

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

THURSDAY

10:00 A.M.

JUNE 18, 2026

PRESENT:

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

Janis Galassini, County Clerk
Kate Thomas, County Manager
Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney

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

26-0427 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Mary Richardson displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She spoke in support of the Board accepting the canvass of the vote. She stated that while it was the Board's duty to vote to accept, she encouraged them to do so enthusiastically and joyfully. She declared that the election voters had marked a paper ballot, then cast their ballot by scanning it into the ballot scanner. She noted there was a great deal of comment on the new system. She claimed that poll workers found the system easy to monitor. She expressed that the voters she spoke with were surprised by their positive response to the experience of actually having a paper ballot and being the one responsible for scanning it into the machine. She alleged that trained observers had commented on the professionalism of the poll workers. She felt that first-time voters were impressed with how smooth the voting process went. She stated she had heard the phrase *well-oiled machine* more than once. She claimed that observers had complimented the way the managers addressed problems quickly, efficiently, and effectively. She said they got on the phone, received instructions on how to solve a problem, and then solved it, even amid some chaos. She explained that every ballot was under lock and seal, or under bipartisan security, at all times from the moment it became a live ballot until the end of its existence. She mentioned that the people she worked with were among the most dedicated and conscientious she knew, and that they worked every day to protect the vote. She shared that thinking of the energy on election night as the results came in to the Registrar of Voters (ROV) gave her goosebumps. She expressed that the people took their role as protectors of the integrity of the vote very seriously. She thought this was why she could add one more

aspect to the Board's yes vote: integrity. So, she concluded, the Board could cast its vote on the report with enthusiasm, joy, and integrity.

Maureen McElroy knew that there was worry and trepidation lately regarding voting processes. She said that concerns had been raised, from registering to vote to the final counting and securing of ballots. She stated that she wanted to say a few words about what she had seen done about the concerns. She shared that she had taken the opportunity to attend meetings where ROV Andrew McDonald and his staff carefully explained the processes, safeguards, and innovations put in place to make their voting as seamless, safe, fair, and secure as possible. She noted that the ROV website had been updated and contained a host of information to educate and enlighten voters, including a link to track one's ballot, information about updates to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible voting, including new curbside voting for people with mobility issues, information on how to use the new voting machines which allowed the voter to print their own ballot, a paper copy in which they could verify their choices in black and white and then scan into a secure box, and a new website dashboard that allowed voters to see up to date voting results, election data, turnout numbers, and archived election results. All of this, she alleged, was done to inform voters and help allay worries they might have about the process and their vote. She knew the Commissioners were already aware of all the work that had been done to make the voting processes as safe, verifiable, and transparent as possible, but she felt compelled to state them aloud, as many still doubted the election's integrity. She declared their voting processes were solid. She thanked Mr. McDonald and his team for their work to have safe, fair, and legal elections.

Tammy Holt-Still stated she was before the Board because, after seeing a news article regarding 15,000 undeliverable votes, and after seeing how many people voted within District 5, including her paying over \$600 for 22,000 records for the Republican Party, she felt they either disenfranchised those people due to the sample ballot, or else she had been tricked because there were not 22,000 voters in her district. She alleged there was a problem. She stated she and others had told the Board about it, but it was dismissed. She added that they filed a complaint. She wondered if this had sabotaged her, because when you input your paper ballot into the machine, it could be manipulated through the computer system on a day-to-day basis. She added that she did not trust the Board. She noted she had seen how they worked, and she did not believe the system was correct. She said she was not a sore loser and that she had lost. She felt this was not a problem and was what the people had decided. But, she explained, when one added Katherine Yriarte's votes and her own votes together, they almost equaled Rob Pierce's votes. She felt this was suspicious. She declared she was a numbers person because of her experience as a tax examiner and that she was following up on her suspicions. She stated for the record that the current ROV should not be in that role, and that it should be an elected position, under oath of office and the penalty of law, because there had been a good deal of covering up. She alleged she had felt it for nine years, had seen the corruption, and that it was still in place. She stated that her assertions proved it.

Nicholas St. Jon displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He stated it was a graph and that he ran the data from the Secretary of State

(SOS) database every day. He alleged that, after the close of early voting on June 5, one would think that, by taking the secure digital (SD) cards used and processing them into a tabulator, the vote would be counted in a couple of hours. He said that the graph showed that on June 8, a number of votes were added. Then, he added, on June 10, 73 votes were removed from third-party early voting and appeared to be placed on Republican and Democratic ballots for early voting. He explained that on June 12, 230 votes were removed from third-party designations and 115 each were put into the Democratic Party. He declared that this was shown in the document before the Board. He stated that this went for three days, and then, as of the day prior, another 13 votes had been added to the third party, then 11 or 13 were removed. This, he felt, showed there was some kind of activity after the close of June 5, when early voting was completed. He explained that his request from the courts was to ask the Board to have the ROV bring those approximately 2,000 early voting paper ballots into the Chambers and count them so people knew exactly how many ballots had been cast in early voting by third parties. He acknowledged that the courts had ruled he did not provide sufficient evidence, but he did not know what more he could produce that did not include items he did not have access to. He felt that before the Board canvassed the vote, they needed to answer where the 230 ballots had come from, where they had gone, and why they had ended up in the Republican and Democratic Parties. He stated that the Board had the power to ask the ROV to bring those ballots into the Chambers and to spend approximately 30 minutes conducting a count. The question, he said, was whether they were concerned about the integrity of the election enough to actually do that. He explained that they were not required to actually submit the canvass until 11:59 p.m. the next night, which meant they had plenty of time to perform a hand recount.

Kate Vineyard stated that she did not work in the polls, but wanted to know what was happening. She explained that she had two tools at her disposal: the Nevada SOS and the Washoe County ROV. She declared that the information she was receiving was extremely unreliable and outdated. She explained that, as of the night before, it showed 49.9 percent of the ballots had been processed, with 63,998 remaining. She had questions about the reliability of the data presented to all voters who were not involved. She questioned where those ballots were and was also interested in learning more about the curing process, because she said she checked every day and saw that the numbers did not change, then suddenly changed. She wondered what had happened. She felt there were too many questions for someone outside the ROV to know what really happened. She hoped the Board could help answer why the information was so flawed. She asked why, if everything was already finished, it still showed 63,000 votes outstanding.

Lynn Gillespie declared she had worked very hard on the election, as had everyone in the room. She explained that she had been on social media almost every day and wanted to let the Board know that many people did not trust the system or the individuals on the various boards, the Reno City Council, or the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). She added that those people felt cheated, and many did not vote because they believed the election was already decided.

Oscar Williams described a number of races as close, including the races for mayor and District 40. He thought this was Drew Ribar's race and that they were still

waiting for the official final results. He stated that, whatever the result, and with respect to what Mr. St. Jon was presenting, he wanted to discuss something he had mentioned to the Board before. He said this was that the Nevada Supreme Court and the United States (US) Supreme Court had affirmed one's right to vote as protected speech, and that at no point did that change with the topic of the day. He announced that some people may counsel the Board that their votes on the canvass were ministerial and nondiscretionary, only if there was no evidence to the contrary. But, he declared, when there was evidence, they had to pause and question what they should do about that. He said that if the Board ignored it, it was a neglect of duty, and they had to be the front line for the rest of the voters and investigate issues that might be system-wide. He stated that it might be individual races, or components of the system, which he felt was up to the Board to determine. He encouraged the Board to vote according to their conscience. He thought there was nothing stopping them from doing that, and that they should not let anybody else tell them otherwise. He announced they could approve or deny the canvass, but that there was also a third choice. He suggested they could hire a grand petit jury, pursuant to the Nevada Constitution, Article 4, Section 20, and give them some money, a place to meet, some security, and a mission, and the evidence to ask them to fix the situation. That way, he felt, the public would know that the election was true and accurate. Then, he said, the Commissioners could certify. He was impressed that in the Agenda, the Board had added language regarding Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 293.387. He asked what noting the discovery of the error meant, and how they would know if there was an error if they were not being told by the ROV. He declared that they were not an investigative body, which was why they needed someone to present the case to the grand petit jury. He requested that they consider it as option three or four among their possible choices.

