

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

APRIL 8, 2025

PRESENT:

**Alexis Hill, Chair**  
**Michael Clark, Commissioner**  
**Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner**  
**Clara Andriola, Commissioner**

**Janis Galassini, County Clerk**  
**Eric Brown, County Manager**  
**Nathan Edwards, Assistant District Attorney**

ABSENT:

**Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair**

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

**25-0196      AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.**

Mr. Colin Biggs noted that librarians presented engaging story times, instilled the value of being a lifelong reader to dozens of children, walked senior citizens through the use of new electronic devices, assisted patrons with ID Me accounts, hosted Dungeons and Dragons campaigns to keep at-risk youth engaged, instructed patrons through art classes, and helped with last-minute print jobs for interviews, meetings, or court hearings. He indicated that Nevada Governor Joe Lombardo's goal was to double literacy rates by 2030 and that literacy improvement meant more librarians. He mentioned that budget cuts meant cutting staff, which he said was a community disservice. He voiced that the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) was the last social safety net and community gathering place. He communicated that the Nevada Department of Training, Education, and Rehabilitation (DTER), the Social Security Administration (SSA), and the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) referred patrons to the WCLS and questioned where those individuals would go if there were fewer librarians and branch hours. He requested that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) fully fund the WCLS. He felt that the WCLS was an investment in the community.

Mr. Thomas Daly displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He read from his document regarding Senate Bill (SB) 319.

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

Ms. Alex Hoeft mentioned that she was a resident of District 5 and that since receiving her library card in 2017, she had borrowed 285 books and spent over 50 hours working in Zoom rooms, phone booths, and desks. She said she had made leprechaun masks, played a life-size Candyland game, created a hobbit terrarium, and sang and clapped through toddler times with her three-year-old daughter. She noted that for the past year and a half, she had volunteered every Wednesday morning at the Northwest Reno Library and that she witnessed how much heart and hard work the librarians put into their days. She asked the BCC to fund the WCLS. She believed that the failure of Washoe County Question One (WC1) was not surprising because the ballot language was confusing. She reported that she had to ask library staff members for clarification and that it was not a new tax. She indicated that many people did not understand WC1, and that several residents had expressed that they did not realize what the question entailed and would have voted differently if they had. She said that as services were being cut across the State and the Country, she asked the BCC not to cut the WCLS services. She believed that the WCLS offered opportunities for education, internet access, socialization, shelter, bathroom access, and community for free. She felt that children were slated to suffer greatly with the failure of WC1 because they were unable to vote. She indicated that WC1 was never a vote to defund the WCLS. She asked the BCC to support the WCLS and wished everyone a happy National Library Week.

Ms. Karren Smith displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that she had been a proud library card owner since 1965. She noted that she had taken a two-hour ferry ride to Hong Kong to buy books while living in China for three years. She mentioned that she spent thousands of dollars between four bookstores in Hong Kong and that those stores were her only source of books. She voiced that the average price of a book equated to five to six gallons of milk. She communicated that children could not play sports or be in the school band without paying and that the library was the only free place in the Country. She commented that during the COVID-19 (C19) pandemic, librarians saved her family's lives. She said that the innovation during C19 helped many people in the County. She asked the BCC to continue funding the libraries for the families who did not have money for internet, childcare, story time, or books. She referred to her documents and said the signed individuals did not understand WC1 and would have voted differently if they had.

Ms. Maureen McElroy indicated that federal funding from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) had ceased. She said the IMLS grant funds paid for many of the electronic databases at the WCLS. She noted that the electronic databases used at the WCLS were at risk of being terminated because of the IMLS fund cancellation. She mentioned that the databases were used by the community and supported the citizens in many ways. She voiced that the loss of the resources would negatively impact those who used the services. She believed that it was the BCC's duty to sustain the WCLS.

Ms. Holly Kozan noted that some of her earliest memories were with her father at the library. She mentioned that she remembered the smell of paper and the books that sparked her love of reading. She indicated that she did not have a literacy issue because she read every chance she had. She voiced that she was thankful for the libraries and that

she grew up in a rural community whose library provided her with internet access. She communicated that she had utilized the library for job applications and that she performed concerts at the library to educate the public about cultural folk music in Reno. She commented that when she had knee surgery, she spent the equivalent of \$300 utilizing Libby through the library. She said that the library was more than just a place for books, it was a place that any person could attend for peace and quiet, safety, to escape reality, to learn, discover new adventures, and gather with the community. She asked the BCC to fund the library.

Ms. Candace Powell voiced that she was a proud supporter of the WCLS. She reported that her children loved the library and that she visited nearly every weekend. She indicated that the library was her daughter's favorite class at school and that because of the WCLS, her daughter and she created a family book club. She noted that she looked forward to curling up with her daughter in their book nook to read every day and that her four-year-old wanted to join their book club. She said that the summer reading program transformed her daughter's relationship with reading. She indicated that a librarian at the South Valleys Library introduced her daughter to the *Magic Tree House* series, which gave her daughter excitement. She felt that if anyone had attended the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) meetings and library branch updates, the importance of the library would be known. She mentioned that it was incredible to witness what a small team could do for the community. She noted that libraries supported every corner of the community and that while WC1 did not pass, she felt it had been shown in public comments and evidence presented to the BCC that the failure was largely due to a misinformation campaign. She explained that the BCC could fully fund the libraries through the regular budget process and that funding the library was one of the best investments the BCC would make for the community. She said that busy families needed the weekend hours and asked the BCC to keep family book clubs like hers alive by funding the library.

Ms. Rachel Curran mentioned that the library was always available for her daughters. She noted that the library was her family's favorite place after home, work, and school. She speculated that not all families had the luxury of attending the BCC meetings and that she was in attendance for the parents who could not make it due to work. She felt that books expanded the mind and for that to continue the library needed to stay open for everyone. She indicated that open libraries allowed parents to say yes to their child visiting. She hoped the BCC would fully fund the WCLS.

Ms. Marsha Tidd explained that she had been a resident of District 1 since 1983. She said that she paid taxes, read many books, and that her two adopted granddaughters attended the library growing up. She noted that every time her granddaughters had questions, the librarians were helpful and friendly. She asked the BCC to maintain the WCLS's financial stability by providing full funding.

Ms. Tara de Queiroz displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She said that she volunteered for the WC1 campaign because her children grew up in the WCLS, which provided them with story time, books, a place to spend time without money, and the best librarians. She noted that she was frustrated

because the Washoe Republicans created a voter guide that told individuals WC1 would increase their property tax, which she felt was disinformation. She mentioned that she felt vexed when a Commissioner stated he was waiting to see the library budget from the LBT Chair. She said that the LBT bylaws stated that the trustees would acknowledge the annual budget for the library system and monitor expenditures. She believed that it was not the LBT's responsibility to present the budget to the BCC. She voiced that she heard speculation of the budget's unavailability, which she felt was untrue. She commented that she attended the LBT meetings that discussed the budget presentation in detail and that she knew more about the library's printer lease and travel allowance for employees to drive to Incline Village than she ever wanted to know. She felt that the WCLS was audited regularly, and noted the budget was available. She trusted that the Commissioners who supported the WCLS would do everything they could to fund the WCLS. She said the library had staff who were trained in helping children find books, helping individuals look for jobs and housing, and treating the community with respect. She expressed that with abysmal student literacy rates and a severe housing crisis, she believed the community could not afford to dismantle a library system that provided essential services that benefited all the residents of the County. She recommended that if there was any hesitation in funding the WCLS, those individuals should sit in a library and witness what took place.

Ms. Gail Townsend reported that she had been a Washoe County resident since 1970 and lived in District 4 since 1979. She asked the BCC to fund the WCLS adequately. She noted that free public libraries were essential to the community's quality of life. She recalled arguments pertaining to respecting the will of the voters since WC1 did not pass. She noted that she was a part of the WC1 advocacy group and apologized for not working hard enough to ensure WC1 passed. She said that the opposition indicated that voters would be prevented from deciding how much money was allocated to the library if WC1 passed; however, she mentioned that was what the advocates were in attendance for. She wanted the library to be funded because she felt it was a community asset. She hoped the libraries would stay open, employees would not be laid off, and services would be maintained. She voiced that she wished for the library to sustain its collection, buy new books, and keep its hours the same. She commented that she realized the budget was difficult nationwide; however, she believed the library budget was a small part of the total County budget at less than two percent. She explained that the return on library investment was phenomenal. She said that there were some Commissioners interested in senior and child issues, which she felt the library could help with.

Ms. Naseem Jamnia indicated that she was a Sparks homeowner, digital library user, and a local author of traditionally published books for adults, teens, and children. She believed that the WCLS was under attack for several years and now hung in the balance of the upcoming budget discussion. She noted that in the first six months of 2024, there were over 65,000 book checkouts, with District 5 being the highest at 197,000 and District 2 at 160,000. She mentioned that almost 30,000 meeting rooms were reserved, with District 2 having the most at over 10,000 and District 4 at 8,500. She felt that defunding the library impacted all residents and that deflecting under the will of the voters when the County had the discretion to fund the library was underhanded and obfuscatory of the real issue. She mentioned that across the Nation, public libraries were defunded and

becoming a battleground for ultra nationalist totalitarian ideologies. She voiced that public libraries were some of the last spaces left where anyone, regardless of background, identity, or class, could access resources for free. She commented that keeping libraries funded was a vital part of keeping democracy alive in a time when deeply threatened. She explained that at least twice last year, two libraries became evacuation hubs for those affected by wildfires. She communicated that there was a housing kiosk, legal information kiosks, resources for job seekers, and blood pressure kits at the Downtown Library. She pointed out that the librarians and staff were those who ensured the services ran smoothly and would be the immediate victims of cuts if the WCLS was not funded. She said the library budget in fiscal year (FY) 2024 was \$12 million of a \$1 billion budget and that with the projected upcoming deficit of \$27 million, she was alarmed at the possibility of further whittling down an already meager request. She urged the BCC not to give in to fearmongering, disinformation, or excuses when discussing the budget. She asked the BCC to support all residents and the National Library Week proclaimed by keeping the WCLS funded.

Mr. Richard Thomsen provided documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He noted that he was a former Washoe County Community Services Department (CSD) employee of 21 years and that he had to retire eight and a half years earlier than desired due to an accident which caused the removal of his lower leg and other health issues. He indicated that the issues caused him to lose his commercial driver's license (CDL) in December of 2023, which he said was required as a Road Supervisor in Incline Village. He divulged that the forced retirement was devastating to him and his family. He reported that he thought he would be financially stable because he had been paying for three accident and disability policies through American Fidelity, which the County brought in to help employees. He mentioned that he paid \$192 a month for the policies from 2016 to the time of his leg amputation. He reported that the policy was supposed to pay him \$3,700 a month until he turned 67. He said that he was told that his monthly payment would be \$100 per month when he filed his claim because he received a government pension. He commented that he was told by American Fidelity that the information was in the fine print and that he should have read it. He voiced that he met with American Fidelity every year up to the month before his amputation and that he was never told about the exception. He believed that it was unacceptable for the County to allow American Fidelity to sell policies to employees. He communicated that in 2023, he notified Human Resources (HR) and the Washoe County Employee Association (WCEA) by email to inform them that employees were paying for something he felt was a scam. He indicated that HR believed it was a mistake. He said that American Fidelity denied 67 percent of their clients, and while they accepted his claim, he would only be paid \$100 per month. He noted that it was not morally right and that nothing had been done to address the issue. He speculated that HR had not continued the discussion because he was no longer an employee and was just a guy with one leg. He felt that it was time to take care of the employees and retirees of the County.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Thomsen for his service to the County and assured the matter would be investigated.

Ms. Rosie Zuckerman said that she lived in District 3 and was a taxpayer, homeowner, small business owner, and loved the library. She asked the BCC to continue supporting the WCLS despite WC1 failing. She believed that the failure was due to disinformation distributed by Washoe County Republicans and that the WCLS was an essential resource to the community. She mentioned that Nevada had one of the lowest literacy rates in the Nation and that the library worked with schools to boost literacy. She said that the library provided preschool programs, which she indicated was a huge asset to children's love for reading. She expressed that the library was a wonderful place for families to spend time together on weekends due to books and free resources. She reported that the use of books increased yearly, with 1.7 million checkouts in 2022, 1.9 million in 2023, and 2.3 million in 2024. She commented that the WCLS had over 70,000 active patrons, with the highest number in the five-to-twelve age group. She explained that children were unable to vote on WC1. She communicated that the South Valleys Library consistently produced the highest number of visitors and checkouts. She said the library provided free access to online publications, research databases, an extensive collection of electronic books (e-books), and audiobooks. She indicated that the library provided outreach through the bookmobile and book vending machines, which she believed were essential in promoting literacy in the County. She requested that the BCC continue funding the WCLS.

Ms. Glenda Gilmore commended Commissioner Andriola for the open checkbook program. She noted that the program was wonderful for the County.

Mr. Deandre Burleson displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He recited his Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) number, Nevada Identification number, and Reno Housing Authority (RHA) number. He mentioned he was homeless and referred to the submitted documents regarding receipts and bills. He indicated that he was soliciting help from the County. He indicated that his issue with the RHA was serious and that he stayed at the Motel 6 that month.

