

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

MARCH 10, 2026

PRESENT:

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

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

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

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Andriola announced that the public hearing was a time-certain item and would not be heard before 1:00 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

**26-0139** **AGENDA ITEM 3** Public Comment.

Harry Swenson said that he lived year-round in Incline Village and was an applicant for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). He thanked the Board for the opportunity and for encouraging full-time Lake Tahoe Basin (the Basin) residents to apply. He emphasized the importance of selecting someone who appreciated Lake Tahoe's wonder while understanding the realities of living there. He believed that residents faced ongoing challenges, including wildfire risk, complex evacuation planning, heavy snowfall that affected transportation, and summer traffic congestion on the two-lane roads. He thought that full-time residents directly experienced issues such as workforce housing affordability, the needs of schoolchildren and seniors, and the impacts of millions of annual visitors. He noted that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) played an important role in advising the Governing Board on emerging science and policy issues that affected both the Basin and its residents. He emphasized that it would be essential for the appointee to understand and clearly communicate the science behind those policies and their impact. He shared that the TRPA played a critical role in protecting Lake Tahoe, which he referred to

as the jewel of the Sierra, and ensuring its sustainability for future generations. He thought some residents might perceive regulations as onerous or unevenly applied, and he stressed the importance of improving understanding and communication. He said that, looking ahead, challenges such as transportation congestion and emerging concerns like microplastics warranted continued attention and research. He mentioned that visitor education was critical so that everyone understood their responsibility to protect Lake Tahoe. He indicated that his family had been visiting Lake Tahoe since the 1960s and that he had lived there for the past 12 years. He explained that, following a career with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) focused on science, technology, and management, he hoped to apply his experiences and deep appreciation for Lake Tahoe to help protect it for future generations.

Thomas Daly read a document regarding his concerns related to the Sierra Reflections development, the possibility of overturning the Planning Commission's (PC) decision to deny the tentative map and Special Use Permit, and possible dangers to constituents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk.

Terry Brooks shared an original poem about discrimination based on politics and age.

Curtis Coulter read a document outlining his concerns regarding the Sierra Reflections development's zoning regulations, land use, infrastructure needs, and compliance with Nevada law, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk.

Beverly Silva read a document regarding her concerns related to the Sierra Reflections appeal and traffic impacts, sewer infrastructure, and who was responsible for paying for new infrastructure, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk.

Drew Ribar, a candidate for Nevada Assembly District 40 and a resident of Washoe Valley, said that he had many conversations with residents during his campaign and mentioned that he drove past the proposed Sierra Reflections development daily. He stated that he purchased his property in Washoe Valley because of its rural setting. He noted that if Pleasant Valley were developed, it was important to maintain its rural character. He stated that he had not spoken with anyone in Washoe Valley who supported the proposed subdivision and suggested that voters were opposed to it. He added that numerous legal concerns had been raised by other speakers and urged the Board to vote against the project. He mentioned concerns about the availability of well water if the new development were approved and believed others shared those concerns. He explained that Washoe Valley had only one fire station and cautioned that adding approximately 1,000 homes could result in insufficient fire protection.

Jay Howard, a longtime Washoe Valley resident and Nevada resident for more than 60 years, shared his concerns about the Sierra Reflections application. He requested that the proposal be denied, stating that it was incompatible with the land and resources of the Truckee Meadows and South Valleys. He asserted that adequate studies had been conducted on groundwater availability for the proposed 940 single-family

dwellings and mentioned his apprehension regarding the valley's water supply. He urged the Board to deny the development, adding that it could negatively affect water availability for existing Pleasant Valley and Washoe Valley residents, particularly during drought years. He raised concerns about increased vehicle trips, traffic congestion, public safety response times and capacity, and the deterioration of the quality of life. He concluded by reiterating his opposition and asked the Board to protect the water supply and quality of life in the South Valleys.

Christopher Wood, a resident of Incline Village and candidate for the TRPA's APC, said that the APC functioned in an advisory capacity, collected technical and planning information, and offered perspective. He noted that the Board was responsible for appointing a lay member from Washoe County to represent the community. He shared that the APC recently recommended to the TRPA that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared for the recent planning changes, which he felt were significant. He explained that the EIS was the most extensive and difficult analysis conducted, and added that the recommendation came from the APC through its work with the Tahoe Living Working Group, which had gathered technical and planning information over two years. He noted that the Tahoe Living Working Group suggested that if planning rules for the Basin were to be changed, an EIS should be prepared. He mentioned that the Washoe County lay member should be non-technical and represent and voice the community's opinions. He suggested that residents in Incline Village had varied opinions, and he felt it was important that the lay member understood the diverse personalities and opinions to communicate them to the APC.

Taylor Hodges, a Steamboat Valley resident, expressed his opposition to the Sierra Reflections development. He recalled prior warnings about mercury contamination in water and wells related to mining in the Virginia Range and felt that similar issues could affect the proposed development. He shared issues related to the current infrastructure being overwhelmed, high winds that caused the closure of portions of Interstate 580, and ongoing congestion on Eastlake Boulevard. He thought that many residents chose to live in Washoe Valley for its rural, outdoor lifestyle. He added that local athletic fields could become overcrowded, creating safety concerns for children during drop-off times. He asserted that the community overwhelmingly opposed the project and urged the Board to represent its constituents by not overburdening existing resources. He asked the Board to uphold the Planning Commission's (PC) denial of the appeal, as the community opposed the development.

Philip Gilanfarr, an applicant for a lay member position on the TRPA's APC, noted that he had lived in the Basin for more than 60 years and had operated an architectural office in Incline Village since 1989. He explained that, over the course of his career, he worked extensively with the TRPA, Washoe County, and other jurisdictions on a wide range of projects throughout the region, particularly within the Basin. He expressed appreciation for the TRPA's critical role in protecting Lake Tahoe and welcomed the opportunity to contribute his experience through service on the APC as the Washoe County representative. He said that his background provided a practical understanding of how the TRPA policies were developed, implemented, and affected the Basin and its communities.

He felt that Lake Tahoe was an extraordinary place, and that the TRPA was essential to protecting it. He mentioned that after five decades of living and working in the Basin, he wanted the opportunity to serve Washoe County and the Basin to ensure that planning decisions would continue to protect the Basin and support healthy communities. He suggested that the APC was primarily a technical advisory commission that reviewed planning policies, development proposals, environmental issues, and the Basin, and made recommendations to the governing board and the governing body. He thought that the TRPA conducted a very limited project-specific review and did not make a final ruling. He shared that his work had required extensive interaction with the TRPA, the regulatory system, and Washoe County's regulations to interpret regulations related to coverage, land capacity, scenic standards, environmental, fire, and forest health. He felt that his experience qualified him, as did his many years of involvement in community planning efforts. He noted that over 40 years ago, he was involved in the Incline Village and Crystal Bay community plans, and then again in the incorporation of the Tahoe Area Plan (TAP). He mentioned that with his prior independent architectural and planning experience, he would contribute his experience and long-term perspective to planning in the Basin and how it would affect the community. If appointed, he said he would be honored to serve Washoe County and the Basin by providing thoughtful, balanced recommendations and supporting environmental protection and a strong community.

Autumn Harry said that she was a member of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, an artist, and a muralist who lived on the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Reservation. She shared that she worked with Vice Chair Garcia in 2025 on a mural project in Verdi. She thanked the Board for previously approving her mural project at the Sparks Library and noted that the fiscal sponsor had changed to Honor the Earth. She displayed images of the last mural project in Verdi along the river, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She explained that her first image was at Riverbend Park and showed Lahontan cutthroat trout swimming upstream, without any barriers, along the Truckee River. She said she often included trout and other fish in her artwork because she was a fly-fishing guide at Pyramid Lake. She stated that the mural project focused on recognizing a keystone species within the area. She mentioned that the second image was a coyote and its pup, and included native plants such as Indian paintbrush, sage, and cattails. She pointed out that the mural was intended to draw viewers to the river and the ecosystem around it, and noted that it merged the desert with the alpine area. She mentioned that the third image was of a black bear and its cub, and that the image included lupine and pine trees. She shared that much of her artwork focused on the Truckee River watershed and how the community could do more to protect the river and the land, as well as on indigenous rights and the indigenous connection to the land. She thanked the Board and asked them to approve Agenda Item 7E3 to allow collaboration for the mural at the Sparks Library.

Helen Neff, an Incline Village resident, said she felt encouraged that nine individuals had applied for Washoe County's lay member appointment to the TRPA's APC. She shared that it would be essential that the appointee be able to represent Washoe County and the local community without limitations or potential conflicts. She pointed out issues, including applicants who did not reside in Incline Village or Crystal Bay, an applicant who did not appear to be registered to vote in Washoe County, several applicants

who disclosed potential conflicts of interest related to matters that might go before the APC. She noted that some applicants currently served on other Washoe County boards. After reviewing the applications, she expressed her support for Harry Swenson. She said that the APC played an important role in evaluating complex environmental and planning issues affecting the Basin, including interpreting and understanding science for the TRPA governing board. She believed that Mr. Swenson's extensive scientific background, management, and leadership experience qualified him for the role. She mentioned that as a full-time resident of Incline Village, he was directly familiar with the community most affected by the APC's work. She shared that his involvement in local issues demonstrated a clear commitment to the well-being of Lake Tahoe and its residents, along with the balanced background needed to engage thoughtfully with the technical information that often informed the TRPA's decision-making. She noted that having a representative who lived in and experienced the Basin community firsthand ensured that Washoe County's voice at the APC reflected the realities and needs of the residents most directly affected by its decisions. She highlighted Mr. Swenson's personal commitment to neighbors, citing his support for a senior friend with Alzheimer's Disease. She noted Mr. Swenson took this friend weekly to the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) Conversation Café and then to lunch, providing important social interaction. She added that Incline Village had limited senior services, and Mr. Swenson's actions demonstrated his kindness and compassion. She thanked the Board for their consideration and service to Washoe County.

**26-0140**      **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas welcomed Jason Bennett, a speech and debate teacher at Coral Academy of Science Middle School, and his class to the Washoe County Commission Chambers and thanked them for attending.

Chair Andriola welcomed the class and shared that members of the Board had viewed the video featuring 468 students who attempted to set a Guinness World Record. She thanked Mr. Bennett for creating an incredible experience.

Commissioner Herman shared that she had been approached by constituents who asked her to inform the Board that they believed the Board of County Commissioners (BCCs) did not fully understand its role. She suggested that some constituents felt certain Commissioners had greater allegiance to members of the Reno City Council than to Washoe County. She stated that Commissioners took an oath of office to serve the people who elected them and relayed that constituents believed the Board could do a better job.

Commissioner Hill shared that the Board had previously received a presentation from the Verdi Television (TV) District and asked whether staff could review the information the Verdi TV District provided to the BCC to determine whether the County could take on its management. She wondered whether it made sense to have a separate Verdi TV District, or if staff through the Community Services Department (CSD) could manage it. She suggested that if the County took it over, it would create greater transparency for residents, as she had heard concerns from her constituents about not

knowing who the Verdi TV District board members were, the lack of transparency in meetings, and the district's budget. She recognized that the previous meeting with the Verdi TV District had been difficult and questioned whether the Board would be willing to assume that responsibility. She stated that because reviewing the information would take longer than two staff hours, it would require a staff report to approve staff to examine the information and generate a report for the Board to determine how to proceed. She felt it was important to listen to her constituents' concerns to determine the best way to support Verdi's residents.