Cliff Nellis stated that in 2024, he was very active in attempting to discover all voter fraud. He reiterated his congratulations on the Board's Democrat-run operation of total fraud. He stated the Board knew about it. He felt there was no transparency and no way to see what went on inside the new ballot machines. He declared there was one way to find out. He expressed that he liked the new scanned ballots and felt they were much easier to read than tapes. He reiterated that the ballots had not been hand-counted. He shared that when he was using the machine, he asked a member of staff how he could know the machine had recorded what he had entered, as it was just a machine. He recalled that the member of staff told him that the machine was audited. He referenced that the 2024 audit for the SOS included 119 votes out of over 100,000. He thought that figure in that County equated to one-tenth of one percent. But, he stated, a real audit was 20 percent. He declared that he wanted an audit, specifically a hand audit. He added that he wanted 100 percent of the votes audited. He said that he helped school board candidates run. He felt they had four good American Traditionalist candidates, unlike the first two speakers, whom he felt were Communists. He alleged that the first two speakers were proof of a fraudulent system. He described the speeches of the first two speakers as crafted speeches. He felt they were overly complimentary, and therefore proof of a fraudulent system. He expressed that candidates spent a lot of money running for office. He asked who ran for the school board election. He stated it was Colleen Westlake. He described her as a traitor. He said no one ran against her because it was a waste of time and money, since they already knew the outcome, especially on the school board and in the primary election. He stated they wanted

the children. He emphasized that he wanted the children back from those he described as perverts, and other perverts on the library board, as well. He acknowledged he was venting with his speech. He reiterated his request for a hand audit. He felt that Mr. St. Jon's suggestion was excellent. He announced that they had no confidence in the election at all and that he would be spreading the word to the people. He stated that many people were simply ignorant and did not care, and that they knew it was rigged and would not participate. He asked whether that was the way to run a Country and whether it would be successful. He suggested the Board ask themselves those questions.

Penny Brock stated that she was not only a voter but had also spoken with voters and had repeatedly heard, especially in light of what she told them about her time as an observer in the ballot processing room, that they did not trust the election and would not vote. She acknowledged what she described as Chair Andriola's new election data transparency project, as the Chair was concerned about declining voter participation. She announced that what she saw in the observation booth almost made her not want to vote anymore, because she did not trust that their votes were being counted accurately. She reiterated that she did not trust the process. She declared that she would continue voting and observing because it would give her more stories to tell. She found it interesting that there were 321,109 registered voters, yet 322,219 mail ballots were sent out. She alleged that mail ballots for online voters were still being generated. She did not know how many actual mail ballots were generated. She asked how there could be more ballots than registered voters. She expressed that the information indicated the election should not be certified, and that something was wrong. She clarified that she got the number from the mail ballots in the June 8 report, and at that time, 78,069 had been rejected. She added that 47,149 mail ballots had been accepted for counting. She alleged that another thing that happened while observing on election night, with her not going home until 12:15 a.m. the next morning and three of their observers remaining until the ROV turned off the lights, was that they saw things happening even though there was no transparency. She stated that, in an interview the prior week, Mr. McDonald was asked how long it took to process a mail ballot, and he approximated 10 to 12 hours. She asked how that happened. She described it as musical chair mail ballots in the observation room.

Roblyn Williams stated she had observed approximately 40 hours in the observation room. She expressed that the people who had spoken about knowing how wonderful the vote went never came to observe the process, and neither had any Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) or non-government entity that Washoe County had hired. She announced she had many questions about her issues with computers that go in and out of the building, get taken home, and then are brought back in and plugged into what should be sterile election equipment. She declared she had a significant problem with that, as did other counties. She stated she did not have the internet. She claimed that, based on an investigation and a Senate hearing with the ROV in Maricopa County, the ROV was forced to admit that the laptops the staff had taken home and brought back in did have the ability to use at least two signature verification methods at home. She felt it was important because it was via signature verification that one could remove active voters or pause them. She alleged that Washoe County had paused many voters. She explained there were a variety of problems with signature verification. She stated they received answers such as

that laptops could, in fact, be taken home, and it was not a problem. She felt that if that was something decided in 2020 because of COVID-19 (C19), it had been six years since then. She expressed that if the Board wanted transparency in the elections, they should not allow the workers to bring their phones and laptops in and out. She added that the observers were not allowed to use their phones to take pictures, but that members of the press were allowed to sit for five hours with an open line of communication on their laptops and phones. She stated she had personally witnessed two workers in the room, one of whom went onto a Google page and the other looked for job opportunities in Washoe County, all after being verbally assured by ROV Public Information Officer (PIO) George Guthrie that the computers did not go on the internet. She opined that it took so long to count votes because the staff sat around. She attested that she had hundreds of pictures, along with video, and that she collected documentation. She felt the Board never asked, as they did not want to hear it or see it. She hoped that one day someone would collect her documentation and there would be a federal audit.

Veronica Cortes stated she was running for Legislature District 27, and was excited to work with the new District 3 Commissioner. She explained that since becoming a candidate, she had been looking into campaign donations. She added that, working for the Washoe County School District (WCSD) for the last 26 years, she had never earned more than \$37,000 in a year. She noted one could not live off of that, but it was reality. She stated she had a ten-year-old daughter, whom she had recently had removed from school because of corruption in the schools in Sun Valley. She expressed that she wanted to work closer to her business because she could not live off a lunch lady's salary. She shared that she had opened her own pizza restaurant, earned her Notary Public license, and was focusing on improving Sun Valley. She felt that, as she tried to improve Sun Valley, she met resistance from Board members. She thought many things were being hidden, and they were things she did not expect to see from her leaders. She said that many people had lost faith. She opined that she knew, deep down, the Commissioners were godly people. She attested that she and Chair Andriola attended the same church. She noted that she played the flute. She stated that she never found Chair Andriola at her church, then explained that she attended a thousand-person audience. She invited the Board to come to Immaculate Conception Catholic Church at 7:30 a.m. She felt that it was nice to attend church early, then go on with one's day. And, she added, one received a free donut, and sometimes they sold turnovers. She expressed that it was nice to know a Commissioner had a backing in God, and she hoped the rest of the Commissioners did, too. She hoped they could deliver the change people in the community wanted, whether through the Commissioners as leaders, or herself. She knew she was not winning her race, and explained that she was going up against a career politician who had all the Democratic money in the world. But, she noted, she had God on her side, and everybody would be judged one day. She stated she was ready and hoped the Board was as well. She named County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas, Vice Chair Garcia, Chair Andriola, Commissioner Hill, and Commissioner Clark, and said she blessed them on their journey. She added that she also wanted to advocate for Sun Valley, which she described as a super dangerous place, and that they were working to make it better. She hoped that, for the next Commissioner who came in, she would work together with them as a community, regardless of party lines. She thought they were a community and needed to stick together. She announced that she would be hosting a

campaign kickoff party at Alfredo's Café on June 27 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. She stated they would have a Sun Valley history presentation and hoped to see everyone there.

Debra Jalen shared her takeaways as an observer during the current election. She noted that she had observed a couple of elections. Her takeaways from election night were that there were no high chairs in the lobby to view the tabulation room and that the chairs were not high enough to see into it. She stated the observers had asked for different chairs and were denied. She added that the same night, they requested the lights be turned on in the room twice, and the staff said no. She said they contacted Assistant County Manager (ACM) Ryan Gustafson, who did provide higher chairs in the tabulation room and turned on the requested lights. She noted that the lights were not on many other times in the tabulation room. She declared that Mr. Guthrie informed them at 7:25 p.m. that evening that the intake would occur in the parking area, which she stated was 50 to 60 feet (ft) away. She felt there was no possible way to observe that. She alleged that they were told previously that the intake was always 8 to 10 feet away, so they could confirm it was fine or, if they saw something, point it out. She stated they were only allowed to have three people stand and look, and there was only room for three, at a distance of 50 to 60 ft. She thought this did not allow for meaningful observation. She recounted that she asked Mr. Guthrie about it, and he said he had told them, and he recalled two of the observers he had informed. She said she asked both of them, and both attested that they were never advised of any change. She felt there was no lighting 50 to 60 ft away. She asked what one could see. She stated there were simply not enough rooms in the processing room for them to perform meaningful observation. She expressed that it was wrong. She claimed that 15,000 ballots were not found. She wondered about the 150 they had found in just one precinct they had covered, where Commissioner Clark lived. She asked whether those ballots had gone out. She stated they did not know and that those records came from the ROV. So, she added, she hoped the Board did not certify the election. She declared that it was not fair. She explained that outside the Chambers, there were three inlays in the flooring as one entered, which were integrity, effective communication, and quality public service. She felt that none of them had been followed by the ROV.