Ms. Sieglinde McTigue indicated that she lived in District 4 and had been an active user of the WCLS for many years. She noted that she grew up in a close-knit neighborhood and was the eldest of five children. She mentioned that she had a close neighbor who taught her how to sew and garden. She reported that she received her first library card at six and that she was able to check out as many books as she wanted with her neighbor. She said that the Downtown Library took her breath away the first time she visited. She voiced that there was a 1960's conversation pit at the Downtown Library when she was a child that she loved. She explained that going to the library every week was the highlight of her childhood. She said that she was happy to witness the change since her childhood. She communicated that she still attended the library weekly, and the previous day she examined the 3-dimensional (3D) printer services. She communicated that at the last LBT meeting, it was asked if the library needed to be everything to everyone, and she felt it did not. She explained that people did not want valuable resources to be squandered; however, she trusted trained library science professionals to understand and implement community-driven programming. She divulged that as a former Washoe County employee, she was well-versed in budget restrictions and planning, but she felt that it seemed the

libraries were viewed as frivolous. She believed that the service the library provided was an investment in social and intellectual capital. She asked the BCC to fund the libraries.

Ms. Janet Butcher said that people chose to vote no on WC1. She noted that it was a pity if individuals did not comprehend the question, and she thought those individuals were election deniers. She indicated that the libraries were not free because taxpayers and renters paid for them. She mentioned that when taxes increased, so did rent. She speculated it was not wrong to question the efficiency of the library and whether it was being run correctly. She recalled that in October, there was a proclamation for the library or librarians, and she wanted to see a proclamation for the LBT. She expressed that the LBT worked for free and that some of the Trustees were viciously attacked for asking questions. She commented that the LBT was appointed to oversee the library. She believed that anyone familiar with budgets would know that what was presented to the LBT was not detailed. She communicated that she was excited to see the open Checkbook and thanked the State Treasurer.

Ms. Cindy Martinez thanked Commissioner Andriola for the open Checkbook initiative. She noted that she read an article from the *Reno Gazette Journal (RGJ)* regarding a disappointing comment from a Commissioner that she said indicated the County should have been in lockstep with the State when they launched their open Checkbook. She mentioned that municipalities were independent of the State, and she commended her Commissioner for taking the initiative to launch the open Checkbook. She referred to Agenda Item 12 and said that it coincided with two of her records requests regarding authorizations for contracts. She explained that social media was lovely; however, she remarked on the tendency for lies to spread more quickly than the truth. She indicated that she had read a disappointing and disturbing allegation that Commissioner Andriola voted to approve County Manager Eric Brown to sign contracts for up to \$300,000. She said that on May 25, 2021, Manager Brown was authorized to sign contracts for the purpose of funding and starting the Cares Campus. She reported that on May 24, 2022, and June 21, 2022, the BCC voted to amend the Washoe County Code (WCC) to authorize the finance team to approve contracts up to \$300,000. She commended County Clerk Jan Galassini and her staff for providing timely and comprehensive records when requested.

Ms. Darcy Phillips displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that she was the Executive Director of Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB). She explained that the KTMB truck was no longer usable. She supported Commissioner Garcia's proposal to allocate funds to KTMB for a replacement truck. She noted that the funds from Commissioner Garcia and the William N. Pennington Foundation would allow KTMB to purchase a new four-wheel drive (4WD) vehicle and trailer to continue reaching illegal dumping sites. She referred to the KTMB 2024 Stats document she displayed regarding the amount of litter and waste removed from the County. She reported that KTMB would be sending individual reports for each district. She expressed if there were parks or open spaces that needed attention to inform KTMB. She thanked the BCC for their support.

Ms. Louise Souffront mentioned that she appreciated the North Valleys Library. She noted that it was a storefront library; however, she felt that it was still essential to the community. She indicated that libraries were sanctuaries and a resource to the community and that people turned to the library when there was a catastrophe. She believed that staffing should not be decreased and that the County had enough funds to continue supporting all functions of the library. She felt that as a senior, she understood how the library was a community center that exposed individuals to other resources the County provided. She asked the BCC to reconsider taking the library resources from families. She said that the library was an investment for individuals, democracy, and the future of children.

Ms. Sandy Scott displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She noted that she used to be a member of the LBT with former Library Director Martha Gould during the composition of WC1. She indicated that two cents did not seem like very much and referred to the Ballot Question WC-1 Improves County Library document she displayed. She mentioned that when providing voters with the document, she would check off each item on the list. She recalled that she showed former County Manager Katy Singlaub the document and told her that the residents were promised a remodeled Sparks Library, which began construction soon after the conversation. She voiced that as she listened to the passionate library speakers, she did not care how they were educated because the library put their voices together. She believed that a story warded off dementia and that story hour was not only for children but for the elderly as well. She asked the BCC to think bigger than two cents, and she wondered what the library could have done with three cents.

Ms. Laura Wade indicated that she had lived in Reno for six years and was an avid reader. She reported that she walked to the Downtown Library every week and had audiobooks on hold through Libby. She noted that she listened to audiobooks while she did house chores or weeded the garden. She asked the BCC to support the WCLS. She said that she was a recently laid-off federal contractor due to federal cuts and that she could not afford to buy books. She voiced that she relied on the library for books and printer access and that the library provided a safe space for all ages. She implored the BCC to fund the library.

Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She noted that she informed the BCC that President Donald Trump would issue an executive order for elections if he were elected. She recalled that on March 25, 2025, President Trump issued an executive order preserving and protecting American elections. She mentioned that she knew there was a bill drafted that would codify the executive order. She indicated that in February, House Resolution (HR) 2499 was introduced and was in the committee. She said that she expected HR2499 to leave the committee quickly to be voted on by the House of Representatives, pass to the Senate, and be signed into law by President Trump. She voiced that the bill included mandatory voter identification with government-issued proof of citizenship, security standards of voting equipment, enforcement of voter list maintenance, and no ballots counted after Election Day. She commented that the federal funding would be tied to election security. She said



that non-citizens would be prosecuted if they voted. She communicated that former President Joseph Biden's Executive Order 14091 had been revoked and noncompliant counties would be penalized. She believed that it was important that the County support President Trump's executive order and the law once it was passed, because the federal funding would be removed if the County was not compliant. She felt that it was not right for the BCC to go to the taxpayers for more money because federal funding was pulled due to noncompliance. She said the Registrar of Voters (ROV) needed to start preparing for the 2026 elections. She expressed that she thought it was sad to see many laws passed in the Legislature that would be revoked once HR2499 passed.

Ms. Trista Gomez mentioned that there were two bills at the Legislature including Assembly Joint Resolutions (AJR) 1 which would raise property taxes on old houses an average of four to six hundred dollars a month for local buyers, and SB319 regarding an assessment of all properties levied and collected as taxes. She said the bill did not call them taxes; otherwise, the voters would have to pass it by vote. She indicated that the two bills put more barriers on buyers. She noted the County should protect locals, seniors, middle-income, and young buyers. She expressed that she was a big fan of teachers, police, and firefighters; however, she said government employees had benefits and pay that exceeded taxpayers' capabilities. She commented that massive increases in assessments on local buyers would have more impact. She was hopeful for the open Checkbook. She explained that she listened to the library advocates and said that no one was advocating to defund the library, but in the wake of the presentations, a severe structural deficit would raise County and State taxes on young people, old people, middle-income, and average buyers. She communicated that arguing the library budget did not raise taxes was true, but felt the County was hurting the population that needed fewer barriers. She mentioned that efficient and just budgets that affected everyone equally should be explored and acted on. She speculated that California was a pariah nationwide and that the County was following in its footsteps. She hoped the BCC would stop trying to hurt the community.

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

**25-0197      AGENDA ITEM 4 Announcements/Reports.**

Commissioner Garcia indicated that April was Child Abuse Prevention Month and said that the planting of pinwheels event was taking place on April 10, 2025. She noted that she was shaken by the news regarding the child abuse case that took place the previous Friday. She wanted to remind everyone that they were mandated reporters as she highlighted Child Abuse Prevention Month. She noted that the community needed to be the eyes and ears of law enforcement, first responders, and County employees. She indicated that the number for reporting was 1-833-900-SAFE. She mentioned that if someone suspected abuse or neglect, they should report it. She explained that the reports were confidential and that many of the reports were filed as information only which helped social workers gather evidence and historical data that could help prevent heinous crimes. She indicated that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), first responders, the

Medical Examiner, and those who worked in the Courts would experience secondary trauma from having to listen to the details. She thanked those individuals for their work because she felt it was a difficult job.

County Manager Eric Brown noted that the Board of Adjustment (BOA) and Planning Commission (PC) were taking applicants from District 4 with the deadline for applications on April 14, 2025. He indicated that Agenda Item 6A1 was a presentation per the request for an update from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) regarding illegal dumping. He mentioned that there was a request regarding tertiary offices, which he believed the Alternate Public Defenders Office (APDO) answered and said that the County paid for the services when required. He reported that the Senior Center would reopen on May 1, 2025, and he believed that Commissioner Clark had the opportunity to tour the facility. He voiced that the Office of the County Manager (OCM) was working on implementing a standing item on the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) agendas that announced open positions for boards and commissions with a link to the applications. He said that the mobile kitchen for the Senior Center would be dismantled before the opening and no service interruption would occur. He reported that there would be a link for the public to access insurance information from Nevada Division of Insurance Commissioner Scott Kipper. He explained that commissioner Kipper answered Chair Hill's question regarding the red-light cameras, which had lowered insurance rates, but that commissioner Kipper said that date was not tracked. He communicated that the Cares Campus overflow presentation was scheduled for next month.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Commissioner Garcia for addressing the recent abuse case. She noted that it was a tragedy in the community and believed that similar incidents more likely occurred than she knew. She mentioned that looking at how the County approached the budget policy provided an opportunity to look at the fundamentals. She indicated that the County was in the business of customer service for essential services and that, as public servants, there was a responsibility in using funds that were taxpayer dollars. She explained that there was a need to define essential services and help create a budget framework that addressed concerns. She said that compliance needed to be prioritized and thought there were opportunities to save money. She noted that when there was a budget situation, staff needed to look at all options. She voiced that the OCM was performing an efficiency review that she thought the library should perform. She believed that asking the Audit Committee to review the library as a third party would provide an opportunity for change. She felt that the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) should be given the audit information and that other departments should investigate reviews of their efficiencies. She said that by researching the library and other departments, it would help the Commissioners understand what those departments need with the budget available. She indicated that unfunded mandates were one of the occurrences at the Legislature that the BCC was no in control of. She noted that she wanted the budget to include an unfunded mandate line item per department to track uncontrollable legislative mandates.

Commissioner Andriola noted that herself and Vice Chair Herman served on the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) which moved to support a national

Christmas tree in Washington, D.C. She reported that the tree had 50 ornaments contributed per county. She indicated that the Washoe County School District (WSCD) agreed to have children make the 50 ornaments for the County. She mentioned that the Christmas tree skirt would represent all 17 counties in Nevada.

Commissioner Clark indicated that Manager Brown did not answer his questions. He explained that he wanted to know the start date and expected finish date for the Senior Center remodel, when the contract indicated the kitchen was due to be operational, and what date, per the contract, the kitchen was supposed to be removed. He mentioned that he also wished to know, according to the contract, when the kitchen delivery was, the setup date, and the dismantling date.

Commissioner Clark noted that he had previously met with Mr. Richard Thomsen and was concerned that he was paying for an insurance policy that was endorsed by the County, which was supposed to cover him financially in case of an accident. He indicated that he was not sure if the allegations regarding the claim acceptance rate were true; however, he wanted them to be reviewed. He mentioned that if County employees were influenced into buying insurance that would not pay, it was the responsibility of the BCC to ensure the insurance company paid. He believed that if the payout was denied due to the clause, the service was not helping the employees. He voiced that he wanted to protect the people who worked for the County.

Commissioner Clark reported that he had met with the Assessor and that the Assessor told him that each year the assessed value on the tax rolls increased. After a meeting with the Treasurer, he indicated that the Treasurer said that investments had paid more money in the last few years than before. Commissioner Clark said that there was more money brought into those two offices, more American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds within the last several years, the highest gas taxes in the State and possibly the Country, and yet the County had budget problems. He wanted to know how the County was bringing in more money than before but was still in a budget deficit with a lack of funding to resurface roads. He speculated that it was due to spending more than receiving and that the County could not increase taxes to fix the budget. He voiced that there were individuals who wanted to raise vehicle registrations, sales taxes, and property taxes, which he said would affect homeowners and renters because landlords would increase their rent. He wished to know why and how the County was spending more money than ever before, and why there was money to buy used painted rocks but not essential services.