Commissioner Hill mentioned a disturbing report she had received from a Washoe County staff member, who shared a text message from developer Mark Campbell requesting an easement from Washoe County. She emphasized the importance of decorum and ethics, noting that Mr. Campbell had suggested a quid pro quo in exchange for campaign donations. She said she would never agree to such unlawful requests that did not align with her ethics. She asked the District Attorney's (DAs) Office to investigate the reported text message and clarified that she had never received money from Mr. Campbell or his development group. She said the Board did not make decisions based on money, and she found it disturbing that someone would suggest otherwise. She emphasized that the Board's priority was to serve the public and to be committed to making Washoe County a better place. She acknowledged that candidates would solicit campaign donations during elections to introduce themselves to the public but emphasized that the Board did not make decisions in exchange for contributions. She expressed concern about the misperception that elected officials would accept money to influence decisions and stated that situations like hers must be addressed immediately. She concluded that paying politicians was unacceptable and noted she was pleased the DA's Office was investigating the matter. She expressed her feeling disheartened by the incident.

Chair Andriola thanked Commissioner Hill for the disclosure and acknowledged that the matter was under investigation. She requested that Washoe County consider, as the investigation continued, whether any funds had been transferred from Washoe County to organizations with which Mr. Campbell had been affiliated with. She indicated that she found it troubling that anyone would believe they could influence officials through financial means and emphasized that such actions would be illegal, unethical, and improper.

Commissioner Clark acknowledged his fellow Commissioners for their condemnation and stated that he did not support accepting funds as a quid pro quo. He indicated that he had personally received a check from a local cannabis lounge in exchange for a vote on a specific item, but refused to cash it. He explained that he could relate to Commissioner Hill's experience of being offered money in exchange for an alleged vote. He mentioned that he retained the uncashed check as a reminder not to accept funds or campaign contributions in exchange for a vote.

Commissioner Clark addressed a situation that had been recently reported in the news. He indicated that Chair Andriola had called to inform him that she had recently spoken with City of Reno Mayor Hillary Schieve, but could not share details of their

conversation. He expressed frustration that the Board was left to navigate another matter without transparency. After contacting multiple sources, including Washoe County Sheriff (WCSO) Darin Balaam, he reported that no additional information was available. He explained that Mayor Schieve asked Chair Andriola to inform the Board that the City of Reno would hold a press conference. He said no further details were provided to the Commissioners. He assumed that if the Reno Police Department (RPD) Chief, Kathryn Nance, was being placed on administrative leave, it was likely due to performance issues. He stated that citizens and taxpayers should receive information, and although it would likely not be specific details, he felt the community deserved a better explanation of what was taking place. He believed that Sheriff Balaam would be commandeered to run the RPD. He indicated that his comments were about the lack of transparency and added that if more information were shared, he would not need to make any further comments.

Commissioner Clark said he thought the sheriff was elected by Washoe County taxpayers, who had not been informed that the sheriff would need to assist in other jurisdictions. He suggested that there were many other individuals with law enforcement backgrounds who could be named interim police chief for the RPD. He shared that, while he respected the RPD, he felt the action taken was disrespectful to all sworn officers. He questioned why no one within the RPD could be promoted and asked why the County needed to step in to help. He agreed with a prior statement made by Commissioner Herman regarding the public's questioning of the allegiance of members at the dais. He said he was unclear why County taxpayers should be responsible for bailing out the City of Reno and added that the City of Reno offered to pay for the cost of the interim assistance. He noted that the bigger issue was available time. He wondered how the sheriff or undersheriff had enough time to help. He believed that the RPD needed mentoring and training, which he felt should be done by its own leadership. He used an analogy of loaning a car to a neighbor, and then not having a car to use, which he noted made no sense. He stated that the City of Reno had a mayor for over 12 years, but the term limit was 12 years, yet she remained in the position. He mentioned that the Reno City Council included at least three appointed individuals, who were not elected but appointed by someone within the City of Reno. He believed that the decision disenfranchised voters when each Reno City Council member was appointed. He questioned who oversaw supervising the RPD Chief, who was under investigation, and added that the City of Reno should handle its issue and not expect Washoe County to step in. He felt that reflected a breakdown in management within the City of Reno. He reiterated that he believed there was a lack of transparency and the community needed to know what had occurred. He stated that voters had not made the choice but were being forced to accept the decision that was made for them.

Commissioner Clark read a prepared statement. No copy was submitted for the record. He said that, as Washoe County District 2 Commissioner, he wanted to understand why he, and potentially other members of the Commission, were not consulted by Sheriff Balaam regarding the reported agreement under which the WCSO would assume leadership roles at the RPD during an investigation involving the Nevada Department of Public Safety. He explained that, according to the report, the City of Reno would pay the sheriff to take over key leadership functions during the investigation. He thought that the arrangement raised a straightforward question since the BCC ultimately approved and

oversaw the WCSO's budget. He felt that County leadership should have been consulted before entering into such an agreement. He stated that it was not about second-guessing the investigation itself. He said it was about transparency and cooperation between the agencies, which were important, especially when dealing with serious matters. He mentioned that when County resources, personnel, and leadership were being committed to assist another jurisdiction, Commissioners had a responsibility to ensure those commitments did not impact the services provided to constituents across Washoe County. He thought the issue had become even more complicated, given recent public commentary by Reno City Council member Devon Reese in response to Our Town Reno's report. He indicated that Council Member Reese wrote on social media, cautioning against letting the allegations drive the headlines or shape the narrative before the facts were known. He said that while attention to detail was always appropriate during an ongoing investigation, public officials should also recognize that transparency, legitimate questions from the press, and public participation were part of a healthy civic process. He emphasized his concern about whether the agreement effectively placed the burden of Reno's internal situation on County resources. He noted that Washoe County residents deserved assurances that their sheriff's deputies, leadership, and operational capacity would not be diverted in ways that would reduce or hamper the services that the community deserved. He requested that Sheriff Balaam appear before the BCC and provide clear answers and assurances that the arrangement would not diminish public safety coverage or investigative capacity for Washoe County residents. He indicated that the situation made him recall an early 2003 reporting by Picon Press regarding Chief Nance and Sparks Police Department (SPD) Chief Chris Crawforth. He thought that, in hindsight, some of those developments might provide additional context for why certain leadership decisions were made at the time, including why Chief Crawforth ultimately declined the RPD police chief position and why Chief Nance was offered the position. He suggested that the issue was not about politics or personality, but about accountability and ensuring transparency for the people of Washoe County, so they could receive the public safety they expected and deserved. He mentioned that Washoe County had its own ongoing issues, which he felt had desensitized him, and he stated that the County should not need to help the other municipalities.

Chair Andriola clarified that, as a courtesy, she had called all Commissioners to alert them, but she was unaware of the content of the press conference. She noted that, given the ongoing investigation, her intent was not to withhold information. She felt it was her responsibility to ensure that all Commissioners were aware of the City of Reno's planned press conference. She apologized for her choice of words and reiterated that she was not unwilling to share information; she simply did not have anything to share. She explained that the press conference was for the City of Reno, not Washoe County.

CM Thomas thanked Commissioner Clark for his comments and acknowledged that the situation was challenging. She said that she did not want to speak on behalf of Sheriff Balaam but shared that, as a regional partner, Washoe County frequently worked across jurisdictional boundaries. She explained that Washoe County represented the entire County and that Sheriff Balaam, as a County official, assisted with all County-related issues. She indicated that Sheriff Balaam would determine the effective allocation of WCSO resources and confirmed that discussions had taken place. She added

that, as the CM, she would never overcommit resources. She informed the Board that a proposed interlocal agreement would be submitted for future consideration and that the sheriff would address the Board's concerns. She noted that the agreement was being drafted by the City of Reno and the DA's Office. She stated that, since the matter was an internal issue, Human Resources (HR) was handling it, and only limited information was available. She mentioned that when being called to serve, that could mean crossing jurisdictional boundaries, and she hoped for the same cooperation in return.

Commissioner Clark apologized to Chair Andriola, noting that he was not accusing her of withholding information and that she likely had no details when she called him. He suggested that Sheriff Balaam already had a proposed agreement in place that the Board would sign after the fact. He acknowledged that the County should help other municipalities, but expressed frustration that an agreement would be brought to the Board for a vote without their prior awareness of what had occurred. He said he did not agree with approving something first and then reviewing it later. He mentioned he did not live in Reno, did not support many of their decisions, and did not vote on items regarding the City of Reno. He explained that, although the Board would likely approve the agreement, it was important to first understand the details. He noted that many people were involved in creating the agreement with the RPD, including the Governor, but the individuals he felt were excluded were the ones responsible for voting on it. He described it as an example of disenfranchisement and recalled similar agreements being made by former CM Eric Brown before the Board had a chance to review them. Chair Andriola expressed her appreciation for Commissioner Clark's apology. Commissioner Clark clarified that his comments were not directed at her personally but acknowledged that the overall situation was unfortunate.

Chair Andriola thanked the students from Coral Academy of Science for attending the meeting. Commissioner Clark said that he hoped the students learned something during the meeting.

Chair Andriola shared that the agenda included a presentation by Director of the Nevada Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Brenda Scolari, which had been rescheduled to April 14, 2026.

**26-0141** **AGENDA ITEM 5A1** Presentation by Brenda Scolari, Director of the Nevada Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, on America250 Nevada and statewide efforts to educate, engage, and celebrate Nevada's contributions to the nation's semiquincentennial. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Andriola announced that the presentation was rescheduled to April.

**26-0142** **AGENDA ITEM 5A2** Presentation and Update on FY 26 Second Quarter Status Report for the Washoe County Regional Detention Facility to include security of the jail, conditions of confinement, staffing and medical care of inmates housed at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Captain John Stewart conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Jail Status Report; Medical Information; NaphCare Medical Data (2 Slides); ADP; Average Length of Stay; Total Bookings; FY 25/26 2nd Quarter Jail Data; Inmate Assistance Program.

Captain Stewart greeted the Board and stated that he would share the second-quarter statistics. He said that while he would be going over all the statistics, he wanted to go further into a few of them to better explain what was happening. He shared the slide titled *Medical Information* and noted that the jail had 42 medical refusals. He explained that a medical refusal was when a sister agency brought in an inmate, but the jail medical team determined the inmate had a health condition, such as elevated blood pressure or blood alcohol concentration (BAC), or an infection that was higher than the level of care the detention facility could provide. He noted those cases required the jail medical team to refuse acceptance of the inmate and instead refer them to the hospital. He stated that this helped defer liability away from the County and the taxpayer, depending on which agency was the arresting agency. He mentioned that many people in the community believed the Sheriff's Office operated a hospital within the jail, adding that the Commissioners who toured the jail knew it was more of a triage than a hospital. He clarified that while they had emergency medical care when needed, their emergency medicine was equipped for a relatively low level of care. So, he added, when Commissioners saw those medical refusals, that is what those meant. Moving on to Grievances, Captain Stewart stated that those were medical grievances handled by the jail, and that the WCSO oversaw some of the appeals portions. Moving to the last point on the slide, Emergency Room (ER) referrals, Captain Stewart explained that those referred to inmates in jail custody who had medical episodes that required a higher level of care, as determined by the contracted medical staff. He stated that in those instances, the inmates would be referred out.

Captain Stewart shared the slide titled *NaphCare Medical Data (1/2)* and noted that it included numbers for October, November, and December. He stated that nothing stood out to him or seemed out of the ordinary, clarifying that if anything did, he would point it out to the Commissioners. He brought up pending numbers for the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) designation section, stating that they had some issues working with their medical contractor to obtain those numbers for November and December, but that he would have them in their next quarterly meeting. Captain Stewart stated that suicide watches were high in October, dropping to 69 for November, then dropping even further in December to 53. For mental health medications, he stated that the average daily population over the last year was about 1,170 inmates, and for approximately 800 of them to be taking mental health medications gave the Commissioners a good idea of the population that they dealt with within the detention facility. Captain Stewart shared the slide *NaphCare Medical Data (2/2)* and stated that it contained more statistics over the months on dental visits and medically assisted treatment (MAT). He clarified that MATs could include anything from Suboxone to other medications, and that some inmates detoxing off drugs or substances would be included within the MAT program. He added that it was a good program aimed at reducing recidivism among inmates rejoining the community. Captain Stewart stated that Hospital Days were when the jail sent an inmate to the hospital, and there was a significant uptick in December. He stated they would need

to discuss this with the medical staff to find out what happened that month to raise that number. He stated that sometimes they would have very chronically ill inmates within their custody, whether that was due to advanced age or an infection, and these inmates could be in the hospital for months at a time. He added that was why they sometimes saw spikes in those numbers. Captain Stewart stated that the jail worked well with the courts and its medical staff to mitigate costs as much as possible with taxpayer dollars. He added that, depending on the inmate's charges, they were always working very hard with the courts, judges, and district attorney to see if they could mitigate costs.