Janet Butcher thought she saw some familiar faces while observing, which she found nice because they were working hard. She felt there were fewer election observers than in the past. From her time in the observing room, she thought that things could be more efficient. She thanked Deputy ROV Reginald Greer for answering her questions, adding that she submitted her last question on Monday and received an answer by Tuesday morning. She noted that she had more questions and hoped to ask follow-up questions about Mr. Greer's answers. She expressed that the Board would approve the vote without asking any critical questions. She alleged that they had always done so in the past, and that individuals would come before the Board, provide documentation, and show what was wrong, but the Board would approve anyway. She did not know why or how the Board could do that and be happy about it. She declared there were problems. She asked why people did not vote, and why Washoe County had low voter turnout. She felt it was obvious why voter turnout was low, as voters wondered why they would bother voting. She stated she would not quit voting, but many people would. She shared that the new ballots and new voting measures were interesting. She added that her neighbors were split on the topic. She

thought the privacy sleeve was ineffective because one had to remove their ballot from the sleeve to cast it, and anyone standing nearby could see it. She reiterated that she did not think the Board should approve the vote without further discussion.

George Eddie Lorton stated that he was running for mayor. He alleged that a few things had occurred. He asked who would have expected that Nevada Governor Joe Lombardo, whom he described as being beholden to developers and special interest groups, would endorse someone in a race of his size. He announced he was only 380 votes out. He described that as a terrible part about entrenched politicians. He said they wanted uncontrollable development, which he hoped the Board would look out for in the future, and data centers. He stated the entrenched politicians did not care about resources or infrastructure, but that he himself cared about the people. He expressed that his team had put a lot of work into his campaign and that running for office was difficult. He mentioned that in his race alone, there were inconsistencies at first. He alleged the ROV took a long time to provide the initial tally for his race, and then they performed several drops. He explained that after those drops, he was 600 votes out. He thought they dropped a number of his votes, and then they stopped updating his race. He shared that his attorney then called the ROV, and after that, suddenly, he gained 200 votes, and the ROV began regularly updating the vote totals in his race. He alleged that the ROV was supposed to send his team reports, but halfway through his race, they stopped doing that. He noted they received the full reports at the end of his race. He declared that he was a forensic auditor and a business analyst, and he found it suspicious that all of a sudden, there were changes in the votes, which he felt were mathematically impossible. He said that things like that happened multiple times. He stated that the other night he gained another 20 votes, bringing his total to 380 out. He expressed that votes meant something, and was surprised to learn that 1,000 votes did not get procured, which he said meant those votes would not be used. He felt those votes could have changed the outcome of his race. He thought it was not right. He stated that he had recently been informed that 15,000 votes had been returned to sender. He thought this meant Washoe County did not have clean voter rolls. He explained that getting 15,000 votes back as undeliverable, when he only needed a few hundred votes, was unacceptable. He alleged that others were happy because, in the past, 42,000 votes had been undeliverable. He said the Board needed to review the system and that mail-in voting should be suspended a week before the final vote to avoid such a situation. He stated that Washoe County was an embarrassment to the Nation, as they were the very last to report on national elections, because the elections were counted for a week and a half. He added that if mail-in ballots were stopped, then the ROV might have time to count and procure the vote, which would help the system. He stated that one had to abide by the system's rules. He wanted to point out that Fallon, Nevada, in Churchill County, held special elections over a few hundred votes that were not delivered.

26-0428 AGENDA ITEM 4 Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas recognized the extraordinary efforts of the 18 staff members in the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office. She explained that she worked alongside the ROV, executive staff, and County employees, who worked tirelessly to ensure the election was conducted as smoothly, fairly, and transparently as possible. She

thanked the ROV staff for their tremendous efforts and expressed her appreciation to the more than 400 people who supported the election at 50 vote centers on election night, as well as those who contributed to the extensive coordination, training, and preparation. She added that the ROV's efforts had not gone unnoticed.

Commissioner Clark expressed concern about a comment Doug Jalen made during a previous Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting about postcards he mailed in his neighborhood. He suggested that Mr. Jalen had likely purchased the mailing data and relied on information obtained from the ROV's Office. He stated that Mr. Jalen had reported that 47 percent of the intended recipients did not receive the postcard he mailed. Commissioner Clark noted that he had contacted Assistant County Manager (ACM) Ryan Gustafson regarding ballots in Washoe County. He said that approximately 40,000 ballots had been returned as undeliverable two years earlier and that more than 15,000 were returned undeliverable in the current election. He pointed out that he could not recall the exact figure but believed it would be shared with the Board at a later time. He questioned whether the more than 15,000 undeliverable ballots were associated with voters who were deceased, no longer resided at their registered addresses, had incorrect addresses, or had misspelled names. He asked how more than 15,000 ballots could be returned as undeliverable and what the County's costs for postage and printing were. He speculated that some races had been much closer and that some candidates might have prevailed if some of those 15,000 ballots had been delivered and counted. He stated that he did not know what an acceptable number of undeliverable ballots was, but asserted the ROV's Office had two years to update the voter rolls. He acknowledged that not every ballot would be delivered but said he considered more than 15,000 undeliverable ballots to be unacceptable. He asked ROV Andrew McDonald for a list of the names associated with the undeliverable ballots. He said that, if providing the names was not possible, he wanted to know whether any of the more than 15,000 individuals with undeliverable ballots had requested a ballot on Election Day or had voted. He opined that providing that information would reassure Washoe County voters by explaining what had occurred. He stated that he had asked the Treasurer what would happen if 15,000 tax bills were undeliverable, and the Treasurer responded that the State of Nevada would likely close the Treasurer's Office. He added that he had asked the Assessor what would happen if 15,000 properties were not assessed and was told that the Department of Taxation would likely close the Assessor's Office. He questioned what would happen if the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO) failed to record 15,000 property deeds. He asked why certain County departments were held to a high standard of accuracy while he perceived that the ROV's Office was not. He observed that the ROV's Office appeared to view the reduction in undeliverable ballots from approximately 40,000 to more than 15,000 as a success. He reiterated that he did not know what an acceptable number of undeliverable ballots was but believed a study should be conducted to determine an appropriate number.

Commissioner Clark asked Chair Andriola how she felt the previous year when some Board members voted against certifying the election results and what led her to reconsider her vote. He recalled that Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards had instructed the Board to vote according to their conscience. He believed the Board had followed that advice and that, shortly afterward, the Nevada Attorney General threatened

to file a lawsuit if the Board did not certify the election results. He expressed hope that Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large would comment on the matter. He again asked Chair Andriola to describe her experience when the Board initially voted not to certify the election results and what had changed her mind.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked the ROV staff for their outstanding work. She acknowledged that she had already expressed her appreciation but emphasized the difficulty of their work and commended staff for their dedication. She noted that, in addition to managing the office's day-to-day operations, Mr. McDonald had consistently implemented successful new initiatives. She stated that Washoe County had a strong ROV team that not only carried out its responsibilities effectively but also found creative ways to make the voting process more accessible and transparent. She recalled Mr. McDonald's proposal to print and scan paper ballots, which she initially believed would be a significant change for the public. She said she had since heard many positive comments about the new voting process, with voters finding the ballots more legible and expressing confidence that their votes were accurately reflected. She recognized the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant curbside voting locations and expressed her appreciation that individuals with disabilities could participate in the voting process with greater ease and accessibility. She suggested that the service could be promoted more widely to constituents. She recognized that the ROV Office would be moving into its new facility later in the year and said she looked forward to the next general election being conducted there. She thanked Mr. McDonald for his hard work and stated that the new facility would be a historic milestone for the ROV Office.

Chair Andriola thanked staff, leadership, observers, and the hundreds of volunteers who supported the election. She stated that achieving the goal everyone shared would take time. She said that voting was what set America apart and emphasized the importance of counting every vote. She asked members of the public in attendance to be respectful and allow the Commissioners to make their comments without interruption. She acknowledged that every election provided opportunities for improvement and said she believed changes were needed at the legislative level to make mail-in voting opt-in. She suggested that the Founding Fathers intentionally built tension among the three branches of government. She noted that, during the Nation's 250th anniversary, reflecting on the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence reinforced for her the significance of voting. She acknowledged that the election process continued to evolve and that there was room for improvement. She added that she looked forward to seeing what changes the Legislature would make under the current Governor's leadership. She commended the ROV staff for doing everything within their legal authority to administer the election as effectively as possible. She said that the ROV staff had worked under significant pressure and carried a tremendous responsibility to ensure the election was conducted correctly and in accordance with the law. She expressed her gratitude to the ROV staff for their tireless work, CM Thomas for her leadership, and CDDA Large for his legal guidance.