Commissioner Clark wanted to know who was supervising Sober24 because the federal government had never closed a County Office before. He indicated that he visited Washington, D.C. to represent the County, and when submitting his expense report for reimbursement, the County would not pay for his checked luggage. He thought it was unbelievable, and said he did not understand the County's thought process regarding spending. He reported that the Sparks Chief of Police told him there were no fights at the Sparks Senior Center, which Commissioner Clark said was unlike the County Senior Center, where fights were a regular occurrence. He believed that the reason there were frequent fights at the Senior Center was because it had become an extension of the Cares

Campus. He felt that there needed to be a senior section of the Cares Campus to assist with homeless seniors. He wanted detailed reasoning for the \$18,674.25 purchase of 92 Greyhound Bus tickets by the Human Services Agency (HSA).

Commissioner Clark communicated that there was a radon tunnel at the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) and that he had asked when the tunnel was tested last and was given an incorrect answer. He referred to the child abuse case in Cold Springs and requested the history of the heinous crime and if the County knew about the abuse beforehand. He explained that he did not need to know names; however, he wanted to know if the family had interacted with HSA. He noted that he found a developer in Cold Springs who would be willing to donate land to the County for pickleball courts, and that the developer was looking for funding.

### **PROCLAMATIONS**

**25-0198**      **5A1** Proclamation for the week of April 6th through April 12th as National Library Week. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia read the proclamation.

Library Director Jeff Scott thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and Congressman Mark Amodei for their support.

Library Trustee Marie Rodriguez thanked the library staff for their work.

Library Board of Trustees (LBT) Chair Ann Silver thanked the BCC for their recognition. She noted that libraries were essential and that the LBT was doing everything it could to support staff, users, materials, and cultural opportunities to help the community experience learning and growth.

Chair Hill thanked the LBT for their leadership.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5A1 be adopted.

**25-0199**      **5A2** Proclamation for the week of April 6th through April 12th as Crime Victims' Rights Week. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Andriola read the proclamation.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Zach Young indicated that he attended the meeting in lieu of District Attorney (DA) Christopher Hicks. He noted that during his 20 years as a prosecutor, he witnessed the impact of the initial offense and the ongoing impact

of crimes on victims. He mentioned that there were hardships and challenges associated with those experiences and that crime victims needed support, to be heard, and to have justice served. He explained that he was happy to attend the meeting for the proclamation, but the other members of the DA's Office, Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), other law enforcement agencies, first responders, mental and medical health professionals, and victim advocates also played a part in victims' rights. He indicated that it was beneficial for all to recommit themselves to victims' rights. He thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for the proclamation.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5A2 be adopted.

**25-0200**      **AGENDA ITEM 6A1**    Presentation by Bureau of Land Management Carson City District Manager Kim Dow, and Supervisory Law Enforcement Officer Mike Yost, to discuss illegal dumping within Washoe County. (All Commission Districts.)

Ms. Kimberly Dow, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Carson City District Manager, and Mr. Michael Yost, BLM Supervisor Law Enforcement Ranger, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: BLM Response to Illegal Dumping – Reno Area; Overview: Reno Area; Example: Homelessness; Example: Vehicle Dumping; Example: Commercial and Household Dumping; Example: Shooting Related Trash; Sun Valley: High Urban Interface; South Truckee Meadows and Washoe Valley; Enforcement Approach; Investigations; Game Cams: The Force Multiplier; Two Main Types of Cameras; Success Example Non-Cellular; Success Example Cellular; Limitations: A License Plate Helps; Cleanups/Partnerships: Teamwork!; Chimney Area; Take Aways.

Ms. Dow said she appreciated the opportunity to provide an update on illegal dumping. She mentioned that if the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) desired future updates, she would be happy to accommodate that. She noted the presentation focused on urban interface challenges. She expressed her appreciation for the partnership that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Washoe County had. She explained that there were three law enforcement officers who covered the entire district, which covered 4.8 million acres, eight counties in Western Nevada, and portions of three counties in eastern California. She said there was one ranger dedicated to the greater Reno area, and she thought the presentation would reflect the workload and complexity of the issues, which could not be managed by the BLM alone. She stated that the BLM was fortunate to have a working relationship with both Washoe County and David Solaro, Assistant County Manager, who helped address target shooting-related issues. She said Mr. Yost worked closely with Captain Amelia Galicia, Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), on a variety of topics. She added that he also worked with the Mobile Outreach Safety Team (MOST) to provide resources for people experiencing homelessness. She mentioned that

the BLM had a ride-along with Commissioner Garcia, and during that time, they were able to brainstorm how to expand the partnership. She highlighted that the BLM felt Washoe County's support from all aspects. She noted that support was incredibly helpful and important to BLM and could be seen in the presentation.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Overview: Reno Area* and said the Washoe region included as far north as Pyramid Lake, and south to Washoe Valley. He mentioned the ranger covered the smallest acreage with the densest population. He indicated that the slide did not include the more non-urban areas the ranger covered.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Example: Homelessness* and mentioned that there were various types of homelessness sites on public lands. He said there could be people sleeping in their cars, tents, recreational vehicles (RV), or areas with piles of trash.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Vehicle Dumping* and said illegal vehicle dumping spanned across the entire district. He noted there were vehicles that had been stolen and burned, likely dumped because there was no way to get rid of them. He added that homeless transients left behind the vehicles that no longer ran.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Example: Commercial and Household Dumping* and stated there were large dumping sites of commercial waste including when businesses completed yard cleanups and dumped the waste on public land.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Shooting Related Trash* and explained the three categories listed. He mentioned that shooting material led to micro trash, which made the cleanup extremely time-consuming. He said larger household items were used for target practice and left behind. He noted the difficulty with smaller items was that they could not be easily monitored. He said it would be too time-consuming to have his ranger watch someone drive out, set up, shoot for hours, and pack everything up when he was already responsible for covering 1.7 million acres. He noted that the main reason those areas went unchecked.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Sun Valley: High Urban Interface* and said they followed a program where one ranger was assigned to the Reno area and three additional officers, as well as himself, would patrol the areas on off days or high-volume days to track where they found illegal dumping. He explained that the green cars represented cars that were located and removed. He noted the cars in red had not been removed, and the orange dots represented large trash dumps that totaled two cubic meters or more. He indicated the tents were where they found transient camps with more than five people living there.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *South Truckee Meadows and Washoe Valley* and stated that waste was more spread out and harder to locate. He indicated for the Toll Road area, although dumping activities were sporadic, they found large amounts of dumping sites.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Enforcement Approach* and said the first offense would not receive a citation but would need to clean up their trash. He noted that the BLM would inquire why the individual dumped illegally and ask how the BLM could help. He felt local engagement was the most important thing and explained that while he was at the meeting, he had received information regarding an abandoned RV and a boat being dumped illegally.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Two Main Types of Cameras* and mentioned that game cameras were the main technology used to facilitate their investigations. He noted that an issue with the cellular-enabled camera was that he received a massive number of text messages each day. He stated there were currently five cameras in the field, which made it difficult to sort through the extensive number of images that the cameras collected. He said the cost ranged from \$100 to \$150 per month, depending on the number of photographs the cameras took. He explained that although the non-cellular cameras were less expensive, the ranger had to physically check the cards throughout the week, depending on location. He mentioned the non-cellular cameras had a delayed recovery, which meant if someone made an illegal dump and stole the camera, there would be no evidence of the crime. He said the cellular-enabled camera would alert the ranger if there was camera theft.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Success Example Non-Cellular* and described someone with a load of trash who had a visible license plate, and the camera took a clear picture. The ranger went to the individual's home and located the vehicle with a noticeable missing load of trash.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Success Example Cellular* and noted someone drove into BLM land with a piece of furniture in their vehicle. Once the ranger arrived at the location, they noticed that the same piece of furniture was full of bullet holes. He said that the camera caught a clear image, and the ranger was able to go to the individual's residence to make contact and issue a citation. He noted that afterwards, the individuals went back and removed the furniture that had been shot.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Limitations: A license plate helps* and said that without a license plate on the suspected vehicle, it was impossible to find it. He added that often, individuals removed or blocked their license plates.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Cleanups/Partnerships: Teamwork!* and noted that the hazardous materials budget was limited, and only certain materials could be removed. He mentioned various groups that the BLM was partnered with that organized individual weekend cleanups. He acknowledged community involvement was key and explained several examples of how the groups had assisted with cleanup efforts.

Mr. Yost reviewed the slide titled *Chimney Area* and noted the photo was taken in 2023 in the BLM chimney area prior to a Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB) cleanup. He said the areas in red needed to be cleaned up.

Commissioner Garcia thanked staff for the presentation. She was pleased to hear that the BLM referred to Washoe County as a good partner, but thought the County could do more. She said she knew the issue was not unique to Washoe County and added that Nevada had the highest percentage of public lands in the Nation. She stated neighboring states had high percentages of public lands with the same issues. She listed various states that were likely facing the same issues with a limited budget. She wondered what reasons individuals gave the BLM for dumping illegally. Mr. Yost replied that individuals provided several reasons but mentioned cost and not knowing where to take their trash seemed to be the most common. Commissioner Garcia asked about dedicated funding being only for hazardous materials cleanup and requested examples of materials found in the field. Mr. Yost noted they had found large buckets of paint, items with labels that stated the waste was biohazardous and the contents were unknown, and a tank that contained 100 gallons of oil. Commissioner Garcia thanked KTMB for being present, as well as the other partners who helped the BLM daily. She said she was glad that those relationships had been established over the past several years.

Commissioner Garcia felt it was important for local jurisdictions to invest in community partners. She said it was dependent upon them to invest because illegal dumping impacted the overall quality of life for all constituents. She commented that the presentation was important to her because the issue impacted all five Commissioner districts. She felt heartbroken when she saw what had happened in the open spaces, but thought there had been improvements. She thought community cleanups were a way for each Commissioner to help in their own district. She highlighted that the Board oversaw the franchise for Waste Management, which offered four free dump days and provided excess garbage stickers. She mentioned the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID) had an e-waste program and thought electronic waste was extremely problematic for people to figure out how to dispose of responsibly. She asked if there had been a collaboration between Washoe County and the BLM regarding a public awareness campaign. Mr. Yost stated there had not been a collaboration in the past, only with KTMB. He explained that for a month, a trash dumpster was available, and during that time, no illegal trash dumping occurred in that area.

Commissioner Garcia asked if the BLM knew of any communities that had successful neighborhood watch programs. Mr. Yost replied that within the local community, he had informants from whom he received a lot of information. He said each ranger handed out approximately 1,000 business cards per year, which he felt helped the public to make reports. He felt the proximity of the trash facilities had a huge impact. The further away the facility was, the more illegal dumping that occurred. Commissioner Garcia asked if any community partners offered rewards to citizens who reported illegal dumping. Mr. Yost said he was not aware of any. Commissioner Garcia asked if there had been any beautification, art installations, or educational spaces that were near the urban interface areas that were technically BLM land. Mr. Yost said the closest thing to that would be Golden Eagle Regional Park. Commissioner Garcia asked if the fines for illegal dumping were adequate compared to other states. Mr. Yost stated BLM citations were adequate, but no portion of the citation went back to the BLM. He said the entire fee was sent to the treasury and assigned to various causes. He said he worked with the BLM to



offer individuals the opportunity to reduce their fine by half by completing community service. Commissioner Garcia had researched other jurisdictions and mentioned District 3 had huge issues with illegal dumping, and she felt it was unacceptable. She shared that her constituents were concerned. She appreciated the education from the BLM through their presentation. Mr. Yost said KTMB completed a site visit with the BLM, and within a few days, another RV full of trash had been dumped. Commissioner Garcia said she asked her constituents to report illegal dumping to Washoe County 311. Mr. Yost stated the BLM had worked with Washoe County to ensure he was the point of contact to receive those reports.

Commissioner Andriola said Waste Management was offering free dump days at Lockwood that would take place on April 17 to 19 and April 21 to 26, 2025. She thanked the BLM and mentioned her district encompassed Hidden Valley and Golden Eagle Regional Park. She thanked the BLM for working with Washoe County and the Forest Service to do what they could to have a shooting facility that was managed more appropriately to avoid illegal dumping. She felt that resources needed to be leveraged. She said all the partners were doing a great job, and she wondered how many people knew about the free dump days. She knew there had been advertisements and wondered if there was an opportunity to look at the County's communications department to help with an awareness campaign. She stated at a Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meeting in Spanish Springs that she encouraged the community to take a photo of license plates and report illegal dumping. She said she appreciated all that the BLM and KTMB had done.