Captain Stewart shared the slide titled *ADP* and stated that the jail's average daily population (ADP) for the second quarter was 1,158. He added that last year the average was 1,170, and that the jail often saw an uptick towards spring and summer. In winter, he mentioned, they would see a small decrease. He stated that the average length of stay (ALS) for inmates in the facility was about 16.3 days. Captain Stewart shared the slide *Average Length of Stay* and stated that in quarter two of last year, the ALS was 16.64, then dropped to 16.3. He shared the slide *Total Bookings* and stated that for the quarter, total bookings were 3,806 and total releases were 3,786. He then shared the slide, *FY 25/26 2nd Quarter Jail Data*, and stated that, when looking at fights, they saw that the inmate-versus-inmate count of 21 for the quarter was up from 15. He clarified that they often saw a small uptick that could be due to holidays and the high level of inmate activity. He stated that they tried to counteract that by getting the inmates out of their cells more often and by using the tablets and devices they had available for inmates to play music or have video visits with their families. He stated that they tried to encourage those things as much as they could because they knew they lowered stress levels, which led to fewer fights; however, that number was typical for the second quarter. Captain Stewart noted that inmate-versus-staff incidents were at 10, up from 6. He also noted that 65 fights had been averted, which was up from 63 in the first quarter.

Captain Stewart covered suicide watch placements, which were at 219. He noted those placements were instances where an inmate said that they were going to harm themselves or actively tried to harm themselves. He noted jail staff determined those inmates needed to go on suicide watch. Captain Stewart stated that suicide interventions specifically meant an inmate was attempting some type of harm to themselves, whether that meant using a sheet or an improvised weapon. He then shared the slide *Inmate Assistance Program* and stated that he and the Board had already discussed the Inmate Assistance Program, including the days saved versus the dollar-per-day calculation made. For the second quarter, Captain Stewart stated they determined they had saved 4,455 days in jail, which equated to just under \$1 million, or \$911,250. He then stated that his presentation was concluded and asked if the Board had questions.

Commissioner Clark stated that he was always very supportive of the WCSO, adding that he had been on numerous jail tours. He stated that he thought they were doing a fantastic job and that the jail was very clean and respectful. He mentioned that the food was excellent. He added that the Commissioners enjoyed hearing the reports. Commissioner Clark clarified that his comments about what else had taken place had no reflection whatsoever the management of the WCSO. He acknowledged they were just

doing their jobs and had to adjust to ongoing situations. He added that the jail was clean, orderly, and professional. Commissioner Clark stated that he watched the deputies interact with the inmates there, and it was always respectful, and that he had nothing but good things to say about their department. He thanked Captain Stewart.

Commissioner Hill asked when the next graduation date for *Getting Ahead While Getting Out* would be. Captain Stewart stated that he did not know and asked if he could get back to Commissioner Hill. She then asked if they were still working with Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) on that program. Captain Stewart confirmed that they were. She asked whether there were any issues with enrollment or if it was still going well. Captain Stewart stated that he thought it was going well. He added that they were also running an Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) program to help individuals obtain OSHA certification so that, upon release, they would have some certification and technical skills. Commissioner Hill asked about transportation and stated that she knew they had been working closely to determine how they could support inmates released in the middle of the night and ensure they had proper transportation. She acknowledged that, on North Virginia Street, people who were released were in the middle of nowhere. She asked if the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) partnership had been strengthened since the Board and the Sheriff's Office had met. She stated that she had not heard anything negative, which was always a plus, but that she wanted to make sure Captain Stewart had the resources he needed from the RTC. She added that RTC had been helping the Sheriff's Office by providing vans to pick people up. She noted there was a straight line to dispatch but wanted to make sure that was still the case and whether there was anything additional she needed to know. Captain Stewart replied that he believed it was still happening and recalled seeing RTC buses come up to the front, rather than the inmates going towards the Bonanza Casino, where the other bus stop was. He reiterated that he thought people were receiving the transportation they needed. Commissioner Hill asked him to stay in touch and to make sure the Commissioners were informed of any issues they needed to research.

Commissioner Herman thanked Captain Stewart for the work he was doing. She stated she could not handle the dangerous things he and his department had to deal with. She stated that it was amazing and that she was grateful for the staff.

Vice Chair Garcia stated she appreciated the update. She recalled that the quarterly updates were statutorily required, and that the BCC's role was to ensure things were running smoothly and that the WCSO had the infrastructure and everything needed to run operations. She noted the safety of the inmates was paramount and was curious about the mental health population mentioned. She recalled that the suicide watch placements were at 219 for the quarter. She asked if that was the typical amount, or if they had seen an increase or spike. Captain Stewart stated that he had to check the previous quarter, but that the number did not jump out to him over a three month period, because the staff often saw multiple people stating they wanted to harm themselves or showing behavior that indicated that. He stated that the number did not surprise him with the population that they were dealing with. He reiterated that they housed about 1,170 inmates daily. Vice Chair Garcia thanked him for the clarification. She stated that the Board was very supportive of all

mental health efforts across the region, and that his facility was no different. She asked Captain Stewart to let the Board know if he saw any trends changing. She stated that she did not see the quarter-over-quarter and year-over-year comparisons, so she was curious. She thanked Captain Stewart.

Commissioner Clark asked Captain Stewart to provide the Board with more information about the OSHA training, including what it entailed. Captain Stewart explained that they had a program director and that the program was fairly new, but that they offered classes where inmates could earn OSHA certifications upon leaving the facility, which would give them opportunities for other jobs when they were released. The idea, Captain Stewart added, was not only to help inmates get out, but also to reduce recidivism. He stated that if an inmate could recover from the setback and start making money, they might not return to old ways of seeking to make money quickly and subsequently end up back in jail. Commissioner Clark thanked him for the clarification, then stated he had a suggestion. He asked if Captain Stewart had any liaison with the trade unions in the County. Commissioner Clark stated that he knew all the trade unions were seeking apprentices and that good pay was available. He mentioned that the Chamber of Commerce had thousands of career opportunities, so inmates who earned the OSHA certificate might want to check with them. He suggested that someone from Captain Stewart's office might want to check in with the Chamber of Commerce or, perhaps, establish a liaison relationship with the Chamber of Commerce and trade unions, such as electricians, plumbers, and sheet metal workers. He added that all those unions were looking for workers and that they paid well, so if inmates were receiving OSHA training, the next step might be getting them into an apprenticeship program or at least introducing them to it. He stated that if Captain Stewart's department could research that, it would be very helpful. He thanked Captain Stewart. Captain Stewart thought it was a good idea and stated that he would speak with the program director about it.

Commissioner Hill stated that she asked at the beginning of the year whether the Board could obtain an analysis of the breakdown between the reimbursement the County received from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) for detainees and the Sheriff's department's spending on those detainees. She requested the information by their next meeting, which she noted was on Tuesday.

Captain Stewart stated that he had some inside knowledge of the matter because he worked on the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the United States (US) Marshals Service. He asked Commissioner Hill if that was what she was looking for. Commissioner Hill affirmed that was the agreement she was looking for, then specified she wanted to see what the County was actually spending. She said she saw that in some Nevada communities, such as the City of Henderson, they were exceeding their compensation from the federal government, versus what they were spending on the detainees. She thought the public had a right to know what the numbers were and hoped they could receive the information. Captain Stewart stated that he would get the information for the Board. Commissioner Hill thanked Captain Stewart.

Chair Andriola announced that there were OSHA 10- and OSHA 30-certifications and that she was pretty familiar with them. She thought it was a good segue into construction jobs and a great suggestion. After clarifying that it had nothing to do with the current matters per se, she shared that someone recently told Chair Andriola how impressed they were with the WCSO's jail-based mental health program. She shared that the person told her that other counties might be using the model.

**26-0143**      **AGENDA ITEM 5A3** Presentation by Judge Walker to discuss Competency Court: Program Performance and Return on Investment for the Second Judicial District Court. (All Commission Districts.)

Second Judicial District Court Chief Judge Egan Walker conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Competency Court; Chief Judge Egan Walker; Sequential Intercept Model; The Competency Crisis: What Was Happening Before 2023; SJDC Competency Court Goals; Return on Investment: Alternative to Prosecution Program (Diversion); Beyond Dollars: Public Safety & Human Outcomes When Housing is Provided; 2026: A New Chapter — Jail-Based Restoration; Competency Court Works Together; Competency Court Works.

Chair Andriola said that the presentation would be thrilling and believed Judge Walker was excited to be there. She announced they were excited to have him. Chair Andriola said she had been anxiously awaiting and requesting the presentation and Judge Walker's wisdom, which she appreciated him sharing.

Judge Walker stated that it was a privilege and thanked the Board for having him. He explained that a little over two years ago, he challenged the Board to pursue the Sequential Intercept Model. He recalled asking the Board for a Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) through the budget. He mentioned that the Competency Court Case Manager was in the room with him. Judge Walker stated that he would tell the Board what the FTE provided, through the work of several dedicated individuals. He added that he did not realize he would be following Captain Stewart's presentation, but that the Captain had left the Board with the concept of jail-bed-days saved. Judge Walker mentioned he intended to build on that concept. He noted that in the two and a half years the Competency Court had been operating, it had diverted 150 people out of a very dysfunctional process. He thought the Board might recall that if people were not competent to answer allegations against them, they were put in the State forensic system, which had been chronically underfunded and under-resourced for decades. He noted they had removed 150 from that process and believed they had saved the County \$9.6 million, through estimates of bed days at the jail and the Lakes Crossing Center. Judge Walker believed that was a gross understatement of the amount of money saved. He clarified that it was not a check directly into the County coffers and that, unfortunately, the Board did not receive that additional budget authority. Judge Walker noted one exception that he, as a district judge, had sanctioned the State of Nevada multiple times over the previous 12 to 18 months. He stated that checks totaling more than \$1 million in fines imposed against the State of Nevada for underfunding the competency restoration system were delivered to the County General Fund. He noted they

had returned 196 people to competency, and that evaluations were now 80% faster than previously.

Judge Walker shared the slide titled *Sequential Intercept Model* and stated he would be before the Board often in the coming months to discuss it. He mentioned that Captain Stewart had covered Intercepts 0 through 4 of the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM). He paraphrased the SIM as: what happened before people came into contact with the system; interaction with a police officer; what happened after they were arrested; what happened when they went to court; what happened when they were disposed of in court; and what happened when they left court. He stated that Intercept 3 was where he worked most as a district judge, but that he was trying to push all the concepts across the SIM. He noted that he would address the topic with the Board in subsequent presentations. He shared the slide *The Competency Crisis: What Was Happening Before 2023* and reviewed a brief history of where they were when they first started the Competency Court. He stated it took 68 days from the initial court order to the completed evaluation. He clarified that 68 days was two months and eight days of human life just to get a doctor or a trained psychologist to evaluate a person to determine if they were competent to answer the allegations. That, Judge Walker stated, was an abomination. He defined the time as *dead days*, and clarified it was time that was dead to the humans involved and dead to the taxpayers who paid for the days. He added that after the system received the evaluations, which found people not competent and requiring placement in the forensic process, it took 141 days to get them to the Lakes Crossing Center. He mentioned that if people were accused of a gross misdemeanor, for which his jurisdiction over them was 364 days in the Washoe County jail, then they had spent more days in jail than they would have received, even if he gave them the maximum sentence, all before they had even entered a plea or been found guilty of any charge. He explained that a 364-day sentence usually equated to about 180 days in jail, and that the cost of that time was \$500 a day to the County budget and taxpayers. Judge Walker professed that what was more troubling to him than the dollars was the human toll.