Chair Andriola explained that it was the first day of the 107th Reno Rodeo, which began in 1919, and added that there were a few years when the Rodeo did not take place. She mentioned that there were many great family-friendly events and close to 1,000

volunteers who worked tirelessly year-round to put on the wildest, richest rodeo in the West. She hoped that the public would attend. She noted that a free Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association (PRCA) Reno Rodeo youth event was scheduled for the indoor arena. She stated that Kids Day would take place on Father's Day, which would be a great way to spend time with family. She recognized Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) J.J. Goicoechea for his role in bringing back the Nevada State Fair. She explained that the Nevada State Fair had operated for 136 consecutive years before a 16-year hiatus and had since returned in 2026, with plans to host it in Reno again in 2027. She thanked Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County, the Governor, and the Legislature for supporting Assembly Bill (AB) 333, which designated the land for agricultural use consistent with the original 1800s deed, enabling the fair's return. She hoped that the public would attend the Reno Rodeo and would celebrate the wildest, richest rodeo and Western heritage. She thought that the Country was made of cowboys, cowgirls, God, faith, country, apple, and apple pie.

Chair Andriola thanked Washoe County staff who supported the ROV's Office. She acknowledged the hard work of ROV staff and noted the important contributions of volunteers. She expressed her appreciation to CM Thomas for taking charge and ensuring that all aspects of the election process were covered.

Commissioner Herman apologized for not attending the meeting in person and shared that it was due to medical reasons. She thanked the members of the public who provided comments. She stated that, throughout her nearly 12 years as a Commissioner, she believed every election had experienced issues. She said that citizens had repeatedly asked the Board to improve transparency and integrity in elections, and she felt those concerns had not been adequately addressed. She expressed the view that the Board had not adequately addressed public concerns. She mentioned that the dedicated, patriotic constituents had requested that the Board return legal, acceptable elections that were fair and equitable and in compliance with the law. She thought the public had suggested that elections be returned to what worked back when they trusted elections, when Americans proved their citizenship with photo identification (ID), and when elections were on Election Day, not election month, and when voting and ballot counting were conducted within each precinct. She shared that the election observers had brought the Board's attention to the imperfections of Dominion and other equipment, and the Board was defiant and purchased millions of dollars of equipment at taxpayers' expense, which she alleged did not work. She said that citizens had spoken and suggested that elections were broken. She mentioned that voters had asked for no mail-in voting, no early voting, one-day elections, voter roll cleanup, and new registration. She thought that if everyone sent in a postcard, it would help the ROV's Office clean up voter registration, which she believed was in shambles. She explained that, although brave citizens had attended meetings and tried to guide the Board in a better direction, the Board sadly ignored their wisdom, and the taxpayers paid for the poor judgment. She speculated that elections seemed to get worse year after year, and she thought that taxpayers suffered the consequences.

Commissioner Clark stated that Chair Andriola had not answered his questions. He recalled that, a few years earlier, ADA Edwards had instructed the Board to

vote according to its conscience. He asked CDDA Large about the legal requirements for canvassing the vote.

Chair Andriola thanked Commissioner Clark for raising the question and said she had intended to ask CDDA Large the same question during Agenda Item 5. She asked CDDA Large whether he preferred to address the question now or during the next agenda item.

CDDA Large responded that, under Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 293.387, the Board had a statutory obligation to canvass the election returns. He explained that the statute required the Board to meet and complete the canvass on or before the 10th day following the election. He explained that during the canvass, the Board was to note any clerical errors discovered and account for any resulting corrections, so that the certified results reflected the true votes cast. He added that the Board would receive the canvass report during Mr. McDonald's presentation.

Commissioner Clark asked whether the Board was required to vote to certify the canvass.

CDDA Large explained that his role was to inform the Board of its statutory obligations. He mentioned that it was the Board's duty to determine whether it agreed.

26-0429 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Declaration of Canvass of Vote and Order for 2026 Primary Election held on June 9, 2026, as required by NRS 293.387. "Canvass" means a review of the election results by the Board of County Commissioners, by which any errors within the election results are officially noted and the official election results are declared. The canvass shall separately note any clerical errors discovered and take account of the changes resulting from the errors discovered, and the results declared must represent the true vote cast. As soon as the Board declares the results, the Registrar of Voters shall certify the abstract of the results, which must contain the number of votes cast for each candidate and enter it in the record of the Board. The Board shall order the Registrar of Voters to transmit a copy of the certified abstract, as well as a mechanized report of the abstract in accordance with regulations adopted by the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of State within the time required by NRS 293.387. Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Canvass of the Vote 2026 Primary Election; Turnout; Graph Slide (2 slides); Vote Centers; Mail Ballots; Undeliverable Ballots; Post Election Processing; Testing and Audits; Thank you. He thanked the citizens who voted in the primary election. He said that while he wished more voters had turned in ballots, he appreciated those who took the time to cast their votes. He expressed gratitude to his hard-working, dedicated staff of 17 and asked those in attendance to stand and receive a round of applause. He commended the 189 County workers who

signed up for 867 shifts and put aside their daily work duties to participate in the election. He recognized that those employees would not have been able to assist the ROV's Office without approval from their direct line managers and department heads, whom he appreciated. He acknowledged the 435 election workers who worked the two weeks of early voting and on Election Day. He asserted that the election could not happen without many individuals devoting their time. He said that safe, secure, and transparent elections were possible with effective members working the election.

Mr. McDonald noted that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) escorted staff daily to and from the United States Postal Service (USPS) to ensure mail ballots were always protected during pickups and had also provided security coordination on election night. He thanked the Secretary of State's (SOS) Office for its work and its attentiveness to calls and questions from the ROV's Office. He indicated that the Office of the County Manager (OCM) and its executive team periodically assisted the ROV's Office with election-related questions and administrative matters, which he appreciated. He said that the support and trust provided new and innovative ways to perform the election. He explained that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) authorized the ROV's Office to procure new voting equipment so that all in-person voters could cast tangible ballots, while also supporting poll workers in getting through the election. He commended Chair Andriola for her ability to negotiate the Reno-Sparks Convention Center (RSCC) lease at no cost. He said that without vote center locations, the ROV's Office could not have in-person voting. He reported that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) provided 27 school locations, while the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) provided 6 voting locations. He relayed that other voting centers included community centers, churches, and several private facilities that allowed voting at no cost. He said the ROV's Office was actively working on creating a Patriot Award for vote center partners.

Mr. McDonald reported that the 2026 Primary Election held the first-ever Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curbside voting program in the State. He said the program was used 40 times, which he speculated might seem like a low number; however, it was the first time the program had been provided. He believed that the program would become more popular as the general election progressed closer. He opined that it was helpful for voters to know they did not have to travel along the voting center's path lines into the center, which would risk a fall or require a wheelchair. He explained that the RSCC was a supercenter. He said that an election worker's lapel pin was created for those who worked the election as a reward and recognition for their work.

Mr. McDonald mentioned that the *I Voted* sticker was revamped to highlight Washoe County lands, rivers, mountains, and trees. He pointed out that the new mail ballot envelope design showed red, white, and blue for patriotism instead of its previous pink stripe. He said that the County implemented automatic signature verification (ASV) to enhance efficiency in mail ballot processing. He indicated that the vote center intake and supplies were in the garage for parallel processing and operations. He explained that observers were asked to fill out a form with any questions they had, so the answers could be read publicly online. He pointed out that public observation was available for 34 days, during which the ROV's Office received nearly 90 submissions, totaling 320 questions. He

said that one individual was responsible for 33 percent of the submissions, while the remaining submissions came from three other individuals.

Mr. McDonald read from the slide titled *Turnout* and said that the 2026 Primary Election had a 30.8 percent turnout. He explained that 37 percent of those individuals voted in person, while 63 percent voted by mail. He relayed that there were 331,409 registered voters, 18,781 early voters, 17,111 Election Day voters, 62,399 mail-in voters, and 535 provisional ballots were cast. He explained that the party affiliation breakdown included 39,606 Democrats, 43,170 Republicans, and 16,050 nonpartisan or minor party votes. He referred to the first *Graph Slide* and said it displayed the historical voter turnout by method. He reported an increase in mail-in ballots. He divulged that he preferred in-person voting as opposed to mail in because the results were available on Election Day; however, the County followed the Legislature's rules. He said that the law required every individual to be mailed a ballot. He referenced the second *Graph Slide*, which displayed the historical turnout percentage.