Commissioner Clark thought there was an opportunity for the Board to solve some issues. He thanked the BLM for the presentation and thanked Commissioner Garcia for asking her questions. He said the Board should be looking at opportunities to fix the problem in District 3, which he felt was an area that had a lot of trash. He mentioned the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) was not going to have its green waste pickup in the spring, which he felt was a missed opportunity. He thought it would reduce the number of people illegally dumping if they could drop off their waste at the TMFPD. He said someone had mentioned a rewards program for turning people in, but felt there should be a rewards program for people who disposed of their trash at an appropriate disposal location. He suggested that there be a few acres of BLM land adjacent to Sun Valley to offer free dumping, and the County could pay to have it hauled away. He thought that if there were a small community dump in areas where there was an illegal dumping problem, it would alleviate the issue. He said having the highest gas taxes in the State and hauling waste to Lockwood would be expensive. He felt the waste facility in Carson City was much cheaper. He thought there were opportunities to fix the problem and thought that the Board could contribute. He said it was not only BLM land that had RVs and trash scattered, and he felt the problem was much larger than that. He thought the Board should make sure that the TMFPD had funding for their waste drop-off. He mentioned that KTMB was receiving a donation from the Board, and he was giving a donation to Senior ResQ, for low-income Seniors to create defensible space around their property. He added that local fire unions would supply the manpower at no charge and only needed dumpsters. He thought that with his discretionary donation, that would provide an opportunity to rent the dumpsters to haul debris away. He felt the two largest issues were cost and being able to

haul waste away, and he thought those were simple issues to fix. He thanked the BLM for bringing it to the Board's attention.

Chair Hill said she was happy that the County was collaborating with the BLM and thanked them for their hard work. She felt there was an opportunity to create a team to help keep the region clean. She stated she would appreciate future updates or an annual report so that the Board could ensure that the BLM received support.

**25-0201**      **AGENDA ITEM 6A2**      Presentation by Cathy Hill, Washoe County Comptroller, to provide information and an overview on the newly released Washoe Checkbook website. The Washoe Checkbook is a new public website that will enhance transparency by displaying County spending detail, budget-to-actual comparisons for the different County departments and summarized payroll information. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill described that the Washoe Checkbook was an initiative of Commissioner Andriola in partnership with the State, and she invited Commissioner Andriola to lead the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) through her process.

Commissioner Andriola introduced the Nevada State Controller Andy Matthews, who she said initiated the Open Checkbook concept for the State.

Mr. Matthews stated his support for accountable and transparent government. He explained that the Nevada State Checkbook was made available to the public in February 2024 and contained information about State spending. He conveyed that the reaction from the public was good. He shared that he received a call from Commissioner Andriola soon after the website was launched to express her appreciation for the tool and inquire about the possibility of creating something similar for Washoe County. He said their teams began work on Washoe Checkbook soon afterwards. He thanked Commissioner Andriola for her leadership on the issue and the other BCC members for their support. He acknowledged that many other people contributed to the effort, including Washoe County Comptroller Cathy Hill and Nevada State Chief Deputy Controller James Smack. He related that his constituents often asked him why he was so passionate about government transparency, and his answer was always that taxpayers deserved to know what the government was doing with their money. He thought it was empowering for citizens to have that information. He said he was reminded of that earlier in the meeting while listening to spirited discussions on a number of subjects, including libraries. He believed that, regardless of feelings on any particular issue, everyone should be able to agree on the importance of open access for citizens to transparent and accountable information on government spending and funding. He thanked the Commissioners for undertaking the effort. He believed that the Washoe Checkbook website would be a great service to County citizens and also an example to other local leaders around the State. He congratulated the BCC on the success of the project.

Commissioner Andriola encouraged other jurisdictions to consider implementing a version of the Washoe Checkbook. She recalled that when she spoke with Mr. Matthews, he shared his hope that all counties and jurisdictions across the State would be able to offer that opportunity. She thanked the implementation team for their work to aggregate information that was already publicly available and consolidate it in one place. She thought it was good for people to have clear access to budget details. She recognized the assistance provided by Justin Bruce from Tyler Technologies and noted that the benefits of using the same system as the State included familiar website navigation. She thought it would be ideal if citizens in any jurisdiction of any county of the State could access similar information. She thanked Budget Manager Lori Cooke and the entire County Finance team. She said that all budgets were complex, and she thought providing live and recorded versions of the *Budget 101* overview for the Washoe Checkbook would give an opportunity to show people how the tool worked. She advocated for an annual, recorded overview for people to watch, replay, and fast-forward to any section as needed. She thanked everyone for their work on the system over the past year and stated that it would be much easier to navigate moving forward. She applauded the interactive components and searchable interface of the new website.

Ms. Hill expressed appreciation to Technology Services (TS), who she revealed were essential in collaboration with Tyler Technologies and the Finance department on the Washoe Checkbook. She said that the County had joined the State to enhance convenience to the public. She communicated that the County was excited to share the Washoe Checkbook tool to augment the reporting that the County was required to provide to the public. She summarized that the goal was to be transparent in the presentation of the budget and expenditures and to provide data on spending in each area. She explained that the online tool showed current expenditures by fund and department. Three fiscal years of data were available. She viewed it as progress in the promotion of in-depth fiscal accountability in the County. She noted that the budget would be discussed more at a future meeting. She said the budget in the Washoe Checkbook outlined where the County was going, and the expenditures showed where the County was at a specific point in time. She informed that there was a nightly refresh of the information, therefore the figures shown could change from one day to the next. She commented that the Washoe Checkbook made it easier than ever to access and understand the County's financial information. She conducted a digital tour of the tool, which she explained contained information about County expenditures that could be downloaded. She added, as Commissioner Andriola mentioned, that there was a section of the website with Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).

Ms. Hill displayed the Washoe Checkbook online tool at <https://checkbook.washoecounty.gov/> and showed that there were four quadrants presented on the main page. She said the first two were the budgeted revenue and the budgeted expenditures. She reiterated that the budget would be explored further in a future *Budget 101* meeting. She described that the budgeted revenue and expense quadrants addressed budgeted funds and the year-to-date status of expenditures. She explained that information about the percentage of the designated budget that had been spent so far could be viewed by hovering a mouse over the bars. She noted that the three fiscal years available were

shown at the top of the page. She commented that the website was very user-friendly, and a click on the left side of the page would navigate the user back to the main screen. She said the second quadrant showed budgeted expenditures for the County for the year. She pointed out that the screen looked very similar to the previous screen, and navigation was identical. She mentioned that if a user preferred to see the information displayed in a pie chart or over time, it was possible to select those options.

Ms. Hill stated that the last two quadrants depicted where the County was at a point in time and how much had been spent to date. She explored Total Spending of \$2.49 million as an example and explained that the figures were displayed by fund. She disclosed that people often requested details regarding the General Fund, and she showed the departments within the General Fund. She explained how users could view more departments and also view each of the divisions within a department, along with the associated expenses for each division. For more information on expenses, users could click on the checkbook to see details of where the money had been spent. She said the numbers were also represented in their consolidated form on the bottom of the page, and users could click on them to show how many invoices made up the total dollar amount. She noted the number sometimes represented just one invoice, and other times it aggregated multiple invoices. She said the key points were the dollar amounts and the ability to see who was paid for what services. She mentioned that if the number of results exceeded what could be shown on one page, users could click along the bottom, go to the next line, and see what was paid and where it was categorized. She hoped the public would enjoy using the website to access information.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Hill. She expressed her deep appreciation for the access that the Washoe Checkbook website enabled for people. She advised that the *Budget 101* session in the spring would provide more details and give people an opportunity to explore further, but she emphasized that people did not have to wait for that session to get answers. She offered that they could reach out to Washoe 311 as an alternative. She asked Ms. Hill to speak about what the County was legally required to report on and share with the public. She wondered if the Washoe Checkbook would serve that purpose, or if it was still necessary for the County to provide a printed record of budgets and reports.

Ms. Hill advised that it was the opinion of the District Attorney (DA) that the County still needed to provide printed information, but the new website meant less information had to be printed since it could be accessed by people in a different way. Ms. Hill added that would save money and time.

Commissioner Andriola concluded that the Washoe Checkbook exemplified the potential to improve efficiency, services, and savings by using technology. Mr. Matthews affirmed that the State Controller's Office saw a decrease in public records requests after they implemented the system.

Commissioner Garcia commended Commissioner Andriola for bringing a solution-based idea to the County. She expected the Washoe Checkbook to add a lot to the community.

Commissioner Clark thanked the presenters and said that he looked forward to the Washoe Checkbook being utilized. He asked if it would be possible to track public views. He noted that he wanted to protect confidentiality but was interested in reports on the number of people accessing the website, if that was available. He wondered how questions or appreciation could be communicated from citizens.

Ms. Hill said she would look into the question of what usage data was available. She supposed that people with thoughts or questions could communicate through Washoe 311 or reach out to the Clerk's Office to share thoughts in public comment.

Commissioner Andriola noted the list of FAQs on the Washoe Checkbook website and advised that Commissioner Clark's question about user feedback was addressed in that list.

### **DONATIONS**

- 25-0202**      **7A1** Recommendation to accept monetary donations from various donors in the amount of [\$2,882.98] and donations of dog/cat food and treats from the SPCA with an estimated value of [\$28,069.49], and recognize numerous citizens and businesses who donated animal food and various goods with an estimated value of [\$8,096.20] (see attached donor lists) to Washoe County Regional Animal Services ("WCRAS") retroactive for the period of October 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024, to be used for the humane care and treatment of sick and/or injured, stray, abandoned, or at-risk animals; express appreciation for these thoughtful contributions; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Regional Animal Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0203**      **7B1** Recommendation to accept a one-time equipment donation of 26 Preliminary Breath Tests (PBTs) and 1 Easy Cal. Calibration Station valued at \$5,019.00 from the Nevada State Police to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office to be distributed to Washoe County personnel for use in the field. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0204**      **7B2** Recommendation to accept a one-time cash donation of [\$300.00] from private citizen, Elsie Kelly to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for the Mounted Horse Unit to be used for operating costs, and, if approved, direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0205**      **7B3** Recommendation to accept a one-time cash donation of [\$500.00] from private citizen, Minnie Chinn to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office

for the Search & Rescue Unit to be used for operating costs, and, if approved, direct Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0206**      **7B4** Recommendation to accept a one-time cash donation of [\$500.00] from private citizen, Edward L Hensley to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for the Search & Rescue Unit to be used for operating costs, and, if approved, direct Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7A1 through 7B4 be accepted.

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8H3 EXCLUDING  
PULLED AGENDA ITEM 8F3 HEARD SEPARATELY**

- 25-0207**      **8A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meeting of February 25, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0208**      **8B1** Recommendation to approve Resolution R25-32 calling a public hearing (to be set for May 13, 2025) on the amendment of the Service Area and Contaminant Boundaries (Program Boundaries) of District No. 24 (Remediation Program/Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District) in Washoe County, Nevada; providing for notice of hearing and for other matters properly related thereto. The Remediation Program manages and remediates existing tetrachloroethene (PCE) contamination of groundwater in the central Truckee Meadows area, which requires the Program Boundaries to be updated annually. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0209**      **8B2** Recommendation to approve a Lease Agreement between the Gerlach General Improvement District (Lessor) and Washoe County (Lessee), pursuant to Nevada Revised statutes 277.050, to lease a parcel of land (+/- 8,058.6 square feet) at 380 Short Street, Gerlach, Nevada, for a term commencing upon execution of the agreement through April 30, 2035, to locate a Washoe County owned manufactured home to provide additional employee housing for the Gerlach Road Operation and Maintenance Program, [at a lease rate of \$1,200.00 annually to Washoe County]. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)
- 25-0210**      **8B3** Recommendation to approve an Amendment to Land Lease Agreement between the Gerlach General Improvement District (Lessor) and Washoe County (Lessee), pursuant to Nevada Revised statutes 277.050, for

the continued occupancy of Gerlach Senior Center, consisting of 1,440 square feet, located at 385 E. Sunset Blvd., Gerlach, Nevada, for a term commencing upon execution through April 30, 2035, in support of Washoe County Senior Services Program, [at a cost of \$1.00 annually to Washoe County]. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

- 25-0211**      **8C1** Recommendation to approve the removal of uncollectible accounts pursuant to NRS 354.257 which states “authority for removal of information concerning uncollectible accounts from records of County. The Board of County Commissioners may remove from the records of the County the amount of an account receivable and the name of the debtor, upon determination by a centralized collection system.” Accounts receivable for removal are Community Development Fees for [\$262.42]; District Court Fees for [\$5,357.03]; Juvenile Services Fees [\$711.64]; Regional Animal Services Redemption Fees for [\$526.78]; Regional Animal Services for Notice of Civil Penalty Fees for [\$101,695.31] and Public Defender fees for [\$8,497.57] for a total amount uncollectible and for accounts past statute of limitations of [\$117,050.75]. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0212**      **8D1** Recommendation to accept the FY25 Federal Title IV-B Subpart 2 Caseworker Visits subaward from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services to support caseworker visits in the amount of [\$25,000.00; \$8,784.00 county match] retroactive to October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2025; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant award and related documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0213**      **8E1** Recommendation to approve acceptance of NSLP Equipment Grant funding from the State of Nevada Department of Agriculture in the amount of \$6,550 [no County match] for the purchase and installation of equipment for the Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services’ kitchen. The grant period is from Upon final signature through September 30, 2025. If approved, direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and authorize the Department Head to sign the sub-award agreement. Juvenile Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0214**      **8F1** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$7,500.00] for Fiscal Year 2024-2025; District 2 Commissioner Mike Clark recommends a [\$7,500.00] grant to Senior ResQ -- a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes -- to support the partnership with Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) in removing brush, bushes, and shrubs from the homes of low-income seniors; approve Resolutions necessary for same; and direct the Comptroller’s Office to

make the necessary disbursements of funds. Manager. (Commission District 2.)

