive in Sun Valley. The project encompasses a total of approximately 24.89 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 207 with 149 lots recorded and 58 lots remaining to be recorded. The parcel is located within the Sun Valley Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 3. (APN: 504-460-03.) If approved, authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1728, Bill No. 1916.

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 Ordinance No. 1728, Bill No. 1916, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

24-0514 **AGENDA ITEM 26** Conduct a second reading, public hearing, and possible adoption an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 20 (Revenue and Taxation) by amending various sections to: change bidding increments from \$300 to \$500.00 for base bids in excess of \$5001.00 for sales of tax delinquent properties; require the completed winning bidder form be submitted along with payment; change the contribution to the county general fund from ten percent of the next \$2,000 of the excess proceeds to ten percent of the next \$10,000.00; change the time period in which a claimant may make a claim for excess proceeds from two years to one year; update a statutory citation; and amend sections to gender-neutral language. If supported, adopt and enact the new ordinance by title. (No Fiscal Impact). Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1729, Bill No. 1919.

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 Ordinance No. 1729, Bill No. 1919, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

24-0515 **AGENDA ITEM 27** Public hearing, second reading, and adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code (WCC) Chapter 45 (Public Welfare). The Nevada Division of Welfare and Supportive Services took over all child care licensing activities for Washoe County effective July 1, 2024. The proposed ordinance will: (1) reflect that change in WCC; (2) allow for consistent statewide enforcement of NRS and NAC 432A; and (3) streamline federal reporting requirements for child care licensing activities and funding. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1730, Bill No. 1920.

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 Ordinance No. 1730, Bill No. 1920, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

24-0516 **AGENDA ITEM 28** Public Comment.

Ms. Janet Butcher reported that she took the day off work to attend the meeting that day, which cost her money. She commented on people in attendance that day who wore stickers with the words count our votes. She said that was what she was asking also, and she wanted to see verification that all votes were properly counted. She professed her deep respect for Vice Chair Herman and thanked her for standing up for the people and not folding. She clarified that her questions and concerns were not only about their individual votes, but also about the process. She stated that all of the Board members knew the process was wrong. She recalled being part of a group that expressed similar concerns in 2020. Ms. Butcher explained that she perceived a disparity between the concern of two Commissioners about the symbols worn by a citizen affiliated with the Reno Toy Run (RTR) and the lack of concern those same Commissioners seemed to have about explicit materials in public libraries. She believed the inconsistency was unconscionable. Ms. Butcher displayed an image, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She applauded the conviction of Senator Robert Menendez on federal corruption charges.

24-0517 **AGENDA ITEM 29** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Clark wanted a detailed account of how much money the County had spent since 2020 on repairs, remodels, and reconfigurations of the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office. He requested an update from the ROV or the Secretary of State (SOS) on Ms. Marsela Kupfersmith, who he stated was trying to get on the ballot as an independent candidate in District 4 for the November 2024 election.

Commissioner Clark recalled a commenter the previous week who inquired about the possibility of Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meetings being held in the evening. He observed an earlier commenter that day, Mr. Stephen Hatch, remarked about having to secure childcare to attend the BCC meeting. Commissioner Clark reiterated his desire to see an agenda item including a vote about scheduling periodic evening meetings to facilitate attendance from citizens who were at work during the hours that BCC meetings were typically conducted. He thought quarterly or monthly evening meetings would allow more people to deliver their concerns to the Board.

Regarding remarks from an earlier public commenter, Ms. Gail Townsend, about needing solutions, Commissioner Clark restated a solution he had proposed on many occasions. He suggested the ROV incorporate a process for candidates to proofread the ballots and sample ballots prior to printing them. He reasoned that review would reduce errors and reprints. He requested a regular report from the ROV to show how many names they had taken off the voter rolls due to lack of voting, relocation, or death.

Commissioner Clark indicated that when public commenters discussed the ROV, he wanted to see a representative from the ROV Office collect names and contact information for those individuals so they could follow up on their concerns.

* * * * *

6:24 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:
Danielle Howard, Deputy County Clerk
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk
Kendra DeSoto-Silva, Deputy County Clerk
Taylor Chambers, Deputy County Clerk