Mr. McDonald read from the *Vote Centers* slide and said there were 50 Election Day vote centers and 22 early voting centers, each with a mail ballot drop box. He noted that there were three standalone drop boxes for early voting and two on Election Day. He said that all locations offered curbside voting, whether for early voting or on Election Day. He explained that the top five drop box locations included the Washoe County Administrative Complex with 2,792 drops, the South Valleys Library with 2,726 drops, the Spanish Springs Library with 1,867 drops, the ROV's Office with 1,277 drops, and the North Valleys Library with 1,134 drops.

Mr. McDonald referred to the *Mail Ballots* slide and explained that 323,000 mail ballots were sent out. He recalled that the Board approved the State Mail Ballot Print Contract, which he reported saved the County money. He said that when ballots were returned as undeliverable, the County did not pay postage. He clarified that State taxpayers still paid for the postage, but Washoe County did not specifically pay for it out of its budget. He said that each undeliverable ballot costs about \$3.50. He noted that 80,000 mail ballots were returned, with 71 percent delivered by the USPS and 28 percent picked up by the ROV's Office via drop boxes. He said that 1 percent was delivered by the Effective Absentee System for Elections (EASE) program. He mentioned that 1,615 mail ballots were rejected due to issues such as mismatched signatures and ballots submitted in a single envelope. He said that as individuals cured their ballots, the rejection rate decreased and the cure rate increased. He said that the signature cure rate was 58 percent, with every single voter being called for curing. He recalled that a public commenter mentioned there were 321,409 active registered voters, which was correct; however, 323,000 ballots were mailed because if someone changed their party affiliation or moved, another ballot had to be mailed, as ballots were non-forwardable. He asserted that there would be more ballots than voters, and, as a result, the ROV's Office created a comprehensive cure report, available daily on the ROV's website, to assist voters and interested parties in identifying and contacting voters with signature cures.

Mr. McDonald indicated that on election night, vote centers, ballots, and

supplies were scaled and extended into the parking garage to allow for parallel processing of votes and materials alongside mail ballot processing. He recalled that an observer said she was told at the last minute that processing was underway. He noted that he had not known that he needed to inform everyone. He explained that the observers were told and the cars were halted until the observers arrived. He said that the observers witnessed the entire process, and while they could not see every inch of the building, they observed the intake process, which had never been seen before in previous elections. He reported that intake took place in the garage every election.

Mr. McDonald noted that there were five ways to cure a ballot: in person, by text, over the phone, InCode, or by mail. He read from the *Undeliverable Ballots* slide and said there were 15,000 undeliverable ballots returned as non-voted ballots, which equaled a 4.6 percent return rate. He recalled that Commissioner Clark had asked what the national average of returned ballots was. He said that the national average was between 3 and 5 percent. He clarified that the County's percentage was higher than he would have liked, but it still fell within the national average. He mentioned that 90 days before the election, the ROV's Office was no longer allowed to perform bulk list maintenance. He said that it was the responsibility of the voters at that time to inform the ROV's Office of changes.

Mr. McDonald mentioned that an undeliverable ballot was one that the USPS determined could not be delivered to a specific voter. He explained that, unlike the Treasurer or Assessor, who could forward mail to an owner, the ROV was not permitted by law to forward mail. He relayed that the national statistic of voters who changed their address in a typical year was 8 to 15 percent. He said that in a fast-growing rental economy, the average renter moved more than a homeowner. He recalled that 332,592 ballots were mailed during the 2024 General Election, with 22,366 returned. He pointed out a 2 percent decrease in the return rate from the 2024 General Election to the 2026 Primary Election. He said there was a specific process for inactivating and removing individuals from the voter rolls, as set forth in Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 293.530. He indicated that the ROV must receive confirmation that the voter had moved to initiate inactivation, and that it was the voter's responsibility to update their registration quarterly.

11:20 a.m. Commissioner Herman was disconnected from the meeting around this time.

Mr. McDonald explained that if the ROV's Office was notified by the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC), which 27 states participate in, of a relocated voter, the ROV's Office would send an address confirmation card to the voter. He said there were other ways to know if someone had moved, such as receiving correspondence returned as undeliverable. He noted that if an undeliverable ballot was received, the ROV's Office started the 90-day inactivation process. He said that if the voter did not confirm or update their address, they would be listed as inactive. He recalled that in 2025, the ROV's Office performed a massive maintenance update to its rolls, with 75,721 voters inactivated or canceled. He mentioned that 55,501 voters were inactivated in 2025, leading up to the 2026 Primary Election and before the 90-day blackout period, with

another 25,000 voters inactivated before March 11, 2026. He reported that Washoe County was responsible for one-third of the State's inactivity since the general election. He said that 1,100 voters updated their addresses and voted in the 2026 Primary Election, out of the 15,000 undeliverable ballots.

Mr. McDonald reiterated that the County did not specifically pay for undeliverable ballots, which was a cost savings of roughly \$52,500 during the primary election. He noted that the 15,000 undeliverable ballots were due to those voters either not providing the ROV's Office with a reason to inactivate them or failing to meet the criteria for inactivation during list maintenance. He explained that, since they were now listed as undeliverable, they would receive a verification card and be made inactive if they did not respond.

Mr. McDonald read from the *Post Election Processing* slide and said that 13,652 mail ballots were returned on Election Day, which was 20 percent of all mail ballots returned that day. He noted that 4,657 of the returned Election Day ballots were delivered via USPS, while the other 8,944 were delivered via drop boxes. He urged the public to place their ballots in drop boxes rather than mail them back as Election Day approached. He divulged that he would not trust dropping his ballot off at the USPS on Election Day. He said that 808 ballots were received after Election Day and accepted because they were postmarked by Election Day; however, 1,837 ballots were received after Election Day and rejected because they were not postmarked by Election Day or were received after the fourth day after.

Mr. McDonald referenced the *Testing and Audits* slide and explained that the ROV's Office participated in two rounds of Pre-Logic and Accuracy Testing (LAT) and one round of Post-LAT at the ROV's current location and the new warehouse. He explained that the equipment was tested two weeks prior to Election Day to ensure it functioned as it should. He said that central counting place tabulation testing occurred two weeks before Election Day, the day before Election Day, and the day after Election Day. He reported that three people certified the tests: a Washoe County employee, a City of Reno employee, and a City of Sparks employee. He said that the names of said employees were listed in the backup material. He noted that the ROV's Office implemented ASV during the last election. He said that an audit of the ASV system required at least 1 percent of signatures to be verified; however, the ROV performed a 2 percent audit. He pointed out that an audit of 374 ASVs was successful. He said that almost 20,000 signatures passed through the system. He recalled that he had asked the Board to approve a 72 confidence level, which he said was very conservative compared to Southern California counties, which approve a 45 confidence level. He indicated that 19,432 signatures passed through the ASV without requiring human review, making the process more efficient.

Mr. McDonald explained that a Risk Limiting Audit (RLA) would be conducted after the election was certified. He said that the RLA would audit a random sample of ballots to confirm that the originally reported outcomes were correct. He noted that the election did have some errors. He said that, as much as people would like it to be scientific and have 100 percent accuracy, the fact remained that the ROV's Office staff was

human and errors would occur. He noted that people were trained for six hours and then expected to perform their jobs. He said the ROV's Office had a hotline with eight individuals available to assist with voter issues or equipment problems. He recalled that there were three locations that began early voting with training mode on a few of the poll pads, meaning 17 check-ins were listed in training mode rather than election mode. He said that because of that, fewer ballots were listed as cast at the Sun Valley Neighborhood Center, the South Valleys Library, and the Spanish Springs Library. He reported that exiting training mode reset the database; therefore, 17 voters were still able to vote and were not disenfranchised, but they did not receive voter credit in the registration records. He asserted that the 17 individuals were able to vote, and he simply wanted to note the discrepancy between the check-ins and the total ballot scans.

Mr. McDonald further reported that poll pad 124, assigned to the Washoe County Administrative Complex, was taken out of service because it was not communicating with the voter registration and election management system, resulting in a temporary disruption of voter credit assignment for 63 voters between May 28 and June 1. He explained that the ROV's Office corrected the issue by pulling the logs from the poll pad and manually assigning credits to the 63 voters. He said there was a deviation at the Reno Public Market (RPM) polling location, where a voter pulled their ballot from the printer before it was fully printed, causing the paper to jam. He indicated that the voter had only cast a partial ballot and left, but when the jam was cleared, the printer automatically printed a second ballot, which was cast on the voter's behalf. He said that the paper jam occurred twice during early voting before the team could intervene.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas indicated that Commissioner Herman was no longer on the phone and that the team was working to reconnect with her.