Judge Walker noted that the Board would recall that 65-70 percent of the people who resided in the Washoe County Jail took psychotropic medications. He stated that should give all the Commissioners reason to pause. He clarified that the County was using the jail as a mental health treatment facility, as was every county in the Nation. He concluded that people with serious mental illness languished in jail. Judge Walker stated that all the studies, courts, and Commissioners believed jail was not treatment, and that people got worse in jail. He added that a person's serious mental health issues got worse in jail, and that the County essentially housed people in jail, all to no good outcome. Judge Walker noted that Washoe County had a remarkably good Sheriff who was very forward leaning and smart on justice. He said that the Commissioners who had had the privilege of going to Miami, Florida, knew his mantra was, *Let's be smart on justice*. He suggested doing things that built a healthier, safer community. He stated that Washoe County had a broken system in which people were essentially lost for months on end, sometimes for more than a year, and there was no way to get them out. He posed the rhetorical question: *Why should we get people out?* He explained that a significant number of people were so sick they were never going to be found competent to answer criminal charges. He explained that when those people were arrested and spent months in jail, only to be found not

competent and have their charges dismissed. He stated that those individuals would be released at midnight on a Saturday, with no bus ride home or medications, and would get arrested within 48 hours, which caused the whole process to start over again. He declared that those people needed to be removed from the system and that Washoe County previously had no way to do that. It was, he said, a wash, rinse, and repeat cycle that cost millions of dollars.

Judge Walker shared the slide titled *SJDC Competency Court Goals*, and asked what the County's goals were. He stated the County wanted to: standardize the process in a fiscally responsible manner; provide timely access to competency restoration and mental health rehabilitation services as appropriate; advance community safety and reduce recidivism; develop partnerships with stakeholders to help identify treatment for individuals who needed it; and promote transparency, efficiency, and improved communication. He shared the slide titled *Return on Investment: Alternative to Prosecution Program (Diversion)* and stated that the big numbers in the presentation were not hyperbole. He clarified that they were not numbers he had put into the County's general fund account, but rather numbers he had saved for the County. He stated that when the Deputy District Attorney (DDA), Zach Young, and others had presented to the Board in the past, the first number they gave was \$2.9 million in savings. Judge Walker clarified that the figure was calculated as the number of people diverted out of the competency process into an alternative to jail, who received a total of 5,800 days of community-based service. He explained that \$500 a day multiplied by 5,800 days equaled \$2.9 million. He restated that that was the first number the team had brought to the Board, adding that it was underreported by orders of magnitude and that it should be about four times higher, since the next number, \$6.78 million, was calculated in the same manner. He recalled that 64 people were diverted out of Competency Court in the 2025 calendar year. He believed it would take them, on average, 96 days to get from the jail to the Lakes Crossing Center, followed by another 90 days at that location. He explained that if you multiplied 64 people by 96 days by \$500 a day, and then repeated the calculation for their time at Lakes Crossing Center, you would get a total of \$6.7 million; however, none of the numbers included hospitalization costs. He stated that the people he previously mentioned, those released without their medications who reoffended, would end up in the Emergency Room (ER), which was County money and not included in the previous figures he gave. He continued, stating that if those individuals were cleared at the ER, they would receive psychotropic medications and then go to jail. He reiterated that none of that spending was accounted for in the figures. He restated that his program was saving millions of dollars, and it was not hyperbole. Judge Walker affirmed he was happy to do the math in detail with anyone who had questions.

Judge Walker shared the slide *Beyond Dollars: Public Safety & Human Outcomes When Housing is Provided* and wondered what a healthier, safer community looked like. He addressed Commissioner Andriola, adding that she had asked him repeatedly what he needed, and that every time he answered that he needed beds. He stated they had 24 people through a Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS) program called Supportive Housing. He defined supportive housing as, while not minimizing what NNAMHS did, essentially buying someone a hotel room at the Tarry

Motel. He stated that it did not seem like a big deal or a lot of money; however, if they bought 24 people rooms at the Tarry Motel, the average annual cost per person was approximately \$34,000 to \$35,000, which he calculated to save \$3.5 million because it got the people out of the system. He added that it was a broken competency-restoration system, but that spending money actually saved money in certain circumstances. However, he asked the Commissioners to forget about that, and instead focus on what that looked like to them and their families, who were not getting battered by people with mental health issues, who were not getting their property destroyed by people with mental health issues, and who were not getting scared by people indecently exposing themselves because they had mental health issues. He stated that the 24 people in the NNAMHS subset who had been housed reduced their arrest rate by 93 percent. He stated that, on average, those individuals were arrested twice a year outside the program, but when in the program, they were arrested one-tenth as often, or 12 percent per year. He stated that the statistic was remarkable and believed the Commissioners would not see data like that anywhere else in the criminal justice system.

Judge Walker commented that the program reduced psychiatric hospitalizations, though he clarified that the funds were State, not County. He noted that psychiatric hospitalizations happened at the Dini-Townsend Psychiatric Hospital, but that every community paid for those dollars, meaning that the tax dollars the community paid still went to the State. He declared that reducing psychiatric hospitalizations was, first and foremost, the right thing to do for people and that it saved a remarkable amount of money. He shared the statistic that there was a 93 percent reduction in arrest rates among people in the Competency Court. He noted that if you gave someone a place to live, with no additional services, you reduced their arrest rate by 40 percent. But, if you put them in the Competency Court, you reduced the number stunningly. He suggested that the County could pay \$95 a day for NNAMHS housing, or pay \$500 a day for jail housing. He told the Commissioners it was their choice, or the community's choice.

Judge Walker shared the slide *2026: A New Chapter — Jail-Based Restoration* and stated that the statistics showed what a before-and-after looked like, noting that it used to take 141 days to get into the Lakes Crossing Center before the program was in place. Judge Walker shared that when he began the program, some of the Commissioners went to Miami-Dade County, along with many of the stakeholders, on two different trips. He noted that he went to find out why it had taken so long to admit people to the jail. He clarified that he would now sign an order stating that the person needed forensic restoration, and they would go out that day. He stated that Washoe was the only county with a no-day waitlist for forensic restoration, and in fact, the only County in the entire State, and all at \$500 a day. He added that it was a restoration program for those who qualified in jail, and that while not all people qualified, restoration began immediately for those who did.

Judge Walker shared the slide titled *Competency Court Works Together* and stated that he could not thank the heroic people who assisted enough and would be remiss not to thank the District Attorney's (DA) Office. He mentioned that DDA Young was the number two in the DA's Office, and that it was rare as a judge to get time with a number two. He added that DDA Young had committed to the new system, and until last year,

when one of his chiefs took over, DDA Young was the DA at the Competency Court. Judge Walker explained that all the cases could be diverted because the DA exercised their discretion to remove people from the process. He noted the process did not happen without the DA. He explained they had several members of the Public Defender's Office and one Chief. He expressed his appreciation for Deputy Public Defender Jennifer Rains and stated that he did not know how to describe what she gave to the system. He listed the Alternate Public Defender's (APD) Office, Housing and Homeless Services, and the Public Guardian's Office as prized components of the County and praised the Public Guardian's Office and the Human Services Agency (HSA). He stated he could thank many more people because, as the Board would notice, the process was carried out with the help of others, other than the added FTE through the Court's budget. He clarified that the people included both police departments through Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training and the justice courts. Judge Walker recounted a story of a husband and wife in Incline Village, and noted the story aligned with other stories from people caught in a tragic cycle of domestic violence. The husband, he continued, was suffering from dementia and was arrested repeatedly because he did not know where to go other than to his home, where his wife lived, and where he had a Temporary Protection Order (TPO). Judge Walker noted that the man could not access the services that would break the cycle of arrests, for which he was not competent to answer. Judge Walker shared that within the County, Justice of the Peace Judge Melissa Mangiaracina reached out to the team, including the DA and the APD, and brought the case to Competency Court. Judge Walker added that within one hearing, he confirmed that the wife could move out of the house so the husband could move into the only place he knew. He affirmed that the husband had not been arrested since and mentioned that the husband had been arrested six times in the six months prior to the change. He concluded that the Competency Court was magic and that it happened through collaboration. He shared the slide titled *Competency Court Works*, then thanked Chair Andriola for allowing him to present to the Board.

Chair Andriola thanked Judge Walker and stated that she had repeatedly asked him what he needed. She asked if he still needed fifty beds, adding that the last time she asked Judge Walker what he needed, he asked for 30 beds. Judge Walker stated that two things were happening in the County, one currently and one in the near future. The first, he stated, was that the City of Reno was opening Highway 40 across from the Cares Campus, and that the Cares Campus had already opened permanent supportive housing. Judge Walker noted that what he needed was permanent supportive housing, not supportive housing alone, which he clarified was when Washoe County paid for a room at the Tarry Motel. He added that he needed the magic of wraparound services to make sure that people received mental health treatment, took their medications, remained clean and sober, and received substance abuse treatment if needed. Judge Walker announced he would take five beds if Chair Andriola gave them to him, but that 50 beds would change the community. Chair Andriola mentioned that if any of the Commissioners had not yet attended Competency Court with Judge Walker, she would encourage them to do so. She stated it was helpful in aligning with what Judge Walker had been speaking about. She believed it was important to share that the SIM was actually bigger than any one area and that, as Judge Walker had pointed out, it encompassed the Cares Campus, Our Place shelter, and

the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team. She opined it truly was a community effort that had to be embraced regionally to be effective.

Judge Walker thanked Chair Andriola and his FTE, Case Compliance Specialist Karlye Hutchinson. Chair Andriola thanked Judge Walker for providing the name and thanked Karlye Hutchinson as well. She stated it was amazing when there was a model that they could work with, with almost no resources. Judge Walker compared it to the desert they lived in, which was beautiful, and in reality, a desert of resources. He mentioned he was fond of saying that Nevada was small enough that you could actually get things done, because everybody knew each other. He said that allowed them to get the right people together at the right place and time and mentioned the plentiful resource they had was human capital.

Commissioner Clark thanked Judge Walker for his report. He stated it was very insightful.

Commissioner Hill thanked Judge Walker and stated they were lucky to have him in his current position. She thanked him for his passion for Washoe County residents and noted that the residents deserved attention. She agreed with Judge Walker that, sadly, the only resource they had had in the past had been the jail. She thought it was getting a little better. She referred back to Chair Andriola's question of what resources Judge Walker needed. She stated they knew they needed approximately 1,100 permanent supportive housing units in the community, which she felt was heartbreaking because so many of those people were not just mentally ill, but were seniors who needed physical support to live and may not have families. She added that Reno was mentioned in the article *Million Dollar Murray*, and noted that Washoe County could really help people if it found them housing and wraparound services. She noted that, according to the article, Murray's wraparound services included sheriff's deputies checking in on him. She recalled that when Murray received stable housing and someone checked in, he was successful at staying sober; however, he died on the streets of Reno from liver failure because he did not have a system that would support him. She expressed her appreciation for Judge Walker's advocacy for more units. She stated that Washoe County wanted to provide that, but it was expensive. She described it as frustrating because people at the Cares Campus needed permanent supportive housing and were waiting for it. She hoped the County could press the State to find those resources. She stated she was curious about the community's mental health ecosystem and knew they had been trying to learn which resources they had available and which they were missing at a regional level. She asked whether Judge Walker could shed any light on the resources that were missing before people reached the stage of the SIM where they were arrested.