- 25-0215**      **8F2** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$20,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2024-2025; District 3 Commissioner Mariluz Garcia recommends a [\$20,000.00] grant to Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB) – a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes - for the purpose of purchasing a vehicle to assist with transportation and the hauling of waste during neighborhood and open space cleanup events; approve Resolutions necessary for same; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary disbursements of funds. Manager. (Commission District 3.)
- 25-0216**      **8G1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$7,543.49; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 Tuberculosis Grant Subaward, retroactive to January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Tuberculosis Prevention Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0217**      **8G2** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$114,010.49; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 STD Prevention and Control Subaward retroactive to February 1, 2024 through February 28, 2025, for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support Sexual Transmitted Disease (STD) Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0218**      **8H1** Recommendation to accept a Nevada Division of Emergency Management grant award [amount not to exceed \$75,666.00, no County match required] as administered through the State of Nevada, Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management, Federal FY 2024 project number 97067.24, to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Northern Nevada Regional Intelligence Center (NNRIC) for the purchase of software enhancements for the retroactive grant period of October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0219**      **8H2** Recommendation to accept a grant award from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) FY 24 DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction (CEBR) Program, Award No 15PBJA-24-GG-02698-DNAX [amount not to exceed \$292,493.00, No County match required], to cover costs related to the DNA capacity enhancement and backlog



reduction/prevention, for the retroactive grant term of October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2026 and if approved, authorize Sheriff Balaam to retroactively execute the grant award documentation, and direct the Finance Department to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

**25-0220**      **8H3** Recommendation to accept letter dated February 13, 2025 from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department which provides additional funding [increase of \$79,036.00, no match required for a total of \$158,056.00] as administered through the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for reimbursement of expenses associated with Internet Crimes Against Children investigations and Law Enforcement related county and non-county personnel training and travel, for the retroactive grant period of October 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025, and if approved, direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Clark referred to Agenda Item 8F1 and noted that the donation would be used to clear trimmings and yards for seniors on fixed or low income. He mentioned that there was no conflict of interest regarding Senior ResQ or *Senior ResQ Magazine*, regardless of the allegations he had heard. He mentioned that he wanted to support anything that helped seniors. He indicated that he supported the fire unions and off-duty firefighters assisting seniors. He voiced that he did not have a personal or financial relationship with Senior ResQ and that there was incorrect speculation regarding an individual from Senior ResQ being his campaign manager. He reported that there may be comments in the future regarding business relationships; however, he emphasized there were no personal business relationships between himself and Senior ResQ. He voiced that he wanted to help seniors stay off the streets by donating to and helping Senior ResQ. He thanked Senior ResQ for their work in the community.

Commissioner Clark requested more information regarding Agenda Item 8F3. He asked if the position had been reopened and if others had applied. He recalled that over the past two years, he had urged new ideas and new people for the boards. He indicated that he was not in favor of reappointing anyone unless there were others who had applied. He noted that he would consider the reappointment if no one had applied.

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson mentioned that reappointments were considered first because it encouraged those individuals with knowledge of the board to continue to serve. She noted that reappointments were brought back to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for approval in a public setting. She said that if the current candidate were reappointed, he would start his second term and then no longer be eligible for reappointment at the end of the second term. She indicated that if the BCC denied the reappointment, the position would be opened for applications and the current applicant could be reconsidered.

Commissioner Clark recommended that the position be reopened so that other individuals in the community could apply and serve. Commissioner Clark pulled Agenda Item 8F3 from the Consent Agenda.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock noted that she supported pulling Agenda Item 8F3 because she felt the position should be reopened for applicants. She referred to Agenda Item 8B3 and said that the Gerlach Senior Center was great. She indicated that there were over 100,000 seniors in the County, and the budget for seniors was \$8 million, while the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) received a budget of \$12 million. She mentioned that she believed the WCLS did not serve over 100,000 people. She asked the BCC to consider a senior center in South Reno. She recalled that in Las Vegas, Nevada, many churches rented space to the county to host seniors.

Mr. Blake Vander Well displayed two documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He indicated that he was the President of the Senior ResQ Foundation and thanked Commissioner Clark for the generous donation regarding the Defensible Space Program for seniors with low income and disabilities. He noted there were many applications for the program and that the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) volunteered firefighters to assist with the cleanup. He said with Commissioner Clark's donation, Senior ResQ would be able to dispose of the materials collected. He referred to and read the monthly report document displayed. He mentioned that the organization was small; however, the need was huge. He asked the BCC to use their discretionary funds to help Senior ResQ assist more seniors. He appreciated the BCC for their support.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8H3, excluding Agenda Item 8F3 which was heard separately, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8H3 with the exclusion of Agenda Item 8F3 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**25-0221**      **8F3** Recommendation to reappoint Adam Kramer as the Washoe County representative on the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority (RTAA) Board of Trustees for a term beginning July 1, 2025 and ending on June 30, 2029, in accordance with the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority Act, Chapter 474, Statutes of Nevada 1977, p. 968 (as amended). Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

\* \* \* \* \*

See the Consent Agenda discussion for additional conversation on this item.

\* \* \* \* \*

Commissioner Clark believed that the position should be reopened since there were over half a million individuals in the County who he felt should have the opportunity to serve on the board.

Commissioner Garcia indicated that she respectfully disagreed with Commissioner Clark because the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority (RTAA) was going through massive change. She felt that consistency and knowledge were important to proceed with progress. She noted that five positions through the RTAA were going through a transition during 2025. She said reappointments were a common practice in the County with countless reappointments being approved during her time on the board. She said she was strongly opposed to making a change.

Commissioner Andriola indicated that she called every applicant regardless of whether it was a reappointment or not. She said that she would have brought her notes from that phone call if she had known a discussion would take place. She noted that she learned the commitment and history of the RTAA from applicant Mr. Adam Kramer. She said that Mr. Kramer was committed and embedded in seeing success and impact in the community. She mentioned that historically, 25 percent of the traffic flying out of the Reno-Tahoe Airport was from residents, and the remainder was incoming flights for tourism. She reported that the percentage changed to fifty-fifty due to business travel and the County becoming larger. She mentioned that she supported the reappointment and thought it was in the best interest of the County.

Chair Hill agreed with Commissioners Andriola and Garcia and wanted to see Mr. Kramer reappointed due to major construction and increased investment in the RTAA. She thought it would be helpful to have existing knowledge of the RTAA board.

Commissioner Clark thanked the BCC for their comments and indicated he was not questioning Mr. Kramer's capability but the process of the appointment. He reported that he always advocated hearing from other individuals, and while reappointments had taken place in the past, he wanted others to have the opportunity. He mentioned that it was transparent to have other people apply, and if Mr. Kramer were the right person for the position, Mr. Kramer would be reappointed regardless of other applications.

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

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Adam Kramer be reappointed to the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority (RTAA) Board of Trustees for a term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending on June 30, 2029.

**25-0222**      **AGENDA ITEM 12** Information and acknowledgement of receipt by the Board of County Commissioners of contracts and purchases that have exceeded or are expected to exceed [\$300,000] that may include services and supplies for all County departments. Pursuant to Washoe County Code 15.490, the purchasing and contracts manager is authorized, subject to the provisions of Washoe County Code and the applicable provision of state law, to approve purchases and contracts up to [\$300,000]. As a matter of best practices, the purchasing and contracts manager will keep the Board of County Commissioners informed of all contracts and purchases for all county departments that have been previously approved that have exceeded or are expected to exceed the threshold amount. A full list of specific contracts, vendors, and amounts is viewable in the staff report. The aggregate amount of known expenditures under these contracts to date is \$616,293.51. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

This item was pulled by (ADA) Assistant District Attorney Nathan Edwards.

Chair Hill indicated the item would be heard at a future BCC meeting.

**BLOCK VOTE – 9, 10, 13, AND 14**

**25-0223**      **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the 911 Parr Boulevard Housing Unit 9 Roof Replacement Project, PWP-WA-2025-183 [staff recommends D & D Roofing and Sheet Metal, Inc., in the amount of \$301,750.00]; (2) approve the purchase of roofing materials from Garland, DBS [in the amount of \$255,443.66], utilizing Racine County, Wisconsin Contract # PW1925 pursuant to the joinder provision of Nevada Revised Statute 332.195; and (3) approve a project contingency fund in the amount of \$20,000.00, for a total project cost not to exceed \$577,193.66. This capital project will remove and replace failing roofing materials with a modified bituminous membrane roofing system, reducing maintenance and preserving the lifespan of the Washoe County Regional Detention Center, located at 911 Parr Boulevard, Reno. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Items 9 be awarded and approved.

**25-0224**      **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Future of Work 230 Edison Facility Remodel Project, PWP-WA-2025-026 [staff

recommends Houston Smith Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$1,433,918.87]; and (2) approve a project contingency fund in the amount of \$75,000.00, for a total project cost not to exceed \$1,508,918.87. This capital project will remodel the office area at 230 Edison, Reno with new finishes and infrastructure in preparation for new systems furniture installation. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be awarded and approved.

**25-0225**      **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to approve a Memorandum of Understanding between Washoe County and the Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association (WCSDA) modifying provisions related to Article 14 (Job-Connected Injuries) and Exhibit A (Salary Schedules) of the WCSDA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for the four (4) year period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2028. The Memorandum of Understanding stemmed from an increase in the Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada (PERS) contribution rate and includes the following agreements: the County will absorb 2% of the 4.375% PERS contribution rate increase that WCSDA members would otherwise be responsible for per NRS 286.421 effective July 14, 2025; paragraph 14(F) of the CBA which requires monthly meetings for Washoe County and WCSDA to discuss workers' compensation improvements is null and void; and negotiations will be reopened to determine the parties' respective contributions if there is an additional change to the PERS contribution rate for the Employer Pay Contribution Plan for July 14, 2025. [Total estimated fiscal impact for all years is \$1,804,992; FY 25/26 = \$584,930, FY 26/27 = \$601,016; FY 27/28 = \$619,046]. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be approved.

**25-0226**      **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Forensic Support Services Agreements between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and various Local Law Enforcement Agencies: Carson City Sheriff's Office \$179,730; Douglas County Sheriff's Office \$29,850; Lyon County Sheriff's Office \$157,107; Mono County District Attorney's Office \$12,569; Reno Sparks Indian Colony Police Department \$32,992; State of Nevada Department of Wildlife \$1,500 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July

1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 with a total income of [\$413,748.00]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved.

**25-0227**      **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to approve an Agreement for Services between Washoe County and H&K Architects for the Washoe County Behavioral Health (WCBH) Facility project [in the amount of \$675,000.00], commencing on April 10, 2025, for initial architectural and engineering design services necessary to support the project. These services include architecture, civil, mechanical, electrical, and structural engineering design along with a specialty behavioral health advisor. The WCBH project will be located at 1240 E. 9th Street and funding for the project comes from a State of Nevada Governor's Office grant (no match required). Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

Commissioner Clark provided a document, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He noted that the \$675,000 for the WCBH facility project was tax dollars that came from the State. He mentioned that he would place the facility's deed restriction on record because it would save individuals from having to request information from public records. He voiced that there were 30 different deed restrictions on the property, with three he felt were concerning. He wondered why money would be spent before the restrictions were addressed. He read from page two of the Declaration of Restrictions document provided regarding Items S, T, V, and W. He said there were several deed restrictions he wanted addressed before more money was spent on the facility.

County Manager Eric Brown indicated there was a recent update from Behavioral Health Administrator Julia Ratti, who reported to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) that the process of use determination was still underway. He noted that there was a time restriction on spending the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to harden the building and ensure it was usable. He mentioned that although there were deed restrictions that needed to be considered, he was unable to address them at that time. He commented that the Northern Nevada Medical Center (NNMC) was aware of the process and, until there was a final determination of use, he was unable to discuss it.

Commissioner Clark thanked Manager Brown for his comments and said he was told the facility was going to be a psychiatric hospital for the community. He said that he did not want to spend \$675,000 on the facility until there was proof that the use was allowed. He noted that he wanted to know how the deed restrictions would affect the County's use of the facility.

Chair Hill asked Manager Brown if the District Attorney's (DA) Office was working on the deed restrictions. Manager Brown confirmed that the DA was working on the concerns. Chair Hill asked if staff felt comfortable that what was presented to the BCC about the facility, along with fundraising efforts, was understood and not a legal issue. Manager Brown confirmed that the staff felt comfortable.

Commissioner Clark indicated that it took two to negotiate. He mentioned that the County was in favor of the facility; however, there was no clarification until there was agreement on the deed restrictions. He thought it was preemptive to give more funding to the facility.

Commissioner Andriola voiced that until restrictions were cleared, the money could not be spent; however, the funds needed to be obligated. She commented that she did not want to lose the funding from the State. She said that it would expedite the process once the restrictions were addressed if the funding were obligated. She noted that if concerns were discovered, the progress on the facility would stop.

Manager Brown confirmed that progress would stop if the concerns were not addressed. Commissioner Andriola mentioned that by not approving the funds, the County was hindering the ability to move forward during a critical situation.