11:31 a.m. Commissioner Herman returned to the meeting.

Mr. McDonald clarified that two additional ballots were cast on behalf of the voters due to a paper jam at the RPM. He said that after the paper jam was caught, all vote centers were notified that all misprinted ballots, regardless of how valid they seemed, needed to be spoiled to ensure a clean process. He noted that there were *fled voters* on Election Day, meaning a voter was checked in to vote but left before casting their ballot, at Grace Warner Elementary School, Marce Herz Middle School (MHMS), Sparks Library, and Spanish Springs High School (SSHS). He explained that at the SSHS, every voter was signed in under accessibility mode, which was a separate mode for individuals who needed accessibility features, such as those who were blind or hard of hearing. He said that the accessibility mode confused some voters and caused one voter to leave the location without voting. He mentioned that there was a discrepancy on Election Day at a location where one more ballot was scanned than voters checked in, which turned out to be a repeat of what happened at the RPM. He asserted that communication was distributed to all voting locations that *fled voter* ballots were not to be scanned on behalf of the voter. He said that four additional ballots were cast at Jerry Whitehead Elementary School, Hug High School (HHS), the Sun Valley Neighborhood Center, and the Washoe County Administrative Complex.

Mr. McDonald recalled that the previous day, the ROV's Office audited ballots in a rejected status. He reported that 15 validly cast mail ballots were found that should have been included in the June 16 count. He said that the located ballots were subsequently added to the election results uploaded on June 17 with the approval from the SOS. He pointed out that the closest race was separated by 36 votes; however, given the discrepancies mentioned, the ballots cast did not affect the election results. He indicated that the votes represented the true votes, minus the noted discrepancies.

Chair Andriola thanked the ROV's Office for their work and believed the quality of their work had improved since Mr. McDonald was hired as the ROV. She opined that Mr. McDonald's work showed the amount of care and commitment he had in following the law. She speculated that everyone would have an opinion about something, but in the end, she believed that Mr. McDonald followed the law and that it was his statutory responsibility to provide the Board with the official record of errors. She said that a lot of important information was shared during the presentation and hoped that those who asked questions had provided information to the ROV and the SOS. She reiterated that the Board was required to have the ROV provide a disclosure and that the canvass was fully transparent and contained the required information. She explained that she was not saying there were no concerns that needed review, but that it was not the Board's responsibility to address those during the meeting. She asserted that canvassing the vote was a statutorily required ministerial function. She again expressed appreciation toward Mr. McDonald and his staff.

Chair Andriola found the new ROV warehouse interesting and recalled that she had recommended additional observation opportunities to enhance clarity and transparency. She wished for the public to participate in the warehouse dialogue. She thanked the ROV's Office for their mock election and for testing the equipment. She requested that Mr. McDonald return to provide an update on the Plain Sight Project to better understand how the Center for Internet Security (CIS) and related protocols would continue to set the standard for assurance and budget-friendliness.

Commissioner Hill believed that the ROV presentation was great because it described discrepancies, why they happened, and how they were corrected or could not be corrected. She reminded the public and the Board that after the 2022 election, there were opportunities to improve communication and reporting. She said that the Board conducted an audit, doubled the ROV's Office staff, and committed general funds to the department. She relayed that the ROV's Office would be relocated to a larger warehouse, where ballot processing would be faster with more opportunities for public observation. She felt that the ROV team had worked tirelessly to ensure that the community had more opportunities for people to vote in person by using Geographic Information System (GIS) data. She applauded the County's efforts in ensuring there were more voting locations. She recalled that she took her parents to vote at the Downtown Library, which she said was an incredible experience because her mother was disabled and the team treated her mother with care. She explained that she was able to vote at an elementary school near her home, which was also a great experience because the team was very well-trained. She speculated that customer service was always at the forefront of the ROV's Office and they

ensured that people felt good when they voted. She commended the ROV's Office and said that there was always room for improvement. She noted that the County was always trying to make elections more accessible and as transparent as possible, which she appreciated. She indicated that she was excited to move to certify the election when the motion was called for.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. McDonald for the report and believed that he had done a great job. He said the staff was wonderful and provided great customer service throughout the entire election process. He opined that it was important for the public to know that ballots were not forwardable, and he appreciated the statistics provided by Mr. McDonald. He noted that it was good the County did not have to pay for return postage.

Vice Chair Garcia believed the canvass was exciting and that investing in the ROV's Office was a strategic priority for the County. She opined that the presentation was among the best she had witnessed from the ROV's Office. She reported that she had intently listened to the public commenters' questions, fears, and concerns. She said she appreciated that Mr. McDonald addressed many of the questions. She disclosed that she had not previously known that ballots were non-forwardable. She thanked Mr. McDonald for keeping the Board apprised of all the nuances of the election. She felt that the presentation and report displayed great communication and transparency. She asked if those in attendance had access to the packet and information provided to the Board. She urged the public to read the information. She asked how the public could submit questions to the ROV's Office. Mr. McDonald said that the public could email the office or call. Vice Chair Garcia reiterated her thanks to Mr. McDonald and his staff.

Chair Andriola asked whether Commissioner Herman had any questions. Commissioner Herman indicated that she believed she had already expressed her comments previously and had nothing else to add. Chair Andriola thanked the community for submitting their concerns. She said that the canvass information was public and accessible to anyone. She asked Mr. McDonald how long answers to public questions would be posted for the community to review. Mr. McDonald indicated that he would work with the ROV's Public Information Officer (PIO) regarding how long the information would be listed, but he believed it would be around 30 to 60 days. He said that as the next election approached, the ability to ask specific questions would end. He clarified that he could commit to 60 days. Chair Andriola expressed appreciation for the 60-day commitment. CM Thomas announced that the supplemental documentation related to the canvass was posted at 8:15 a.m. and that copies of the presentation were available at the public comment desk.

On the call for public comment, Tammy Holt-Still thanked Mr. McDonald for the detail in his presentation, which answered many of her questions. She expressed concern that 15,000 people did not receive their ballots. She shared that she had paid for a mailing list for District 5 and was upset to learn it was incorrect. She mentioned that she had spent a lot of money mailing out cards and was unsure why she would pay the ROV for incorrect addresses. She felt that the election had begun with half of District 5 being

disenfranchised. She thought many of those residents lived in rural parts of the district and could not access their primary ballot online or were not familiar with how to do so. She alleged that the sample ballot did not match the actual election ballot. She opined that inconsistencies caused problems and led people to think the confusion was intentional. She believed changes were needed to simplify the voting process. She said voters should receive an accurate sample ballot so they would know what to expect on their actual election ballot. She wondered how voters would know what research to do when their sample ballot showed different contests that were not applicable to their district. She mentioned that if elections did not begin accurately, it would be difficult to ensure accuracy throughout the election cycle. She explained that during her campaign, she spent a lot of money. She shared her frustration with the sample ballot and said many elderly voters were disenfranchised, as were many other voters who could not afford internet access, lacked the equipment for it, or did not understand how to use it. She thought the disenfranchisement of elderly voters was unacceptable. She suggested that Chair Andriola had ignored the question when it was previously asked, which she found frustrating.

Nicholas St. Jon displayed a document regarding voter counts. No copy was submitted for the public record. He shared that he had submitted his document to Washoe 311, and he hoped that Mr. McDonald would provide answers to his questions. He asked why the votes changed after early voting closed. He believed the process should be completed within a few hours because it was electronic, with the cards inserted into tabulators and then counted. He alleged that 230 early-voting ballots from the third party were redistributed to the Republican and Democratic parties. He felt that the information should concern everyone, and the Board should have addressed the issue. He suggested that it happened for over 300 ballots, or 15 percent. He alleged that someone had commented that 4.6 percent returned ballots was an acceptable number. He said that the Board could stop the canvass and have Mr. McDonald count the ballots in front of God and everyone to determine whether 1,929 had been turned in or 1,625 ballots, based on the numbers obtained from the SOS. He stated that since the Board had enough time to make a decision, he felt it would be easy to prove by taking ballots, counting them in front of everyone, and telling the public whether 1,929 or 1,625 ballots were turned in during early voting. He questioned those who believed a 15 percent error rate in a voting system was acceptable. He indicated that he did not receive any answers to his previous questions during the Commissioner's announcements or during Agenda Item 5. He acknowledged the ROV's great presentation, but he felt his question still went unanswered. He wondered why 15 percent of the paper ballots were scanned, then readdressed and sent to the Republican and Democratic parties a week later. He explained that ballots were very different, and the number of ballots could have made a difference in various contests, because some were within a 300-vote margin. He expressed his disappointment that his concern was not addressed and hoped the Board would address it.