Judge Walker stated that they needed treatment providers. He acknowledged that Washoe County had a university with nationally renowned schools for social work and counseling. He stated that his own daughter was a clinical professional in the community, a marriage and family therapist who received her Master's degree at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). He acknowledged that it was almost impossible to keep people in the local community who were providers because they could make twice as

much working virtually in California. He stated that one of the challenges they had in getting individuals evaluated was the need to implement telehealth evaluations because there were not enough psychologists and psychiatrists in the State of Nevada willing to work for what Washoe County paid. He noted they needed providers and a way to pay for them. Judge Walker affirmed that the Commissioners already understood this, but that the message he would suggest, especially to all who had political responsibilities to their constituents and the budget, was to spend money on permanent supportive housing. He added that, although it was expensive, it was the least expensive way to meet the community's needs.

Judge Walker assured the Board that competent individuals who belonged in the system were returned to prison. Then, he continued, they were released with untreated mental health issues and returned to the community in a worse condition. He observed it was a self-perpetuating cycle. Commissioner Hill stated that she heard providers would work remotely in California because Medicaid reimbursement rates were dismal in Nevada. She suggested that the Board and Judge Walker fight for changes at the State level, because it needed to be addressed. Judge Walker told the Board that he had the privilege of working with a remarkable head of Human Services in Washoe County. He noted that he was the former foster care and juvenile services judge in the County. He declared that Washoe County had amazing talent and needed to use it. He believed HSA Director Ryan Gustafson had several ideas for gerrymandering the Medicaid reimbursement rate.

Commissioner Hill noted that Washoe County currently had no waiting period because Judge Walker had significantly cleaned up the system and found the resources needed. She stated they were lucky to have the Lakes Crossing Center in the north and recalled that Southern Nevada's struggles stemmed from a lack of beds. She stated that a judge in Clark County found the State liable for millions of dollars because it was failing to provide resources for its citizens. She noted that Judge Walker had mentioned doing the same and asked whether that process had started. Judge Walker stated that he did not know and could not provide advisory opinions on cases, but Judge Christie Craig of Clark County had a notable history as a former public defender, like Ms. Rains, and had sued the State of Nevada twice. He recalled that it had resulted in consent decrees against the State of Nevada for violating people's Constitutional rights. He added that Judge Craig had fought the fight for decades, but that the State had plans in place from 15 years ago directing it to follow a model similar to that of Washoe County, which never came to fruition for various political reasons. He stated that Judge Craig, like himself, was a firebrand to hold the State accountable. He clarified that Nevada had a built-in state forensic system but noted that the State needed to build enough resources in to make it work. He posited that there were twice as many people waiting for beds as there were beds in the State of Nevada, and that had been the case for decades.

Commissioner Hill agreed that the matter was heartbreaking. She expressed uncertainty about whether the public understood that the Board could not create resources in Washoe County and could only request them from the State. She specified that a legislative session was coming up, along with elections. She wanted to ensure Washoe

County could advocate for itself as a region because people were frustrated. Commissioner Hill admitted that Washoe County had many people waiting at the Cares Campus, and that was not a success, or rather, that the number of people waiting for mental health beds in Washoe County meant it was not a success. She likened it to picking up the pieces on the State level. She told Judge Walker that he had been an incredible leader, helping the County with people on the ground. Commissioner Hill noted they could only do what they could do with the resources they had each day.

Judge Walker suggested giving the State some credit. He noted that the State of Nevada paid for the treatment unit at the Washoe County Jail. He added that the State funded the unit through legislation enacted by the last Legislature at the behest of the State agents. Judge Walker affirmed the State had acted remarkably well. He noted that if the State did not have two judges fining them \$500 a day per person, then they might not have the bandwidth with the Governor to carry through. Commissioner Hill thanked Judge Walker for making the case for what the County needed and for his leadership.

Commissioner Herman expressed her gratitude to Judge Walker for their recent meeting. She thanked him for being a person who went way beyond the call of duty. She stated that Judge Walker did not just sit in the head seat, but got out and did the work.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked Chair Andriola for bringing the presentation forward. She stated she was excited to hear the updates and was amazed at the metrics Judge Walker provided. She told Judge Walker she appreciated his vision and leadership, and that many people in the room would agree. She requested that he pull up the slide titled *Competency Court Works Together*, specifically the column covering the Washoe County Courts. She expressed thanks to Judge Walker for mentioning the subject matter experts within Washoe County's departments and divisions, and for the systemic change in how complex problems are addressed that resulted from their collaboration on solutions. Vice Chair Garcia referred to her first summit with Judge Walker at the Whitney Peak Hotel. She recalled sitting in the room, amazed that so many elected officials and representatives from diverse places were gathered there to discuss the issues. She declared that the summit was the first step to creating a successful intervention in the system. She noted that during the meeting, they discussed breakdowns in data sharing and data communication. She asked Judge Walker for an update on that matter.

Judge Walker stated that one benefit of the trauma associated with the Detention Services Unit (DSU) was that all pretrial screenings in the County now happened through the court's Pretrial Services. He noted that they now had data from Court employees on who was being arrested at Intercepts 1 and 2, where people were detained. He joked that judges loved their silos. He referenced a joke he had made in the past, that when the County judges met, there were 16 judges and 32 opinions on any subject. He affirmed that it was true across the County and the courts, but there was magic happening. He told the Board that Judge Kendra Bertschy would approach the Board regarding a new Specialty Court, which Judge Walker strongly supported. He stated that both he and the Chief of the Reno Justice Court met regularly with Judge Bertschy, and that the Board would find the idea of breaking those data silos incredible. He added that he did not know

what happened at the Justice Court or the Municipal Court and thought that did not serve the people of Washoe County; however, there were only so many battles he could fight. He admitted they still struggled to get data on people and said he was fond of saying that human beings did not live in the silos judges created. He shared a story of seeding a jury in a criminal case the day before. He said he reminded the participants that the gift they received for stepping forward to do their civic service was a parking ticket. He clarified that was because there was no parking available around the courthouse. He stated that the metaphor went across the County, and that people did not understand why they appeared before Judge James Spoo in Sparks Municipal Court and Judge Walker in District Court. He added that the two judges did not even speak with each other then, which was a problem. The answer to the problem, he suggested, was the SIM. He asked how they could break down data sharing across courts, police agencies, and the County. He answered that there was a plan behind the SIM, which had been shared with the Board. He stated that he looked forward to presenting that plan to the Board in the coming months.

Vice Chair Garcia thought that years ago, the school district used the method of *every child by name and by face*, and she thought it translated well to the work Judge Walker was doing, and the work being done at the County. She stated that was visible in the way Washoe County interacted and engaged with the unhoused population. She noted that, as with any issue that deteriorated over time, it was typically due to a lack of communication or, in this case, a lack of data. She stated that the County was only as good as the systems it had in place for communicating and collaborating. She stated that she was looking forward to the progress they would make in that realm.

Chair Andriola stated that the Board would be rooting for Judge Walker and doing what they could to help him. She shared that the HOPE Team had a 94 percent success rate in tenancy support. She pointed out that was why the SIM was so effective at encompassing the whole community, saving millions of dollars, saving lives, keeping people out of jail, and helping them return to productive citizenship. She added that people might not necessarily feel or see the connection between the teamwork happening between the SIM, the Cares Campus, Our Place, the HOPE Team, and other tenancy support options. She affirmed that she remembered the first summit Vice Chair Garcia had referenced, that she had attended the second summit, and looked forward to the third, where one could see the silos busted. She added that she hoped Judge Walker would continue to ask for what he needed and hoped the Board could help Judge Walker and Karlye Hutchinson. Chair Andriola recalled asking Judge Walker what he needed, and he said one FTE, or even a part-time employee, and she thought there was no way he needed a full FTE. She admitted she did not remember if that was exactly how it occurred, but that the data was supportive. She stated the Board was data-driven in their decision-making. She added that an integral part of their decisions was the legal components, the data supporting them, and the subject matter experts. She thanked Judge Walker.

## **DONATIONS**

- 26-0144** **6A1** Retroactively acknowledge one-time gift card donations at a value of [\$900.00] from Tru Vista accepted by Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) in support of Minor Guardianship Program during FY 2026. District Court. (All Commission Districts).
- 26-0145** **6A2** Acknowledge retroactively one-time Fiscal Year 2026 in-kind donations of 18 Wal-Mart gift cards and 15 Target gift cards at an individual value of \$25.00 each for a total value of [\$825.00] and 7 Wal-Mart gift cards and 12 Target gift cards at an individual value of \$50.00 each for a total value of [\$950.00] and 53 gift cards at an individual value of \$50.00 each, for various children's activities, for a total value of [\$2,650.00] from the Washoe Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) Foundation accepted by the Second Judicial District Court, CASA Program. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Items 6A1 through 6A2 be accepted.

## **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7H1**

- 26-0146** **7A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of January 13, 2026, and January 20, 2026. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.).
- 26-0147** **7B1** Recommendation to approve the reclassification of a Hydrogeologist, pay grade 16, to Environmental Engineer II/I, pay grade 16, as reviewed and evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes. [No fiscal impact.] Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0148** **7B2** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to (1) approve the release of Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Mitigation funds for use on the Lower Rosewood Creek Aquatic Organism Passage Project [in the amount of \$40,000.00] and the Burnt Cedar Water Quality Improvement Project [in the amount of \$50,000.00] and to authorize distribution of the funds to the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District to support Washoe County's Lake Tahoe Lake Clarity Crediting Program, and (2) approve an interlocal agreement between Washoe County and Nevada Tahoe Conservation District for the Lower Rosewood Creek Aquatic Organism Passage Project authorizing work within Washoe County right-of-way. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

- 26-0149**      **7C1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Washoe County Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA), auditor’s report, and report on internal control for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025 as presented; and, authorize the Comptroller to proceed with distribution of the SEFA for public record, as required by law. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0150**      **7C2** Recommendation to approve the award of the Washoe County’s Independent Audit Services to Eide Bailly LLP, in accordance with NRS 354.624, that states each local government is required to provide for an annual audit and in accordance with the State of Nevada Department of Taxation the Board of County Commissioners, for a contract period of one (1) year effective March 2026 for fiscal year ending 2026; fees are based on the amount of time required at various levels of responsibility, plus actual out-of-pocket expenses, including administrative charges. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0151**      **7D1** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to retroactively acknowledge a grant of [\$20,000, no County match required], awarded to the Second Judicial District Court from the Lee F. Del Grande Foundation, for Family Peace Center operating expenses; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0152**      **7E1** Recommendation to deobligate previously approved allocations of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) in the amount of [\$281,822.21] for projects that have been completed under budget, cancelled, or no longer need the previously approved levels of funding:
- Grant Proposal - Infrastructure: \$95,000.00  
STEM Explorers Out of School Time with Sierra Nevada Journeys: \$943.14  
Neuromodulation Treatment - Brain Health: \$1,050.75  
Elevate Catholic Charities Workforce Development Program: \$161,804.45  
Family Respite Care of Nevada: \$792.56  
Medical Examiner's Office Renovations: \$523.00  
Sheriff Office Staffing Study : \$5,470.00  
Nevada Cares Campus Capital: \$16,238.31  
Total: \$281,822.21
- Approve increased allocations to following approved project in the amount of [\$281,822.21]:  
Washoe Children’s Behavioral Health Center Facility Upgrades

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

- 26-0153** 7E2 Recommendation to approve transfer of collected 12% indirect costs on salary from eligible approved projects from July 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025, totaling \$37,822.43, from ARPA-SLFRF Awards to the General Fund. These include Public Defender Personnel \$23,392.10 and Community Reinvestment Revenue Recovery \$14,430.33.

According to the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds Compliance and Reporting Guidance, recipients are permitted to charge both direct and indirect costs to their SLFRF award as administrative costs if they are accorded consistent treatment per 2 CFR 200.403. Indirect costs are general overhead costs of an organization where a portion of such costs are allocable to the SLFRF award such as the cost of facilities or administrative functions like a director's office.