Commissioner Clark reported that he had spoken to Manager Brown over two years ago about the deed restrictions. He noted he had urged Manager Brown to address the deed restrictions before the purchase. He indicated that he wanted to be on record that the County should have negotiated the restrictions prior to making the purchase. He said the County was proceeding forward preemptively with the potential of the deed restrictions never being resolved. He speculated that the facility may not have been the correct purchase for the County's use. He commented that deed restrictions could change the value of the property. He communicated that when the facility's use presentation occurred, the middle option of over \$35 million extra included the deed restrictions. He asked why the County would want to move forward before finalizing concerns with the sellers. He said that he wanted his comments to be on the record whether his concerns were proven or not.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro clarified that while there was a long list of deed restrictions, the County was able to provide two additional areas, including longer than 72 hours subacute inpatient and adolescent pediatric behavioral health services, which was the main County use of the facility. He noted that there was a subsection of the deed restriction that allowed the County's preferred use. He mentioned that the County continued to work with the previous owner to discuss other items of concern. He indicated that the main use of the facility had been taken care of in the deed restrictions.

Chair Hill thanked ACM Solaro for the clarification.

Commissioner Clark mentioned that the building's original use and licensing were not the same as the County's. He referred to different aspects of the building

that he thought were concerning and should be made transparent, such as bedroom size, number of bathrooms, asbestos, and plumbing.

Commissioner Andriola thanked ACM Solaro for confirming the progress.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Commissioner Clark voting no and Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 11 be approved.

**12:57 p.m.**     **The Board recessed.**

**1:37 p.m.**     **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

**25-0228**     **AGENDA ITEM 16**     Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code) by adding and amending various sections in Division Three-Regulation of Uses, Division Four-Development Standards, and Division Nine-General Provisions. These updates include adding various sections to: establish minimum standards for guest quarters, cottage court developments, and employee housing; relocate lot coverage standards from article 306 to article 406; establish required findings for the approval of a common open space development; and establish minimum standards for alleyways. These updates also include amending various sections to: update the table of uses for residential use types to include middle housing, minor accessory dwelling units, guest quarters, multifamily minor, and employee housing; modify allowances in the table for duplexes and multifamily housing within regulatory zones in which those use types are already allowed; and reorganize that table; update the residential use types list to add and define multifamily minor, the middle housing use types of triplex, quadplex, and cottage court, guest quarters, and employee housing, and reorganize the list; update detached accessory structure regulations to reference lot coverage standards rather than enumerate them and to modify deed restriction requirements for connection to water and wastewater facilities; modify attached and detached accessory dwelling unit standards to regulate their use on parcels with middle housing types and specify their mutual exclusivity with guest quarters; modify Table 110.406.05.1 governing regulatory zone development standards to consolidate the separate tables into one table and to make modifications to minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and minimum lot widths for certain regulatory zones; modify the notes to Table 110.406.05.1 to add middle housing and to clarify density for single-family attached; modify common open space development standards to clarify that detention ponds and drainage facilities cannot be included in common open space; modify off-street parking requirements to add standards for the new housing types and modify the



requirements for duplexes; modify landscaping exemptions to include middle housing types; modify residential common open space standards to add dog parks and pocket parks as permissible types of open space and require common open space for all multifamily developments with five or more units; and add or amend various definitions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1734, Bill No. 1925.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Pat Davison indicated that there were not enough affordable housing units and that residents were paying for housing that was subpar or not the correct size for them. She said that families moved to outlying areas where housing was more affordable, with a commute that caused other effects. She noted that the population was growing and that code changes were one part of the solution. She mentioned that the code change would not produce an overnight fix; however, it would help change the development potential for future housing units. She voiced that some factors regarding affordable housing were out of the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) control, but the development codes were not. She asked the BCC to approve the changes as proposed.

Mr. Cliff Low indicated that Agenda Item 16 was an uphill battle and noted that he had spoken a few months prior about the thought of the code change being healthy; however, he believed that stating it did not increase density was misleading. He asked the BCC to reconsider the item so that property owners who had 10 acres zoned for one dwelling per acre could not build 10 dwellings on one acre while leaving the rest of the land as open space. He predicted that if developers took advantage of the change, constituents would wonder how the code change happened since they would see open spaces blocked by cottage homes. He said that the units would probably be on the street for people to see, instead of one unit per acre. He noted that the landscape stood to change because of the potential code change. He speculated that people would wonder why the beauty of the area was lost. He believed that those who cared would look back on the record and that most of the Commissioners would likely be termed out by the time constituents questioned the change. He said the code change would alter the County the constituents knew, loved, and wanted to protect. He requested that the proposal be reconsidered by staff to amend aspects of concern to prevent the potential ruin of the County.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Chair Hill, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Commissioner Clark voting no and Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1734, Bill No. 1925, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0229

**AGENDA ITEM 17** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 610 Final Subdivision Maps, to modify various sections in order to clarify requirements related to final subdivision maps. These amendments include requiring each final map submission to contain a minimum of 5 lots and specifying what type of parcels count toward the 5 lot minimum; updating language to ensure compliance with the Nevada Revised Statutes; adding the requirement for a water supplier certificate on the final map when served by a general improvement district; providing that an acceptable financial assurance document may be utilized in lieu of a faithful performance bond; increasing the number of days for the initial final map submittal from 60 to 120 days prior to the final date to present the map to the Director of Planning and Building for signature; removing the requirement for a phasing plan; further clarifying the timing requirements for the presentation date for the first final map and all successive final maps; and updating the names or titles of public officers and agencies as well as the names or titles of certain referenced reports/studies and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1735, Bill No. 1926.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1735, Bill No. 1926, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0230

**AGENDA ITEM 18** Public Hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Board of Adjustment's affirmance of the Washoe County Director of Planning and Building's decision to reduce the appellant's short-term rental (STR) occupancy from eight (8) persons to four (4) persons based on a reduction in designated parking from two (2) spaces to one (1) space. The appellant is requesting an occupancy of eight (8) persons based on two (2) parking spaces.

The subject parcel is located at 916 Harold Dr., Unit #36, Incline Village, NV 89451. The Assessor's parcel number is 131-140-36. The parcel of land is 0.001 acres in size with a master plan designation and regulatory zone of Tahoe - Fairway, within the Tahoe Planning Area. The appellants and property owners are Matthew J. & Bernadette M. Castagnola.

The Board of County Commissioners (Board) shall consider the appeal based on the record on appeal and any additional evidence submitted at the Board's public hearing. The Board may affirm, modify or reverse the Board of Adjustment's decision. If the Board reverses the Board of Adjustment's decision, the Board may remand the matter back to the Board of Adjustment or directly grant two (2) parking spaces and the STR occupancy of eight persons. Virtual Public Comment Eligible. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill invited staff to provide a presentation. She explained that the appellants would be allocated ten minutes for their presentation after the staff presentation concluded, and then public comment would be heard. She noted that public comment was available for the item in Incline Village.

Community Services Department (CSD) Planning & Development Senior Planner Courtney Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WSTR21-0283 (STR Appeal – 916 Harold Drive #36) April 8, 2025; Appeal Request; Vicinity Map; Summary; Previous Action; January 2, 2025, Board of Adjustment; Background – WCC – STR Parking (2 slides); Background – WCC – STR Occupancy; Background – Code Analysis; untitled photograph and text; Analysis Cont.; Response -; Public Comment; Recommendation(s); Possible Motion; Thank you.

Ms. Weiche read from the *Appeal Request* slide in her presentation. She stated that the decision of the Board of Adjustment (BOA) was based on confirmation that the STR only had one designated parking space. She described the location of the property, which was shown on the *Vicinity Map* slide. She showed the *Summary* slide and advised that she would not repeat the summary of the basis for appeal, which she provided previously. She reviewed the *Previous Action* slide, which outlined the permitting process for WSTR21-0283. She noted that Code Enforcement staff began conducting site visits in 2024 to confirm designated parking for multi-unit complexes. She said that, as a result of a site visit to Cedarcrest Condominiums, the subject STR occupancy was reduced to a maximum of four persons because there was only one assigned or designated parking space for the subject STR. Ms. Weiche displayed the *January 2, 2025, Board of Adjustment* slide and explained that the STR owner appealed the Director of Planning and Building's decision to reduce the occupancy based on the lack of adequate designated parking, and a Public Hearing was held at the January 2, 2025, BOA meeting. The BOA passed a motion that affirmed the decision of the Director on the maximum occupancy allowed for the property.

Ms. Weiche showed the *Background – WCC – STR Parking* slides and spoke about applicable Washoe County Code (WCC) sections, which she noted were highlighted on the slides. She added that many of the pertinent sections were also included in the staff report verbatim. She displayed the *Background – Code Analysis* slide and read the summary. She articulated that the more restrictive of the two occupancy limit factors applied. Ms. Weiche showed a slide with a photograph of the subject property and restated that only one parking space was designated for the property. She said the parking details

were explicitly confirmed by a letter from the Board of Directors of the Cedarcrest Condominium Homeowners Association (HOA). She noted that the letter was included in the April 8, 2025, Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting materials as Attachment I. She read from the appellant's statement from the *Analysis Cont.* slide. Ms. Weiche showed the *Response* – slide and explained that although two parking passes were given to each Cedarcrest Condominiums unit owner, there were not enough parking spaces to correspond to the number of parking passes distributed. She said parking spaces were not designated for specific units, overflow parking was on a first-come-first-served basis, and there was no way to ensure availability of the limited overflow parking spaces for STR patrons. She advised that the WCC did not allow for increased occupancy based on arrangements made with neighbors to utilize their assigned parking. She said the potential number of parking spaces, general STR violations, or lack of violations did not alter the requirements that determined parking and occupancy calculations for STRs.

Ms. Weiche showed the *Public Comment* slide and noted that the 25 public comments from the BOA meeting were included in the BCC meeting materials that day. She showed the *Recommendation(s)* and *Possible Motion* slides and said she was available for any questions.

Chair Hill invited the property owners, Matthew J. and Bernadette M. Castagnola, to present their appeal.

Mr. Castagnola displayed images of the parking areas available to them as homeowners, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. Mr. Castagnola remarked that the Fourth Amendment guaranteed the right people had to secure their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches. He likened being told what he could and could not do with his property to a seizure. He understood that there were rules, and he suggested that the County was trying to make rules to control things, including STRs. He said he and his wife had owned in Incline Village for 21 years and had always used their property as a rental. He said that in doing his research for the meeting, he became aware of the potential for STR owners to continue operating by prior guidelines if they had been following the rules prior to obtaining an STR permit. He objected to not having been informed of that provision when he called County Planning in 2021 to apply for his STR permit. He disclosed that at that time, he had been renting his property for 15 years and planned to continue renting. He listed examples of his compliance with STR guidelines and spoke about his desire to get a permit. He wanted more information about the exceptions, which he referred to as *grandfather clauses*. Regarding parking, Mr. Castagnola revealed that there were 16 spots shared among 24 non-garage units. He said he had never had a problem parking because neighbors worked together. He divulged that he understood the limitations and addressed them through agreements with four other owners to use their parking spots for his STR guests. He shared that he rented the property for approximately 50 days each year and frequently accessed it for personal use. He expressed concern about how the occupancy restrictions impacted his personal use and said he could not host his daughters and their partners because of the four-person limit. He understood restrictions on the rental, although he disputed a change to the way the occupancy limit was calculated. He contended that, because he was given two parking

permits, he should have access to use both parking spaces and, resultingly, have an eight-person occupancy limit instead of four. He described his disagreement with the use of the term *overflow parking*. He explained that the Cedarcrest Condominium HOA board was comprised of five garage-unit owners who each had two garage spots. He claimed that those owners had consistently tried to gain access to his permit spots, and they were the source of the problem. Mr. Castagnola referred to the displayed image, which he said depicted the vehicle of an HOA board member's husband who regularly and improperly parked in a permit spot despite having an empty garage. He spoke about the history his family had with renting property in the area and theorized that Incline Village survived because of tourism. He disagreed with the usage limits the County placed on his property. He disclosed that he was disabled and needed a parking spot to accommodate a second car for times when he required assistance. He did not want to provide details of his disability at the meeting, but he asked to meet privately with staff to request a variance and reasonable accommodation.