Diana Hoffman said she had been an attorney since 1975 and had served as an advisor to two presidents of the United States (US). She mentioned that she was currently president of a nonprofit in Washoe County. She stated that there had been enough errors, and she wanted to incorporate the statements of other speakers, particularly Commissioners Herman and Clark, Oscar Williams, and Mr. St. Jon, since her time was

limited. She said that the canvass was a review and was not strictly ministerial, as noted by Chair Andriola. She emphasized the importance of taking the errors seriously and that the statements regarding contests and errors were incorporated before they certified the election. She believed someone would be discussing the 100 discrepancies in Churchill County that caused a recount. She suggested that Washoe County had many more than 100 discrepancies. She said it was important for citizens to vote and not be disenfranchised by abstaining because of a lack of faith in elections. She felt that Article 1, Sections 2 and 4 of the Constitution, the 15th and 26th Amendments were relevant. She suggested that the Board not certify the election and consider a recount.

Lynn Gillespie asked how many people were involved in counting votes, noting that she had heard news reports that the process was delayed and that errors occurred because there were not enough vote counters. She wondered whether handwriting experts were reviewing signatures on cured ballots. She mentioned that she had heard a previous commenter claim that staff were taking computers home to check signatures and then returning to work, which she did not agree with. She believed that discarding 1,000 ballots because they had not been cured was a significant number of votes. Lastly, she questioned how many ballots were counted without postmarks from the post office.

Jennifer Willett stated that she was the senior campaign manager for All Voting is Local (AVL) Nevada, an organization that advocated for policies and legislative priorities to expand voter access. She noted that AVL Nevada supported certification of the 2026 primary election results. She explained that she lived in Washoe County and volunteered as a poll monitor throughout the election. She added that she voted at the Downtown Library and personally observed the election process, which she believed was conducted effectively. She credited the ROV staff and election workers for helping the voting system run smoothly, noting that nearly 100,000 votes were cast. She said that it was now the Board's responsibility to complete the election by certifying the results. She asserted that certification was a mandatory duty and that the Commissioners could not override the voters' will by refusing to certify the election. She urged the Board to protect the votes and uphold the will of the people by certifying the results.

Cliff Nellis explained that the word *canvass* was not a fabric used to make tents because it had an extra *s* on the end. He mentioned that the word *canvass* meant to scrutinize or carefully review. He recalled a time when he felt elections were simple and real. He recalled when people were at the precinct level, and he helped during the 2024 Republican Party caucus in Pleasant Valley, where he had supervised two people counting on opposite sides of the table. He indicated that anyone could observe without being stuck in a little booth in the corner. He thought real observation meant walking around the entire room, which he said was no longer allowed. He felt that it was imperative that the Board scrutinize the election. He stated that when people were reviewing the numbers and counting the votes, it was easy to verify the addition of votes for each precinct. He challenged that people had access to the computers and added that anyone who voted on a computer was foolish. He alleged that there was no way to verify what went in or came out of the computers, since there were likely no eyewitnesses. He described the most recent election as a joke and declared that someone had changed some of the votes. He

acknowledged that the current ROV staff had done a great job and were honest. He alleged that part of the fraud was involving good people who made the process appear real and genuine. He suggested that the election process was not flawless and added that he believed some people had somehow manipulated the results, since computers were hackable. He thought that the Board had a simple opportunity to postpone the canvass to show the people that they cared about validity. He believed that the difficult situation remained unchanged. He opined that District Attorney (DA) Christopher Hicks was not re-elected because he had made accusations against Commissioners Clark and Herman and Chair Andriola. He questioned when elections would return to being fair. He alleged that, because of the uncertainty about validating information on computers, the votes should not be verified, and the canvass should not be approved. He speculated that the votes could not be scrutinized because no one had fully monitored the entire process and staff had relied on computers, artificial intelligence (AI), and Google.

Ryan Vortisch, the Northern Nevada coordinator for Silver State Voices, stated that his organization was a nonpartisan, nonprofit whose mission was to build a more robust democracy by expanding voter access for historically underrepresented communities and by collaborating with election administrators to ensure smooth, efficient election processes. He expressed his sincere appreciation to the election administrators, poll workers, administrative staff, and the ROV for their hard work and dedication during the 2026 Primary Election. He asserted that each election cycle, he organized Washoe County's Nonpartisan Election Protection Poll Monitoring Program. He explained that during the primary election, 58 nonpartisan volunteers were dispatched to vote centers across the County and assisted voters, monitored compliance with election law, and observed the voting process up close. He shared that volunteers spent over 400 hours at the polls, during which they overwhelmingly reported that the election staff were helpful, efficient, and professional. He indicated that volunteers cheered on first-time voters, patiently walked voters through the process of using the new ballot marking devices (BMDs), and he added that poll workers created a welcoming environment that empowered Washoe County voters to make their voices heard during the election season. He mentioned that when issues occurred, the ROV's Office quickly communicated with the volunteer team, listened to their concerns, and resolved the issues to ensure that every voter had a safe and accessible voting experience. He recognized the ROV's unwavering commitment to accessibility during the election cycle, both through the implementation of Nevada's first ADA curbside voting program and the efforts to ensure that voting materials were made available in Spanish. He believed it was a true testament to the integrity of their team and their unwavering dedication to Washoe County voters.

Penny Brock displayed a document, no copy was submitted for the public record. She said that two of the Ten Commandments were *thou shalt not steal* and *thou shalt not lie*. She speculated that residents in Washoe County were faced with questioning whether elections were accurate and truthful. She noted that public commenters had brought forward many reasons why elections were not truthful. She explained that she had recently seen a short video clip of the Wyoming SOS, who was beside himself about the BMDs. She alleged that the Wyoming SOS mentioned that there was no way to confirm that the BMDs' votes were recorded or accurate. She acknowledged that Washoe County

had used the BMDs for the first time and shared that she had used the machine to vote. She said she kept in mind things she had heard and read, and did not believe her vote was being accurately recorded, if it was recorded at all. She expressed her concern and mentioned that she had provided the Board with information on November 18, 2025, when Mr. McDonald asked the Board to approve the BMDs. She explained her documentation included papers from Berkeley, information technology (IT) professors, and Princeton IT professors written in 2023, which said the BMDs were not secure and could not be trusted. She shared her concern about hearing that ballots were undeliverable and returned. She thought that Mr. McDonald refused to recognize that. She questioned what happened to the mail ballots while in the mail system. She stated that a secure election process was dependent on a chain of custody. She suggested that, according to election mail researchers, there was currently no Nationwide system to reconcile ballots received from the election office, ballots delivered, or ballots returned as undeliverable. She mentioned that the SOS issued a report on June 11, 2026, that showed that Clark County had tabulated 99 percent of its ballots. She noted that at that time, Washoe County was the worst, at only 80 percent. She thought that needed to be investigated because the taxpayers had paid for expensive election equipment. She was unclear how Washoe County was at 80 percent below everyone else, including the rural counties and Clark County. She questioned why Washoe County was slower than Clark County.

Janet Butcher reminded that the Nation's founders established a constitutional republic, not a democracy. She asserted that the word *democracy* did not appear in the founding documents and alleged that the leftists had tried to change that understanding. She thanked Commissioner Clark for securing the negotiated lease for the Longley Lane facility. She acknowledged that her numbers did not match those presented by Mr. McDonald, explaining that she had not yet had an opportunity to review and verify the updated numbers. She stated that there were 1,090 uncured ballots on June 13, 2026, and 943 on June 15, 2026, which was a difference of 147 ballots. She stated that a total of 2,390 ballots had been rejected for various reasons and said she understood that some voters reported not receiving a ballot, while others were informed that their signatures did not match election records. She speculated that if a voter did not receive a ballot but one was returned in their name, it could indicate that someone else had submitted it, resulting in a signature mismatch. She also questioned whether a person who had been deceased for six years might still receive a ballot. She opined that the Board would certify the election results and refer back to the law, but speculated that Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large was an attorney but had not said that the Board was required to say yes.