Washoe County's indirect costs are collected at a rate of 12% on the base salary of grant funded positions provided by ARPA-SLFRF. Indirect costs are collected as an offset to the positions funded in Community Reinvestment by the General Fund.

And, if approved, direct Finance to make necessary journal entries and unbudgeted transfers. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0154** 7E3 Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, a replacement grant recipient from Indigenous on Biocolonialism to Healing Waters Institute c/o Honor the Earth - a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes - to cover the expenses for artist Autumn Harry to paint a mural at the Sparks Library; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager's Office. (Commission District 3.)

- 26-0155** 7F1 Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$155,037.52; \$47,171.30 in county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 HPP / ASPR FY26 Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026, for the Population Health (PHD) Division to support demonstration of achievement in the program domains and capabilities according to the Hospital Preparedness Program (HPP) cooperative agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0156** 7F2 Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$22,215.29; \$89,635.30 in county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 PHP/CDC FY26 Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2025, through

June 30, 2026, for the Population Health (PHD) Division to support demonstration of achievement in the program domains and capabilities according to the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program (PHEP) domains according to the PHEP Cooperative Agreement, and authorize the District Health Officer to execute the Notice of Subaward, any future amendments and MOU agreements with partnering agencies, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0157** **7G1** Recommendation to approve the Forensic Support Services Agreement between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and City of Sparks on behalf of the Sparks Police Department for the retroactive term of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 for the provision of Forensic Science Services. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0158** **7G2** 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: Douglas County Sheriff's Office \$29,850; Elko County Sheriff's Office \$117,830; Fallon Police Department \$43,630; Lander County Sheriff's Office \$25,137 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 with a total income of [\$216,447.00] for all agreements. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0159** **7G3** Recommendation to approve one full-time 1.0 FTE Media Production Specialist within the Sheriff's Office; eliminate two full-time 1.0 FTE Communications Call Taker (600018728) positions and reclassifying one full-time 1.0 FTE Communications Center Manager (60018727) to support this position resulting in an approximate net savings of [\$10,743]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0160** **7H1** Recommendation to approve and adopt the revised Washoe County Investment Policies that contain general guidelines for investing the financial assets of Washoe County by the County's delegated Investment Officers, as recommended by the Washoe County Investment Committee. Treasurer. (All Commission Districts.)

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

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7H1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7H1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**BLOCK VOTE – 9 THROUGH 11**

**26-0161** **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Northwest Library Heating Ventilation and Cooling (HVAC) Replacement Project, PWP-WA-2026-067 [staff recommends Acco Engineered Systems, Inc for the base bid in the amount of \$1,127,250.00]; and (2) approve a separate project contingency [in the amount of \$56,363.00 for a total project cost not to exceed \$1,183,613.00]. The Project is located at 2325 Robb Dr, Reno, Nevada, and consists of 17 rooftop heating and air conditioning units. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be awarded and approved.

**26-0162** **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve the transfer of the existing grants, funds and budget authority of the Support in Treatment, Accountability and Recovery (STAR) Program from the Department of Alternative Sentencing (DAS) to the Human Services Agency (HSA), retroactive to January 1, 2026. This includes all previously accepted grant awards and related contracts, subawards, positions, equipment, property and infrastructure. On August 19, 2025, the Board accepted the Fund for a Resilient Nevada Sub-Award from the Department of Health and Human Services, Director's Office for the amount not to exceed [\$310,536.00; no County match required] retroactive to July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2027 to be used to fund treatment and recovery support services for participants of the STAR program, to include transitional and permanent supportive living recovery housing, medical services gaps, and bus passes for participant transportation, approved a Resolution necessary for same. On November 14, 2023, the Board retroactively accepted a direct grant award [\$826,852.00, no County match required] from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), FY 2023, Project number 15PBJA-23-GG-02433-SCAX, to DAS to expand treatment and recovery services for the STAR program for the grant period of October 1, 2023 to September 30, 2027. And if approved, authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute award-related documents; authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute and/or amend all relevant contracts and subaward agreements; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

**26-0163**      **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to accept a FFY26 Title XX supplemental amendment #1 from the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in the amount of [\$497,856.00; no county match], including possible purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives, retroactive from October 1, 2025 to September 30, 2026 to promote reunification, safety, educational support, and normalcy for children in care; retroactively authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 11 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

**26-0164**      **AGENDA ITEM 8** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three-Regulation of Uses and Division Nine-General Provisions. These amendments include adding various sections within Article 336 Housing Incentives to establish an expedited review process for attainable housing projects and to establish an expedited process for projects which qualify as Tier 1-5 Affordable Housing. These amendments also include amending Section 110.902.15 to add and delete various definitions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. This ordinance is part of a group of amendments the Board has identified as a top priority for implementation of the master plan.

And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for April 14, 2026. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1945.

Katherine Oakley, Planning Manager with the Washoe County Community Services Department Planning and Building Division, was in attendance to give a brief presentation to the Board. She stated she would speak about a development code amendment to establish expedited processes for attainable housing projects. For background, she noted that she and the Board had previously discussed some of the topics and acknowledged that the County was facing significant housing affordability challenges. She provided an update on some of the numbers she had shared previously, including the

percentage of the renting population that was cost-burdened, which she stated had increased to 50.5 percent. She defined cost-burdened as renters spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs, and added that, in recent years, the percentage of cost-burdened renters had fluctuated between the high 40s and low 50s. She noted that the new number was both a Statewide and Nationwide issue. She recalled that during the most recent legislative session, several bills were adopted to address housing costs, including Assembly Bill 540 (AB 540). She stated that the Development Code amendment would bring the County into compliance with the changes required to align with the bill.

Ms. Oakley stated she would start with the definitions and proposed changes because those were a core component of what AB 540 affected. She explained that previously, in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), there was affordable housing with four tiers, up to 120 percent of the area median income (AMI). She clarified that AB 540 changed affordable housing to attainable housing. She stated that it now had a new name and there was a new fifth tier that went up to 150 percent of the AMI, which was approaching the traditional workforce-housing category rather than affordable housing as typically defined at the State and federal levels. That, she reiterated, was the biggest change that came out of AB 540. She proposed updating the local definitions to match the new State definitions. She explained there was something in the bill called an attainable housing project. She clarified that it was a project that specifically received a grant from the Nevada Attainable Housing Account, the fund established by the bill to support the development of attainable housing. She explained that they would use the new definitions to establish the required expedited processes.

First, Ms. Oakley said, it would mean looking at attainable housing projects, which she reiterated were funded by the State and for people with an AMI of 150 percent or less. She stated that the proposal was in alignment with AB 540 and required by it, allowing those projects not to go through a public hearing process if it would otherwise be required. She stated that the new process applied to everything except tentative maps, which were treated differently in the bill. She proposed that if a special use or administrative permit would be required, Washoe County Planning would instead allow it to go through the administrative review permit process. She explained that was a process with a public notice component and an agency review component, which enabled a more complex review. She clarified it would not go to a public hearing. She added that the decision was made by the Director of Planning and Building. She noted that was how staff would comply with the bill's requirement. She pointed out another component: anyone who sought to use the expedited review process would need to provide evidence of the funding received from the State that qualified them for the expedited review. That was the first type of expedited review, she concluded.

The second type of review required by AB 540, Ms. Oakley continued, was prioritizing the review of any attainable housing, or Tier 1 through Tier 5 of affordable housing, over all other projects. She stated that was the language from AB 540. She specified again that attainable housing projects and attainable housing meant different things in the new bill. She explained that, for clarity, they were labeling projects that qualified for Tiers 1 through 5 as affordable housing, within those AMI categories. She

stated that a staff liaison could be requested to facilitate the review process, and that was how her office proposed to expedite the review. She explained that the staff liaison would help coordinate the different agencies participating in a review to facilitate the process. She clarified that would be the expedited process for any housing project, whether it received State funding or not. As long as the project fell within the listed income categories, she explained, it could use the process and simply provide evidence that it would fall within those income bands. She noted the Planning Commission heard the plan in February and voted unanimously to recommend approval. She concluded that, having made all four required findings, the Planning Commission recommended introducing and conducting a first reading.

Chair Andriola thanked the Planning Manager for quickly implementing the new steps for the provisions passed in AB 540 and the Governor's bill. She also appreciated streamlining the administrative process and welcomed it.

Bill No. 1945 was introduced by Vice Chair Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

On the call for public comment, Pat Davison distributed a chart, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She greeted the Board and noted she was a resident of District Five. She stated she was before the Board to discuss additional changes to the County's affordable housing program resulting from State legislation passed the year prior. She stated she did not approve of the State mandates and preferred local control whenever possible; however, she felt that, in this case, the State mandate appropriately sought to fill a gap in the affordable housing picture, namely, the missing middle-income level. She added that the mandate came with money. She stated that the County was not abandoning lower-income levels, but instead expanding the income spectrum with new programs and funding for that population segment up to 150 percent of AMI. She noted that those households made too much to qualify for subsidized housing assistance but did not earn enough to rent or purchase a home in the local real estate market. She referenced the chart she had provided and specified that it tried to simplify the two new definitions and their corresponding changes, which the Board was being asked to consider. She expressed that the first group of changes created a new class of affordable housing called an attainable housing project. She remarked that it might have sounded like a general label, but that it referred to a very specific type of project, which received some of the new State funding. She added that it also received an expedited review process, whether as a new benefit or incentive. She explained that the second group of changes created a new class of affordable housing called Tiers 1 to 5. She stated that it referred to a very specific type of project, one that was required to show evidence that it provided housing for households with incomes at or below 150 percent AMI. She added that it also received two new benefits: the assignment of a staff liaison, if requested, and project prioritization. Both of those benefits, she noted, should help with the expedited planning process for the Tier 1 to 5 projects. She asked the Board to note that the first group, the attainable housing projects, would also have access to the project prioritization and staff liaison, simply by virtue of being included in Tier 1 to Tier 5. She stated that was a great set of new tools added to the Board's toolbox.

She asked the Board to support the changes, as proposed by the staff and approved by the Planning Commission.

**26-0165**      **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to appoint one candidate from a pool of applicants including: Gregory J. Flanders, Philip Gilanfarr, Joel H. Martin, James C. McNamara (incumbent), Michael Ryan O'Neill, Rob Pierce, Daniel M. Small, Harry N. Swenson, and Christopher W. Wood to serve as the Lay Member on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Advisory Planning Commission for a two-year term beginning March 27, 2026 and expiring on March 26, 2028. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson explained the process to the Board, directing them to select their top two candidates for the single lay member position on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Advisory Planning Commission.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the Commissioners' votes aloud, which indicated Harry Swenson as the selected candidate.

On the call for public comment, Harry Swenson was called but chose not to speak.

Christopher Wood stated that he was a resident of Incline Village and an applicant. He announced that the reason he came to speak was to continue with comments about what the particular function of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) was, and to emphasize in particular that the APC was an organization much like the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs). He defined the purpose of the CAB as collecting information from the community and passing it on to the County, providing the County with information on what was happening in the furthest reaches of the County. He stated it was a great function and that the APC worked in the same way. He clarified that it was not simply a technical organization, but also for planning and collecting lay opinion. He added that the position decided that day was the Lay Member position, which, according to the TRPA website, was to convey the community's perspective. He declared that the position was not for passing on regulatory, scientific, or technical knowledge, but for gathering information from the community. He pointed out that in his application, his previous community roles included the CAB and, in a non-public capacity, the Rotary. He added that he had served on the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) subcommittee, which reviewed the old elementary school site in Incline Village and decided not to make it a transit hub. He noted that he had also participated in the Tahoe Living Working Group (TLWG), organized by the APC, to gather data on TRPA's needs. He stated those were the things he offered for his nomination. He understood they had a strong group of candidates and expressed confidence they would make the right decision.

Philip Gilanfarr was called but was not present to speak.