Ms. Castagnola introduced herself as an owner of 916 Harold Drive #36, Incline Village. She said she and her husband had owned and rented their property for 21 years. She conveyed that they were good neighbors, paid their taxes to the County and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and had never had complaints filed against them. She outlined her intent to address the parking issue and her concerns about the character of some of the Cedarcrest Condominium HOA board members. She said public comments had been sent by HOA board members to the BCC against her and her husband, and she thought it was important for the BCC to have the history and truth. She referenced a letter sent to the BCC signed by the Cedarcrest Condominiums HOA board, and she noted that individual board members were not identified in the letter. She asserted that the HOA board had known since September 2024 that she and her husband had filed an appeal. She claimed that the HOA board held multiple meetings since that time, but the letter the HOA board sent on behalf of the community was never discussed in an open HOA meeting. She supposed that the HOA board must have held a private meeting, which she believed was illegal and went against Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). She contended that the community did not know that the HOA board sent the letter to the BCC, and the HOA board did not accurately represent directives from owners. She speculated that the opinions expressed in the letter were only those of the HOA board, not the entire Cedarcrest community. She recalled that the HOA board undertook a survey about STRs two years prior. She shared that the survey offered three approaches: ban all current and future STRs, allow current STRs to continue operations, or completely eliminate STRs and not allow any in the future. She reported that the community overwhelmingly indicated belief that it was their constitutional right to operate an STR on their property. Ms. Castagnola argued that parking changes were never discussed with the community, and she theorized that the HOA board exploited parking restrictions as a loophole with the goal of reducing or eliminating STRs. She found that dishonest. She shared a theory from one of her neighbors that owners without a garage were good neighbors because they shared parking areas. Conversely, she opined that owners with a garage were not good neighbors and wanted to take the parking spaces of other owners. She thanked the neighbors who voted for their constitutional rights to stay in place and do what they wanted with their property. She recommended that the County observe who was making complaints, and suggested they

implement a system to keep habitual complainers from wasting staff time. She thought people should be fined for making unfounded complaints.

Commissioner Garcia asked for information about the question Mr. Castagnola raised about the possibility of an appeal or a special permit for people with medical conditions or disabilities. She did not recall having discussed that aspect of STRs previously.

Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd informed that the WCC was silent regarding any exceptions related to medical conditions. He said he was not aware of any exceptions that could be offered to Mr. Castagnola to increase the occupancy for his STR.

Chair Hill asked if there was an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) allocated parking spot in the Cedarcrest Condominiums complex. Mr. Lloyd responded that there should be, according to WCC requirements. He noted that the complex might have an exception due to its age, but all complexes in the Lake Tahoe basin should have ADA-compliant parking to meet minimum WCC requirements.

Chair Hill commented that the BCC had been diligent in their review of the STR ordinance to identify and resolve problems. She thought ADA concerns needed to be addressed, and she expressed her empathy with the appellants. She recalled extensive discussions she had with County staff about how to appropriately address enforcement of property owners and STR renters. She understood the challenge of different enforcement for owners and STR guests, but she thought it needed to be worked on further and addressed with a future ordinance. She thought it was fair to request that if complexes were going to allow STRs, they have an ADA-accessible spot in them.

Commissioner Andriola asked when parking was changed from assigned spaces to unassigned overflow spaces.

Mr. Lloyd said the County had always required one dedicated space for every four STR occupants, and there was never a time when access to an overflow parking area counted as a dedicated space. He added that the dedicated spaces had to be confirmed by the HOAs for each unit, and the County relied on the HOAs to share pertinent bylaws with the County.

Chair Hill contended that method was new. She stated that the County had not always checked with the HOAs, and it was a new part of the ordinance to address inaccurate tracking of parking by HOAs in some complexes which caused the County to get complaints. She said the County realized that they accepted the claims of owners, which were found to not always be truthful or correctly interpreted.

Mr. Lloyd informed that the County had always required dedicated parking spaces as opposed to passes to determine the occupancy limit. That had not changed. He said one dedicated parking space was required for every four occupants. He revealed that the County had been contacted by a number of complexes since the adoption of the STR

ordinance, which was why Code Enforcement staff took it upon themselves to inspect and count the number of parking spaces in each of the complexes to get a firm understanding of the number of spaces. He shared that they worked with the HOAs regarding their regulations and requirements.

Commissioner Andriola observed that the appellant had parking permits, and she asked if other people in the complex had parking permits that allowed them to use the same spot as the appellant.

Ms. Weiche stated that, according to the letter the County received from the Cedarcrest Condominiums HOA, a parking pass was required regardless of which parking space an individual was using. She explained that there was a dedicated, numbered parking space associated with each unit and additional overflow parking spaces that could be used on a first-come-first-served basis. She emphasized that, according to that letter, people still needed a permit to indicate that they had a right to park in any overflow spaces.

Commissioner Andriola said that she understood what Ms. Weiche communicated but wanted to ask the appellants if they had two permits: one for their dedicated, permanent space and another one that allowed them to park in the additional spaces referred to as overflow parking. She sought clarification about how many permits Mr. and Ms. Castagnola technically had for the parking spaces allocated to them.

Ms. Weiche read from the letter provided by the HOA, which outlined that there was a total of 40 parking spaces in the development, of which 24 were designated as assigned spaces. The other 16 were designated as permit-only or overflow parking. Owners of units without a garage were provided two parking permits. One permit allowed them to park in their assigned numbered space, and the other permit allowed them to park in any overflow space. She surmised that the appellant was suggesting that because they had two permits, they had two parking spaces, which she said was not true. She explained that for each non-garaged unit to have two assigned spaces, there would need to be 48 parking spaces in the complex. There were only 40, which was insufficient for each owner to have two designated spaces.

Commissioner Andriola wondered if someone else could park in the owner's permitted overflow parking space. Ms. Weiche believed, based on her experience reading through the comments, that a permit was still required to park in the overflow parking area. Commissioner Andriola recalled that the owner had two permits and said that was where she was confused.

Mr. Castagnola disclosed that he had served on the Cedarcrest Condominiums HOA board multiple times and was involved in an update to the covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) a couple of years prior. He disclosed that his initial STR permit application included a letter from the HOA board specifying that he had two parking passes that were exclusively for him. He contended that the complex did not have overflow parking, and he suggested that the HOA board used that term intentionally to create difficulty for STR owners. He commented that there were five board members who

had garage units and did not like STRs. He revealed that three of those HOA board members had stated publicly that they wanted access to permit spots for their friends. He restated that nobody without a permit could park in the complex, and he noted that the garage units were not supposed to park in those spaces either. He referenced the displayed picture and claimed that a board member's husband regularly parked his work truck in that overflow area, which was against regulations because he had a garage. Mr. Castagnola divulged that he had made complaints to the HOA and received a response from the truck-owner's wife to say the matter had been dealt with.

Commissioner Andriola asked if Mr. Castagnola had the authority to have the person parked in the picture move. Mr. Castagnola explained that either a complaint had to be made with the HOA to get the person to move, or he could call the management company to get them moved. He noted that there was a period of time that had to elapse before a car could be towed. He described that he had made numerous complaints about people without permits parked in spots where a permit was required, and he said the HOA board did nothing. Commissioner Andriola asked if other people who had permits could park in that spot. Mr. Castagnola affirmed that people who, like him, had a red permit could park in that spot. Commissioner Andriola summarized that Mr. and Ms. Castagnola had one designated parking slot for their unit, in which nobody else could park, and they also had other designated parking areas in which they could use their second permit. She understood that other permit holders could also park in the secondary parking areas. Mr. Castagnola affirmed her understanding and mentioned that the additional parking spaces were spread around the complex. He shared that he and his wife also had agreements with other friends to use their numbered spot if they needed it, which he said they rarely did.

Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards stated that the answer provided to Commissioner Andriola's question resolved what he was going to provide for the record. He discerned that the point raised by the appellant about other neighbors having numbered, assigned spots that they allowed the appellant to use was a more germane question for the BCC to evaluate. He summarized that the essential question was whether there were two designated parking spaces for that unit, which was required by the ordinance. He advised that Commissioners could explore whether they felt an agreement with a neighbor to provide access to a numbered, designated parking spot counted as a second spot.

Commissioner Andriola asked County staff to explain their process for consideration of any *grandfather clauses*, by which she meant allowances for the continued use of pre-existing standards instead of strict enforcement of all current standards. In relation to STRs, she wondered if *grandfather clauses* were considered consistently and how ordinance changes would affect that. Mr. Lloyd responded that STRs were identified in the WCC as a privileged use, not a use by right. He said that, as such, they were subject to annual renewal. He explained that the County relied on STR applicants to provide a self-certification every year, and there was a requirement for an inspection to be performed by County staff and fire staff every three years to verify WCC compliance. He added that if it was determined that the STR was not in compliance, including with parking, the County required that the STR be brought into compliance. Commissioner Andriola said she wanted



to clarify that even though something might be considered *grandfathered in*, the WCC dictated compliance requirements.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Andriola for her clarification questions and remarked that the County did not have an ordinance governing STRs until 2021. Starting at that time, all STR owners were required to apply for a permit.

Commissioner Clark commented that HOA boards came and went, and what might be acceptable to an HOA could change from year to year. He advocated for the County to be consistent with rules and regulations. He expressed concern about the distinction between designated parking and overflow parking. He recalled that Mr. and Ms. Castagnola reported having lived in the Cedarcrest complex for over 20 years, and he wondered if they had encountered situations where all of the overflow parking was used. He concluded that was a possibility because the number of permits issued exceeded the number of spaces available. He supported further research into the potential of an accommodation based on a *grandfather clause* or ADA accommodation. He summarized that Mr. Castagnola had two parking permits and a disability, was a well-established landlord in good standing, and had no complaints against him. He thought that if there were neighbors who were willing to work with Mr. Castagnola and allow him to use their designated parking space, the BCC should take that into consideration. He viewed the appeal as an example of the unintended consequences of broadly applied rules and regulations. He supported finding a way to preserve the rights of the property owners to continue utilizing their property as they had been. Commissioner Clark felt that Mr. Castagnola should be able to use both of his parking permits.

Chair Hill expressed her sympathy with the appellant and stated agreement with Commissioner Clark's observation that HOAs could change their regulations. She had heard different views from people about HOAs and knew there could be conflicts. She was curious about the County staff's perspective but understood if they needed more time to think. She was not comfortable granting the appeal but wanted to consider a change to the STR ordinance. She wondered about the possibility of a notarized statement from a neighbor to allow someone to use their spot, but she acknowledged that could be complicated. She said that the County looked to HOAs for guidance and support. She supposed staff could work on a solution and bring it back to the BCC for consideration and noted that the BCC reviewed the STR ordinance annually. She remarked that similar issues occurred in other places, and she reminded the Board about why they adopted the ordinance. She said the ordinance was created in part to address community complaints about STR guests leaving vehicles on public rights-of-way. She reported there were now very few complaints about parking due to strict enforcement, but she wanted to find the right balance between enforcement and accommodation.

Mr. Lloyd voiced that the parking issue was complex, and he did not want to speak for all of the staff. He predicted that exemptions could lead to concerns about fairness and enforcement. He disclosed that staff sympathized with the property owners and that similar issues arose frequently. He said that he and his staff wanted to find solutions but did not yet know what that would entail. He thought that discussion could be

had and the matter brought back to the Board. He disclosed that he had concerns due to the volatility of the issue in the Incline Village community.

Chair Hill acknowledged the challenge of enforcement and remarked that she knew it was never good to devise a solution at the dais. She said that the discussions would continue, and she appreciated that the appellants brought the issues to light.

Commissioner Clark said there were hundreds of HOAs in the County, including dozens or more in Incline Village. He did not think siding with the appellants would encourage an influx of similar appeals and cause problems. He noted that Mr. Castagnola had been renting out his property for many years and no complaints had been registered against him. In light of that, Commissioner Clark supported consideration of *grandfather clause* exceptions. He thought the BCC should look at all the facts and decide, not reduce the decision to one parking spot or changes made by the HOA board. Commissioner Clark theorized that Mr. Castagnola would not have voted for those particular guidelines if he was still on the HOA board. Commissioner Clark supposed the case was fundamentally about competing desires of owners with and without garages. He said the BCC did not have any control over those competing desires, but he thought representation from both kinds of property owners was important.

Commissioner Garcia disclosed that she often wrestled with HOA matters. She stated that she was not in favor of granting the appeal, but she did want the BCC to address ADA considerations in the WCC. She theorized that granting an appeal based on parking agreements to circumvent the number of assigned spaces could create difficulty for staff and enforcement. She supported the idea of a homeowner with a documented disability obtaining a signed, notarized letter from a neighbor in the event that they needed extra services or support from a caregiver. She acknowledged the complaint about restrictions being placed on a private property owner, but she noted that STRs were a privileged use. She divulged that she lived in an HOA and was often frustrated with restrictions, but she predicted that it would cause many people to be upset if Commissioners chose to selectively enforce different parking restrictions for different owners. She wanted the WCC to address ADA accommodations, and she advocated for providing access to people who could benefit from that recognition. She said that the matter was important to her personally.

ADA Edwards offered that more specificity could be provided about ADA requirements, but he advised that it would not affect the analysis of the appeal. He said ADA requirements superseded WCC requirements, and it did not matter if the WCC contained specific wording to address ADA requirements. He explained that there had to be a demonstration about how an ADA accommodation would address the disability. He clarified that a disability claim did not automatically warrant an additional parking space so that other people could use the property. He said STR restrictions did not affect the ability of the owners to use their assigned numbered space and their other permit to park in the overflow areas.

Chair Hill countered that the STR restrictions affected the property owner

at all times. She said the owner and STR guests were treated the same, which she had previously disputed with staff. She shared that after the dispute, she understood the rationale as it pertained to Code Enforcement staff who had to manage different constituents. She summarized that the concern was the near impossibility of differentiating between a property owner and an STR guest.