Roblyn Williams said that, although she had not intended to speak again, she was very upset and decided to apologize for being hotheaded. She explained that she had been involved in election observation since 2022 and had raised concerns based on what she had witnessed, but felt that observers had received little feedback, follow-up, or engagement regarding their observations, including at the new election facility. She indicated that observers had a lot to say but suggested that the Board had not contacted them. She noted that the observers could share the reasons they chose to watch each election. She alleged that Mr. McDonald's decisions had contributed to ongoing issues. She

said that Mr. McDonald had brought in Assistant County Manager (ACM) Ryan Gustafson without telling the observers who he was. She stated that the observers had seen someone unfamiliar to them accessing the ballot-counting machines. She added that ACM Gustafson was also seen with a scan disc of votes and had inserted it into the tabulators. She shared that observers were concerned that ACM Gustafson might have been a Dominion staff representative or had malicious intent. She thought the situation could have been avoided and that observers would not have needed to photograph ACM Gustafson if they had known who he was. She said that the voting observers had not been told that intake on Election Day would be handled in the garage. She indicated that the media had been notified that intake had begun, leaving the observers wondering what was taking place. She suggested that the observers had been treated poorly and subjected to slanderous allegations with no basis in fact. She speculated that the ROV had done more damage to public confidence in elections and that elections were the people's votes. She alleged that Mr. McDonald lacked background and experience and did not know how to work with the public to de-escalate situations.

Donna Hawkins shared her thoughts on signature verification in the voting process. She explained that she was the caregiver for her husband, who passed away from brain tumors and cancer, and that she held durable power of attorney (POA) for him. She expressed concern about the use of signature verification when people vote, noting that signatures often change with age. She said that her husband was eventually only able to sign his name with an X and believed that other people with disabilities might also be unable to sign their names the same way they did when they originally registered to vote.

George Eddie Lorton thanked the ROV staff for their best efforts. He suggested that the low voter turnout was due to a lack of confidence in the voting system. He speculated that special interest groups and unions decided elections because of the number of their voters. He stated that he ran a strong campaign despite not having the Governor's support. He hoped the ROV would consider a special election, similar to what had been done in Fallon, to possibly uncover other issues. He said he favored paper ballots and hand counts over mail ballots. He believed that Nevada Attorney General Aaron Ford would not likely try to sue the Board because he was running for Governor. He hoped the Board would vote according to their consciences. He felt there had been mistakes made during the election and emphasized the importance of finding out why the errors occurred. He mentioned that after the election, he asked Mr. McDonald to make time for the public to ask questions and help brainstorm a better way to conduct elections to regain the public's confidence in the system. He said that he was unclear if the Board's vote was strictly an administrative issue where they had to vote yes. He added that it would be a waste of time because for every other issue on the agenda, the Board could vote yes or no and would not be sued for voting either way. He thought that Mr. Ford had tried to threaten a lawsuit in prior years. He mentioned that Commissioner Herman had voted no but did not get sued because, oftentimes, people in the legal field would bluff. He mentioned that there could be potential issues that would take time to review and identify in case mistakes had been made. He indicated that, for his race, he felt there had been issues with data reporting. He shared that after his attorney had contacted Mr. McDonald, the ROV was cooperative. He explained that he was a Business Analyst and Forensic Auditor and suggested that it was

mathematically impossible that, after two separate data releases, he was one vote apart twice in a row. He said it was unclear how, out of 600 votes, there could be a single vote difference. He reassured the Board that no one could sue them for casting their vote on the issue, and he compared handling legal issues to playing poker. He said that he supported and was thankful for the Reno Rodeo.

12:16 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

12:28 p.m. **The Board reconvened with Commissioner Herman absent.**

12:31 p.m. **Commissioner Herman returned to the meeting by phone.**

Chair Andriola thanked those in attendance, including the observers and those involved in the voting process. She said the Board recognized that processes had evolved and that the County could better inform individuals. She understood that people felt dismissed or thought that there were ways to improve. She asked CDDA Large to clarify the Board's responsibility related to the canvass.

CDDA Large indicated that, pursuant to NRS 293.387, a canvass occurred as soon as the Board received returns from all precinct and districts in any county; then the Board should meet and canvass the returns. He said that the canvass must be completed on or before the tenth day following the election, and, in making its canvass, the Board should separately note any clerical errors discovered and take account of the changes resulting from their discovery. He reported that the canvass was both mandatory and discretionary because the statute was mandatory and included the Board meeting and canvassing the vote; however, it was discretionary regarding clerical errors noted by the ROV Office. Chair Andriola asked what the process was for a candidate to request a recount. CDDA Large indicated that NRS stated that the only way that a recount could occur was after the canvass and that NRS 293.403 provided that any candidate, at any election, had the ability to demand and receive a recount up to three working days after the canvass. Chair Andriola asked whether any of the Commissioners needed further clarification. No clarification was needed.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote, with Commissioner Herman voting no, it was ordered that the Declaration of the Canvass of the Vote for the 2026 Primary Election be approved, and the Registrar of Voters be directed to certify the abstract of the results and transmit the abstract to the Secretary of State.

26-0430 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Public Comment.

Cliff Nellis indicated that Chief District Deputy Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large was not a judge. He said that if the Board certified something that was fraudulent, it was considered a felony. He recalled that Commissioners Clark and Herman were attacked and threatened to be thrown in jail for voting against the canvass during the 2024 election. He felt that Nevada Attorney General (AG) Aaron Ford and Washoe County District

Attorney (DA) Christopher Hicks should be in jail. He recalled that Nicholas St. Jon had requested a hand count, which he agreed with because he speculated that it would either verify or debunk the election system. He said that the County would not allow a hand recount because it would debunk the Democratic Socialists who run the election. He indicated that Amy Powell was a liberal lawyer from California who was upset about the signs he held for former Commissioner Marsha Berkbigler, which led him to call the cops when she took his sign. He said that Ms. Powell was a certifier with the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office, and he wondered how she was allowed to do that because he felt she was a communist from California. He asserted that the ROV needed to provide a real count of the ballots by confiscating them, as he said the Sheriff of Riverside County did.

Veronica Cortes reported that she had not voted during the last election. She said that she used to advocate for the Nevada School Nutrition Association in Washington, D.C. She believed she knew how to talk to people and knew the difference between a lobbyist and an advocate. She said that she was raised in Mexico and would visit every summer. She opined that there was a lot of corruption in the Mexican government that she was used to because she was raised around it. She said that there was a saying that said, *win the group that is always going to win, good luck*. She recalled that in 1993, she was studying at a university when a candidate named Luis Donaldo Colosio Murrieta had spoke for the people and represented ranchers before he was assassinated. She said she wondered how Mexico could get away with the murder. She noted that her husband was Indian and that in India, individuals had only one day to vote, after which the tallies were counted. She clarified that she was not accusing anyone of corruption; however, if there was corruption or fraud, it seemed that people who were not upset were complicit. She mentioned that the ROV found fraud and that the Commissioners and citizens knew about it, but the canvass of the vote was underway. She requested that Sun Valley conduct a hand count since fraud had occurred. She said the community told the Board that voting was unfair and that Sun Valley had two instances of fraud that needed to be addressed.

Janet Butcher indicated that she always corrected her mistakes, especially if someone mentioned them to her directly. She thanked Deputy ROV Reginald Greer and Public Information Officer (PIO) George Guthrie for answering her questions. She quoted former President George Washington.

Penny Brock expressed excitement about events taking place in Washington, D.C., that she believed would affect County elections. She said the rule against counting ballots after Election Day was expected to be favorable. She noted that President Donald Trump said that any state or county that did not follow federal law, Supreme Court decisions, or executive orders would have its federal funds removed. She indicated that the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility (SAVE) Act was pending in Washington, D.C.; however, Republican Senate Leader John Thune was delaying the process. She explained that President Trump found a different way to pass the act, such as issuing an executive order and including it in a reconciliation bill. She said that she hoped ROV Andrew McDonald was preparing for the SAVE Act because it would affect the general election. She relayed that she would be thankful not to have to observe after Election Day. She said that the SAVE Act included paper ballots, voting only on Election

Day, no universal mail-in ballots, and absentee ballots only for individuals who were sick, disabled, or traveling. She speculated that the SAVE Act would restore fair, honest, and transparent elections in America and in Nevada.

26-0431 AGENDA ITEM 7 Announcements/Reports.

Chair Andriola thanked everyone for attending the meeting and for sharing their thoughts and questions. She explained that there was a 60-day commitment to receiving election-related concerns and questions. She hoped that anything that needed to be investigated would be.

* * * * *

12:45 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

CLARA ANDRIOLA, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

JANIS GALASSINI, County Clerk and
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners

*Minutes Prepared by:
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk
Andrew Garnand, Deputy County Clerk*