Jim McNamara announced himself as the currently appointed member of the TRPA APC. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve on the APC and stated that he wanted the other candidates to be aware of the high-quality representation Washoe County enjoyed. He stated that Commissioner Hill did sterling work and that he could not say enough about Planning Manager Katherine Oakley and Senior Planner Doctor (Dr.) Eric Young. He stated their perspectives and experience were invaluable. He said he was proud when sitting next to them and other members of the APC, and that Washoe County had a deep bench of great people. He acknowledged that the Board had a tremendous group of volunteers for the current nominations. He recalled that two years ago, when he was appointed by the Board, only he and the incumbent were running, and that the position was not even a board position at the time. He added that he was glad there were now so many Washoe County residents interested in the position. He noted that he attended several TLWG meetings throughout the Tahoe community and that there was a tremendous need for affordable housing. He thought it would not go away and had been an issue for the 40 to 50 years he had lived in the Tahoe area. He recalled that even back then, prices were rising, and many small business owners and tradespeople moved out of the area because they could not afford it. He noted that trend had not changed. He declared that there were groups in the area firmly against any measures to explore affordable housing around Incline Village. He said that he did not find that in any other meetings around the Tahoe community. He added that there were a number of political accusations made when those topics came up, though, as far as he was aware, nobody in the APC or the governing board was taking money from developers or was untrustworthy.

Chair Andriola stated that the pool of applicants was impeccable and thanked everyone who was interested in serving their community through the position. She named Harry Swenson as the selected candidate. She indicated she would need a formal motion to appoint Mr. Harry Swenson to the Planning Commission.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Mr. Harry Swenson be appointed to serve as the Lay Member on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Advisory Planning Commission for a two-year term beginning March 27, 2026, and expiring on March 26, 2028.

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

**1:00 p.m.** The Board reconvened with all Commissioners present.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**26-0166** **AGENDA ITEM 13** Public Hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's denial of Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM24-001 (Sierra Reflections) and Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0019 (Sierra Reflections Infrastructure) for a common open space tentative subdivision map for a 940-lot common open space development, with lots ranging in size from 2,876+/- square feet to 68,008+/- square feet.

The project will include major grading of 3.6 million cubic yards of excavation, and 625,000 cubic yards of fill. This project meets the standard for a project of regional significance because it contains housing of more than 625 units, sewage use greater than 187,500 gallons per day, water usage greater than 625-acre feet per year, and traffic counts greater than an average of 6,250 trips daily; as such, any approval by Washoe County is provisional subject to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission's finding that the project is in conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. The applicant also seeks approval of Special Use Permits for utility services (water tanks and two lift stations) and three bridge crossings over the Sensitive Stream Zone and Critical Stream Zone buffers for Steamboat Creek and Browns Creek. The applicant and appellant is World Properties, Inc. The proposed project is in the South Valleys Planning Area, to the west of old 395, south of Pagni Lane, between Pleasant Valley and Old Washoe City.

The property owner is World Properties Inc, the total acreage is 759.7 acres, and the APN's associated with the proposed subdivision are: 046-080-40, 046-060-47, 046-060-45, 046-060-55, 046-090-26, 046-090-25, 046-090-24, 046-090-23, 046-090-18, 046-090-17, 046-090-16, 046-090-15, 046-090-14, 046-090-13, 046-090-12, 046-090-11, 046-090-10, 046-090-09, 046-090-08, 046-090-07, 046-090-06, 046-090-05, 046-090-04, 046-090-01, 046-100-07, 046-100-02, 046-100-03, 046-100-04, 046-100-10

The Board shall consider the appeal based on the record on appeal and testimony and materials submitted at the Board's public hearing. The Board may affirm, modify or reverse the Planning Commission's decision. If the Board reverses the decision of the Planning Commission, it may remand the matter back to the Planning Commission with instructions or the Board may directly grant the application. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Andriola announced that before moving to Item 13, she wanted to deliver some announcements. She thanked the audience for attending and noted that the Commissioners had a responsibility to ensure the safety of everyone in attendance. She acknowledged that the room had a maximum capacity and that the Commissioners would be watching for that threshold. She stated that if the number of attendees exceeded the limit, they would have to ask people to use the seats in the lobby, which had a screen for watching the proceedings. Chair Andriola then asked if attendees could turn off their cell phones, as the Board wanted every voice to be heard. She then called out a few empty seats in the room for standing attendees to use.

After County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas read the Public Hearing Agenda Item, Chair Andriola reminded the audience that the hearing was a business meeting and that professional decorum was expected of all attendees. She added that, whether they agreed or disagreed with the comments, they should refrain from responding out loud, such as through remarks, clapping, or similar actions. She also noted that it would help ensure

everyone received an equal chance to express their feelings on the matter. She stated that, due to the complexity of the hearing, the proceedings would begin with 15 minutes for the staff to present, followed by 15 minutes for the appellant, an opportunity for public comment with each commentator allowed three minutes, and finally time for the Board to deliberate and follow up.

Christopher Bronczyk, Senior Planner for the Washoe County Community Services Department (CSD) Planning & Development, began the staff presentation with a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Appeal: Tentative Map WTM24-001 (Sierra Reflections) and Special Use Permit WSUP25-0019 (Sierra Reflections Infrastructure); Appeal; Vicinity Map; History (3 Slides); Tentative Subdivision Map – Request; Request – Special Use Permits; Trails; Parks; Grading; Hillside Development; Biological Resources; Mercury Remediation (2 Slides); Cultural Resources; Geotech/Soils; Hydrology and Water Quality; School District; Fire Service; Sewer and Water; Roadways and Traffic; Neighborhood Meeting (3 Slides); Public Comment; Findings; Analysis; Recommendation; Thank You.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide *Appeal: Tentative Map WTM24-001 (Sierra Reflections) and Special Use Permit WSUP25-0019 (Sierra Reflections Infrastructure)* and stated that he would review the appeal for tentative map WTM24-001 and the special use permit (SUP) case WSUP25-0019. He clarified it would be for the Sierra Reflections subdivision and associated infrastructure. He shared the slide titled *Appeal* and stated that the hearing was for an appeal. He stated the appellant was World Properties, Inc. He noted that the Planning Commission (PC) had heard the original case on January 6 and that they had unanimously denied the request. He stated that the reasons the appellant provided for the appeal were that the denial of the tentative subdivision map and SUP was arbitrary and that it constituted an abuse of discretion, arguing that it disregarded substantial evidence in the record, including the staff approval recommendation and expert analysis addressing geotechnical conditions, remediation, hydrology, aquatic resources, cultural resources, along with traffic and fiscal impacts. Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Vicinity Map* and noted it was the vicinity map that had been provided to the Board. He pointed out that the blue outline on the map was the proposed development, and that to the right of it was the landscape plan submitted as part of the development. He noted that it showed the overall layout, including the associated parks, as well as where the creeks ran through the subdivision.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *History (1/3)* and announced that the project and property had a significant history. He provided a brief overview of the history, stating that in 1984 the location was called St. James Resort or Sierra Reflections, and that it had received a conditional-use special permit for a resort with 250 hotel rooms, a small casino, 550 condominium units, and a golf course. He noted the permit was amended in 1991 to allow for 350 hotel rooms and a reduction in condominiums. Then, in 2002, Mr. Bronczyk continued, there was a lawsuit based on the regional plan at that time, led by Washoe County and the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID). That, he said, resulted in a settlement agreement. He noted that after the agreement, the properties were downzoned to a maximum of three dwellings per acre. He affirmed that in 2004, the plan

was approved and found to be in conformity with the regional plan. At that time, 1,090 residential units were allowed, but when the Board heard it, the cap was reduced to 995 units. Then, in 2006, this iteration of Sierra Reflections came before the County and was approved by the Washoe County PC. He shared the slide *History (2/3)* and noted there was a series of development agreements and extensions that came later, and that ultimately the application and series ended up expiring. He shared the slide *History (3/3)* and explained that the new submittal before the Board included updated documents and studies that should meet current code requirements.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Tentative Subdivision Map – Request* and gave an overview of the current plan, stating that the Sierra Reflections subdivision would comprise 760 acres across 29 parcels. He noted that 940 lots were being proposed over multiple regulatory zones, which regulated density. He identified the primary zones as medium-density suburban (three dwellings per acre), low-density suburban (one dwelling per acre), and medium-density rural (one dwelling per five acres). He added that there was also general rural (one dwelling per 40 acres), but that it was typically used for steeper slopes. He stipulated that lots ranging in size from 2,800 square feet to 68,000 square feet were associated with the development, along with associated grading.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide *Request – Special Use Permits* and noted that there were SUPs for two 375,000-gallon water tanks, two sewer lift stations to serve the subdivision, and three bridge crossings over the critical and sensitive stream buffers of significant hydrological resources, which he clarified were Steamboat Creek and Browns Creek. He shared the slide titled *Trails* and noted it was an overall trails map provided by the applicant. He stated that they were showing 8 miles of paved and unpaved pedestrian pathways, along with 2.2 miles of equestrian trails. He noted that the trails would be maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA) if not accepted by the County. He shared the slide titled *Parks* and explained that the project would include three parks: two pocket parks and one community park. He noted that 61 percent of the total property would be preserved for open space. He shared the slide titled *Grading* and mentioned there would be substantial grading with the project. He explained there would be 3.6 million cubic yards of cut, plus 4.25 million cubic yards of fill. He detailed that most of the material would be balanced from the cut, but that an additional 625,000 cubic yards would be imported to the site.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Hillside Development* and explained that the project triggered hillside development and that in the application, the appellant detailed the acreage associated with the slopes. He noted that 429 acres of the slopes were classified as most developable, with 177 acres classified as moderately developable where slopes fell between 15 and 30 percent. He added that 153 acres were slopes greater than 30 percent. He explained that his staff believed this was consistent with Article 424, based on how the project was designed and how it responded to existing topography. He shared the slide titled *Biological Resources* and stated that a biological resource assessment was submitted with the application and included the property boundary, with a quarter-mile buffer from the property. He noted that special-status species were identified, along with mitigation measures implemented in Washoe County's conditions of approval associated