ADA Edwards expressed concern about some of the ways STR restrictions were applied, and Chair Hill responded that the concerns could be addressed with a future code amendment. ADA Edwards mentioned that, without litigating the issue during the meeting, it concerned him that owners were told that they could not use their permits. He understood that was not what was being decided that day, but he noted that approach was potentially problematic. He said he would just leave it at that for that day, but it could be discussed more at another time. He reiterated that an ADA accommodation had to specifically address a disability. He described an example in which somebody applied for a variance to build an elevator in their property because they had a disability, and the WCC prohibited an elevator from being built in that particular property. He reported that an ADA analysis was done, and the owner was ultimately allowed to build the elevator within their property because they had a disability, the elevator accommodated that disability, and therefore, the ADA trumped the prohibitions in the WCC.

Commissioner Andriola observed that creating regulations was difficult because the potential implications were not always immediately obvious. She opined that the BCC needed to follow the guidelines established in the STR ordinance, whether they agreed with them or not. She added that further revisions to the STR ordinance could be considered when appropriate. She did not support any consideration of a *grandfather clause*, because she said the regulations in the ordinance were clear. She supported HOAs reporting what the parking allocations were for each STR unit. She summarized that the appellant had one parking permit for a designated space and a second permit that allowed access to an additional parking space. She noted that somebody else with the same type of permit could also park in those additional spaces. She said it was clear to her that the owner had one designated parking spot for his particular unit, and the people who lived in that area had a second permit that gave them the ability to park in any other permitted overflow area. She restated that the BCC did not get to choose to enforce what they did or did not agree with, and she drew a comparison to law enforcement and the judicial system, which might not agree with every law but still had to enforce them equally. She recommended that the appeal be denied.

Commissioner Clark restated that the appellant had two permits. He was concerned that the HOA board could turn permitted spots into overflow spots, and he discerned that was a matter the BCC could rule on to establish consistent guidelines. He recalled that ADA Edwards noted that the owners could not fully utilize their property at that time because of occupancy restrictions. Commissioner Clark stated that needed to be addressed. He observed that sometimes the property was owner-occupied, and sometimes it was occupied by STR tenants, but the fact was that 916 Harold Drive, Unit #36 came with two permits. He wondered how the two permits could be taken away from people who had them and questioned whether the BCC should even be trying to do that.

Chair Hill said that Commissioner Clark brought up good points, but she warned that because of how the WCC was written and the way the condominium complexes were managed, there could be a large number of appeals if the BCC overturned the decision of the BOA.

Commissioner Clark thought the issue needed a large-scale fix, and he asked what would happen in the meantime.

Chair Hill affirmed that the owners would retain exclusive access to their one dedicated parking space if that was the vote of the BCC.

Commissioner Clark recalled a time when Commissioner Andriola asked for a hold while horse permitting regulations were under consideration. He requested a hold on the occupancy restrictions placed on 916 Harold Drive, Unit #36 until the BCC reached a resolution on STRs.

Commissioner Andriola asked that the record reflect that the hold Commissioner Clark referred to about horse permitting was not in any official way because the BCC was not allowed to do a hold. She said she wished it was possible to have a hold, but the BCC was not legally allowed to.

Chair Hill noted that people were still getting citations with regard to the horse permitting matter.

Commissioner Andriola remarked that the BCC had a responsibility to follow the ordinance, even if it was difficult. She felt that in some ways it would be great to be able to table the item, but she discerned that the parking regulations and their impact on occupancy limits were clear. She added that Ms. Weiche and Mr. Lloyd both pointed out that STR ownership was a privilege. She stated that if an owner did not want to apply for an STR or wanted to stop their STR license at any time, they could do that and would then have the full property rights rather than the regulations that came with the STR privilege.

Chair Hill supposed that the BCC's review of the STR ordinance would be ongoing.

ADA Edwards recalled that the appellant offered to have a private conversation with staff about ADA accommodation. He theorized that, if an accommodation were granted, it would potentially address Mr. Castagnola's ability to use his property and have access to the extra parking space when it was available. He strongly recommended that staff follow up with the appellant on the matter, and he thought it would potentially resolve the ADA concerns. He noted that an ADA accommodation would not solve the bigger issue, but he said that it would immediately address a piece of it.

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Castagnola thanked Commissioner Clark for his understanding of the issue. She divulged that she and her husband had hired an attorney, as ADA Edwards mentioned, and she wanted to have a private meeting with their attorney and County staff. She emphasized the importance of ADA compliance and did not think the BCC could deny her husband access to their second parking space. She said denial of his access would result in litigation with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), fair housing, and the County. She thought the issue should be tabled so discussions could happen with their attorney present. She wanted to ensure that the rights of her husband were not violated. She spoke about an email that she said her attorney would follow up on. She was concerned that private information about their neighbors was shared in that email, and she revealed that her attorney was drafting an email to the HOA attorney to address what she viewed as a breach of confidentiality. She said that her husband did not give permission to have that email shared. She opined that names and emails should have been redacted before messages were shared. She thought the whole process needed to be evaluated because people were chiming in with all their hate and not the facts.

Chair Hill noted that the BCC could not address public comment, but she indicated that she heard what Ms. Castagnola said.

Ms. Castagnola asked if the personal information could be removed or if she had to go through an attorney for that. She asserted that her husband did not give permission for that email to be shared.

Chair Hill advised that those points would be addressed with the DA's Office.

Mr. Castagnola contended that owners had the right to rent out their property. He disagreed with the occupancy limits placed on his property but said he could accept the limitation for rental purposes. His primary objection was the application of the occupancy limit to his personal family use, the result of which was that he and his wife could not be there at the same time as their two daughters and their partners because they were limited to four occupants. He confirmed that Commissioner Andriola was correct in her understanding about the number of parking spaces, and there were 16 spots for 24 units. He said 24 owners had that extra pass for a total of two passes each. He added that owners were limited to two vehicles on the property at any one time and could not have a third vehicle at the complex, whether from an owner or a visitor. He shared that the system was inconvenient at times but had worked for the 20 years he had lived in the Cedarcrest complex. He appreciated the support for ADA accommodation provided by Commissioner Garcia. He disclosed that during his time on the HOA board, he was made aware of an accommodation for somebody within the complex to have an extra parking permit for a permit spot.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. and Ms. Castagnola for the clarification. She restated her support for tabling the item to give an opportunity for legal

advice, particularly regarding ADA compliance. She asked if it was possible to table the item.

ADA Edwards clarified that there was a statutory 60-day deadline for the STR appeal. Separately, he recommended that staff work with the appellant towards the resolution of their issues. He advised that the BCC move forward with a vote on the item, and said the appellant could meet with staff in the meantime to explore an ADA accommodation to allow them to use their property with the additional space they had the permit for. He noted that the accommodation would be for private family use of the owners, not for STR purposes.

Mr. Lloyd suggested that the County might have an accommodation mechanism through what he termed a modification of standards. He stated his intention to speak with the applicant to offer that route.

Chair Hill summarized that the review and discussion was beneficial and helped inform additional review of the STR ordinance. She thanked the appellants and staff for taking the time to present and discuss.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Commissioner Clark voting no and Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be denied and the decision of the BOA, as outlined in the staff report be upheld.

**2:54 p.m.**      **Commissioner Clark left the meeting.**

**25-0231**      **AGENDA ITEM 15** Discussion and direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by legislators, by Washoe County, or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues as may be deemed by the Chair or the Board to be of critical significance to Washoe County. Pending legislative bills can be located here:

<<[<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025/Bills/List>>](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025/Bills/List)>>.

Current bills the County is tracking that may be reported on or discussed are listed under Government Affairs at

<[<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>](https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php)>. Due to time constraints inherent in the legislative process, a list

of specific bills that staff will seek direction from the Commission on during this item will be posted on the web site under Government Affairs at

<[<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>](https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php)> by 6:00 p.m. the Friday before the meeting. Due to the rapid pace of the legislative session, additional bills upon which comment may be sought from the Board of County Commissioners will be posted as soon as known. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager Eric Brown indicated that Government Affairs Liaison

Cadence Matijevich was unavailable for discussion. He noted that Ms. Matijevich did not have any new bills for consideration; however, he was available for follow-up requests or questions.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Cliff Low mentioned that he believed the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had not yet taken a position on Senate Bill (SB) 319, enabling the formation of a new fire protection services entity. He wanted to ensure his voice was added to Mr. Thomas Daly's to encourage the BCC to oppose SB 319.

**25-0232      AGENDA ITEM 19 Public Comment.**

Ms. Louise Souffront thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), noted that she had the opportunity to listen to the BCC, and described her appreciation for their efforts. She stated her intent to address Commissioner Andriola's previous comments, which she noted had preceded the discussion of the Washoe County Checkbook. She urged the Board to consider that individual County residents had restricted their budgets to essentials. She emphasized that the community libraries in the County were essential. She suggested that there were categories of what was wanted and needed in a budget and asserted that the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) was a necessity. She noted that more efficiencies could be implemented in the library budget by a judicious review. She asserted that the pause mentioned in Commissioner Andriola's earlier comments should not be an excuse to decrease the funding and services. She requested that the funding be kept at the same level without firing employees, layoffs, or reducing services or hours. She opined the Board could succeed in those efforts if they looked hard and realized how fundamental it was. She reiterated her belief that the Board could achieve her requests. She urged the Board to use the available funding to maintain the WCLS. She asserted that the library was essential for the community and an excellent service to all.

Mr. Cliff Low introduced himself and observed that only three Commissioners were present at that time, as Commissioner Clark had stepped away. Mr. Low noted that the topic he was to discuss affected Commissioner Clark's district. He hoped he knew how Commissioner Clark felt about the topic. He requested that the Board consider his comment not as members of the BCC, but as members of the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC). He said that for a number of reasons, he had been unable to attend the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) meeting that had taken place the week prior. He said that fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) for Washoe Valley, particularly those in west Washoe Valley, had been mismanaged for a long time. He wanted to give a historical background and asked how long the Board thought it had been since the idea was approved, largely by the predecessors of the BOFC, to build a new consolidated station near the north end of Washoe Valley, Station 31. He asked if the Board wanted to guess the answer to his question and acknowledged that they could not speak to that topic. He revealed that the approval was given in January of 2020, which he emphasized was over five years prior. He asked if any substantive progress had been made toward getting Station 31 built. He clarified that he was not saying that people had not tried, but he knew there had been rumors of politics resulting in the delay. He stated that the cost of constructing Station 31 had skyrocketed, and he was unaware whether anyone had

identified a source of funding for the project. He opined that the Board was unfortunately a long way from the event most BOFC members wanted to attend, with lots of smiles and shovels present at the groundbreaking event for Station 31. He provided additional history and time frames. He hoped the Board would remember when Station 30 was closed as a TMFPD station and asked if the Board knew how long ago that closure had taken place. He reported that it had been closed nearly three years prior, in August of 2022. He stated that Station 30 was closed due to an alleged bat infestation. He reflected that he had spoken to a neighbor earlier that week who was unaware that Station 30 had closed and described that the reason was that it appeared as though it was an active station to those driving past because the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) was using the old Station 30. He added that during times of heavy exposure to wildfire, the house was occupied and lived in 24 hours a day. He opined that the NDF was not subjecting its staff to a bat infestation. He suggested that the opportunity to act on that had passed, and he believed that TMFPD would not be able to get that facility back from the NDF. He requested that the Board reconsider some of the ideas that were proposed when Station 30 was closed, particularly standing up the volunteer station on Bellevue Road and spending the money needed to get that station operational.

Mr. Jon Belfort reflected that he personally had only been met with bad faith and ill-natured remarks regarding parking spaces and rental. He opined that he was forced to file a \$5 million claim against the County. He reported that he had filed several documents at the Second Judicial District Court and recited a case number. He noted that he had a set of images of County employees. He expressed frustration with County employees, particularly with the Planning Manager of the Community Services Department, Planning & Development. He suggested that there had been a lack of recognition of the extenuating circumstances he had presented. He noted that he had not received acknowledgment from Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Mary Kandaras for having contracted COVID-19 (C19) and suffering residual effects while serving as a volunteer fireman for TMFPD. He noted those circumstances were never mentioned or considered by Washoe County staff. He declared that the 80 residents of the area surrounding Wilcox Ranch Road in Palomino Valley had defective titles and were victims of crime. He asserted that he and those residents had been making certain representations and informing the County of the issue. He suggested a reconsideration of the facts that had been documented and submitted by residents over the past three and a half years and postulated that they had been ignored throughout that time. He asserted that the motives for such action had become apparent and suggested that those were based on a personal grudge, related to financial interests, or a combination of both. He alleged that the impacted residents would not disengage from the issue and reiterated that the issue had been ongoing for an extended period.

**25-0233      AGENDA ITEM 20 Announcements/Reports.**

There were no announcements or reports.



\* \* \* \* \*

**3:06 p.m.** There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**ALEXIS HILL**, Chair  
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

---

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

*Minutes Prepared by:*  
*Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Jessica Melka Deputy County Clerk*  
*Brooke Koerner Deputy County Clerk*