with the biological resource assessment. He noted that the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) reviewed the request and provided conditions of approval, and that, based on what was submitted and discussions with other agencies, no endangered species were identified on the property.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Mercury Remediation (1/2)* and mentioned that mercury remediation was associated with the Sierra Reflections project. He stated it belonged to the Carson River Mercury Superfund (CRMS) site. He detailed that 449 total samples were collected across the site, and that 81 exceeded the residential action level of 7.1 milligrams. He stated that a draft of the Remedial Action Plan was reviewed by Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH), and that, based on what was submitted, his office recommended approval. He shared the slide *Mercury Remediation (2/2)* and showed an image of the CRMS site, directing the Board's attention to the portion specific to the Sierra Reflections property and explaining that it traveled along Steamboat Creek.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Cultural Resources* and noted that a cultural resources document was provided as part of the application. He described what was stated and concluded in the document: that all previously identified cultural resources that qualified for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) had been mitigated and required no further consideration, and that 49 total sites were identified within that assessment. He shared the slide titled *Geotech/Soils* and specified that a geotechnical report was provided as part of the application, analyzing fault lines, seismology, geology, and site soils. He stated the report concluded that the site was suitable for development. He added that the report recommended certain setbacks for habitable structures relative to the fault line. He noted that conditions associated with that recommendation were reviewed and provided by Washoe County Engineering. He shared the slide titled *Hydrology and Water Quality* and noted that a hydrology and water quality report was submitted, which identified multiple permanent waters of the United States (US), and that ordinary high-water marks were provided and identified. He specified that Washoe County Engineering reviewed and provided a number of conditions of approval associated with the floodplains, in addition to items related to the hydrology and water quality report.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *School District* and discussed school district zoning, explaining that the development would be zoned for Pleasant Valley Elementary School, while noting that Herz Middle School and Galena High School were also zoned to the district. He stated that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) informed them that, at full build-out, its schools had sufficient capacity to accommodate the estimated number of children in that development. He claimed that the WCSD mentioned funding mechanisms to accommodate growth if it exceeded projections. He added that a modernization project for Pleasant Valley Elementary School was anticipated for the 2029-2031 timeframe. He stated that other mechanisms could be utilized, such as zoning adjustments to address capacity issues. He noted there was also a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program provided as part of the application and agency review. The applicant, he noted, agreed to undertake off-site improvements associated with SRTS.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Fire Service* and explained that fire service would be provided by the East Washoe Valley Fire Station. He anticipated that it would move to the Washoe Valley Consolidated Fire Station, which was approved as a special-use permit in 2023, with an extension of time in 2025. He noted that the extension of time was due to funding mechanisms and that there were currently conditions associated with the Truckee Meadows Fire Review for evaluating and identifying additional funding mechanisms, which would be placed on the applicant. He shared the slide titled *Sewer and Water* and explained that sewer services would end up at the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF), and that it had capacity. He added that the project was responsible for constructing the force main through Pleasant Valley to tie to the existing Washoe County infrastructure. He noted that there was a sanitary sewer infrastructure dedication agreement from 2016, which required the property owners or their successors to design, construct, and pay for all the infrastructure to convey sewer services to the existing sanitary sewer collection system in Washoe County. He shared the slide titled *Roadways and Traffic* and detailed that the project was expected to generate 8,864 daily trips, with 658 morning peak-hour trips and 884 evening peak-hour trips. He noted that two roundabouts associated with the development had been recommended as part of the traffic study. He added that the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and Washoe County Engineering had reviewed the roundabouts, which were required conditions for approval of the project.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Neighborhood Meeting (1/3)* and mentioned that multiple neighborhood meetings associated with the request began in 2024, along with an open house in 2025. He shared the slide titled *Neighborhood Meeting (2/3)* and noted that substantial concerns were raised in those meetings regarding water resources, traffic and access, schools, infrastructure costs, environmental health, public safety, and, sharing the slide titled *Neighborhood Meeting (3/3)*, he added environmental impacts, community character, lot sizes, and recreation and trails to the list of concerns. He shared the slide titled *Public Comment* and mentioned that, prior to the January 6 public hearing, 51 emails and 1 voicemail were received. He added that 37 comments were submitted to a neighborhood meeting hub site, and a 1,600-signature petition was also provided. He stated that all public comments received were opposed to the proposal. He added that 44 comments were submitted at the public hearing, all of which were in opposition.

Mr. Bronczyk shared the slide titled *Findings* and stated that at the January 6 meeting, the PC was unable to make all the required findings, though staff was able to make them, as outlined in the staff reports. He shared the slide titled *Analysis* and clarified that staff reviewed the project in coordination with local, regional, State, and federal agencies. He said those agencies provided technical analysis and subject-matter expertise and that the resulting recommendations and conditions of approval had been incorporated into the project. He shared the slide titled *Recommendation* and stated it was the recommendation slide he had for the Board. He explained the possible actions to the Board: they could affirm the PC's decision and deny the project, reverse the decision and approve the project, or reverse the decision and remand the matter back to the PC. He stated he was available for any questions.

Commissioner Clark questioned whether, if a presenter exceeded their time limit, anyone else would receive the same opportunity. Chair Andriola clarified that questions should be directed to the appellant. Commissioner Clark asked to see the map showing Browns Creek and Steamboat Creek. He asked whether Galena Creek was also on the property and whether they were all waterways. He then asked whether the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) had reviewed the project and whether they had an opinion or sent any reports. Mr. Bronczyk stated that the USACE was sent the project multiple times to review, but that no comments or conditions of approval were received. Commissioner Clark then asked about the history slide that was shown, clarifying the passage regarding Washoe County and the SVGID in 2002. He asked what the SVGID was doing in Washoe Valley. Mr. Bronczyk clarified that the settlement agreement from that time was not specific to Washoe Valley but was instead based on the city expanding and the sphere of influence expanding, and therefore, the property in question was just one property associated with that specific agreement. He added that the agreement was not specific to just Washoe Valley. Commissioner Clark clarified that Washoe Valley was a significant distance from Sun Valley, so he was wondering why the SVGID would be involved in what happened in the south end of the County.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large stated that in 2002, Washoe County and the SVGID initiated litigation against the region regarding spheres of influence for the Cities of Reno and Sparks. He noted that, as part of the Comprehensive Settlement Agreement, all of Washoe County was included in the settlements reached, and that the SVGID was only one of the parties to the lawsuit, and that Washoe County was only one of the co-plaintiffs.

Commissioner Clark stated that he wanted to get that on the record and make sure everybody understood what was really taking place. He thanked CDDA Large for the clarification. He alleged there was talk about some development agreements that had expired. He asked for an explanation to the public, who might not be familiar with the details, about the expiration and what that meant when a development expired. Mr. Bronczyk explained that when a tentative map expired, the previous reviews and history associated with it were null and void. So, he noted, his office reviewed new applications based on the newer current standards. Commissioner Clark asked whether it was fair to say that it was nice to know a project's history, but that once it expired, it was no longer viable. Mr. Bronczyk affirmed that the original request was no longer a viable project, and so his team reviewed the new project as if it were a new submittal. Commissioner Clark asked whether, after a project was approved and then someone else bought or sold it, that person could return before the Board or other bodies in the future to amend the existing agreements. Mr. Bronczyk affirmed that was correct, and that there were processes such as an amendment of conditions, and that if the project were sold, the new owners could come in for something completely different.

Commissioner Clark suggested the current project could be changed in the future, including adding more units. He recalled that in the past, developers had come back to the County to ask for even more density. He asked if the density for the Sierra Reflections project already existed with the underlying zoning and was capped in historical Board of

County Commissioners (BCC) meetings, so that, if someone from the project came back before the Board in five to ten years, they could not then exceed the current amount of 995 dwelling units. Commissioner Clark stated he just wanted to get that on the record. He asked to hear more about the cut and fill and for clarification on the stated amount of 3.6 million cubic yards and the fill amount of 4.2 million cubic feet. Mr. Bronczyk confirmed the numbers were correct. Commissioner Clark stated that it was a lot of soil and a lot of movement as well. He then asked about the superfund site and whether Sierra Reflections was the only superfund site in the County at that time. Mr. Bronczyk stated that it would be a better question for NNPH. Commissioner Clark commented that if they were not available at the moment, they could be asked later.

Commissioner Clark asked if the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP) had weighed in on the project. Mr. Bronczyk stated that the NDEP was sent the review multiple times, along with the Nevada Division of Forestry for Threatened and Endangered Species (NDFTES), but that he did not receive comments or conditions of approval from either agency. Commissioner Clark asked whether the NDFTES, NDEP, or the USACE had yet weighed in on the project. Mr. Bronczyk stated that none of those entities had provided any conditions or comments.

Chair Andriola asked for questions from the other Commissioners. Seeing none, she asked Mr. Bronczyk for the opportunity to call him back later in the proceedings.

Chair Andriola explained that the Board would proceed by hearing the appellant's presentation, noting her understanding that one of the presenters would be providing comments virtually. Bowman Group Planning Manager Dave Snellgrove asked whether Holland & Hart Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) Counsel Doug Thornley was present at the meeting, and Mr. Thornley confirmed that he was. Chair Andriola noted that the presentation timer would be set to 15 minutes. Mr. Snellgrove introduced himself and explained that Mr. Thornley would begin the presentation by discussing the first few PowerPoint slides, while Mr. Snellgrove would present the middle portion, then transition the conversation back to Mr. Thornley.

Mr. Snellgrove and Mr. Thornley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Sierra Reflections; A 40-Year Planning History; The Law is Clear – Zoning Controls; Project at a Glance; Staff Recommendation; Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA); Long-Term Regional Land Use Planning; Master Plan and Code Items Supporting Common Open Space Development; Existing Master Plan & Zoning; Project Slopes; Environmental Leadership: Common Open Space and Clustering; Addressing Community Concerns; Mercury Remediation – Most Comprehensive in the Region; Water Resources – Better Than Pre-Development; Traffic and Road Improvements; Positive Fiscal Impact; Legal Findings; Untitled Slide; Additional Slides for Question; Mercury Slides; Carson River Mercury Superfund Site (3 slides); Mercury Testing (4 slides); Traffic Slides; Primary Access Connections; Eastlake Roundabout; St. James Parkway Roundabout; FEMA Flood Exhibit; Flood Zones; Landscape, Parks and Trails (3 slides); Neighborhood Park #1; Neighborhood Parks #2 & #3; Trails (2 slides); Vision Board (2 slides); Revegetation Plan; Project Dev. Stats and Phasing; Development

Statistics (2 slides); Common Open Space Tentative Map; Lot and Park Phasing Table; SUP Slides; SUP (Water Tanks) (2 slides); SUP (Bridge Crossings – Signif, Hydrologic Resources); SUP (Lift Stations); Faultline Exhibit (2 slides); Grading Slides; Cut and Fill Exhibit; Cuts & Fills; Common Open Space Tentative Map Grading Plan (12 slides); Common Open Space Tentative Map Details (2 slides).

Mr. Thornley introduced himself, noted that he was presenting on behalf of the appellant World Properties, Inc., and displayed the slide titled *A 40-Year Planning History*. He explained that the *Sierra Reflections* slide listed organizations that brought forth professionals whom the appellant engaged after the expiration of their previous tentative map for the Sierra Reflections project to bring the application into conformance with more modern design standards and technical requirements. He referred to a question previously asked by Commissioner Clark, answering that, despite the earlier iteration of the tentative map having lapsed, the project site's underlying zoning had not. He referred to the *A 40-Year Planning History* slide and opined that, while Mr. Bronczyk had done a great job of providing the Board with the project's history, he wanted to draw attention to several other events. He reported that, in 1984 and prior years, a resort casino was planned on the project's property and was zoned for commercial use, which he described as being significantly more intense and intended for denser use. He explained that as the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning lawsuit was underway in 2002 and 2003, the City of Reno agreed not to annex the more economically beneficial property, provided it was rezoned down to residential use. He noted that the dates on the slide represented a timeline spanning over 20 years that showed how, from the time of rezoning, the County had begun to develop public improvement plans and approved a sewer line, followed by an earlier iteration of the project's tentative map. He explained that the tentative map from that time had existed for approximately 15 years before it expired, which he opined was expired for good reason, as the design standards and technical requirements for developing the kind of properties intended for the project had changed in the interim. He reported that the County's career staff and the BCC had rightly decided that, while the project's zoning would not change, the project's plans would need to be revised to ensure compliance with the standards implemented since the project's initial approval.

Mr. Thornley showed the slide titled *The Law is Clear – Zoning Controls*. He stated that it was important that the project's zoning had not changed since 2003. He explained that nearly 1,000 houses had been allowed to be built on the project site for 23 years, with that policy decision demonstrating that the jurisdictions at that time had determined how they wanted the region to develop and what they wanted to see developed in the future. He noted that the project was an example of long-term planning in the region. He stated that it was important to remember throughout the duration of the BCC meeting that, while the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan (Master Plan) was aspirational, served as a guide, and provided a ten-year outlook on expected developments, the zoning designation took precedence when inconsistent with the Master Plan based on the regulations of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and the Nevada Supreme Court having repeatedly held that a zoning ordinance did not need to be in perfect conformity with every Master Plan policy. He emphasized that zoning ordinances were what developers considered when determining what could be built and the standard against which projects

were judged. He reported that the project site had been zoned for residential development at the described density for decades, conformed with the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, and was part of both the Master Plan and the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA). He stated that the matter under deliberation by the BCC was not a policy decision on whether 900 homes should be built, but rather a determination of whether the project, as submitted, adhered to the technical standards and design requirements of the Washoe County Code (WCC).

Mr. Snellgrove displayed the *Project at a Glance* slide. He opined that Mr. Bronczyk had done a very good job of reviewing the general facts of the project, and he noted his intent not to discuss the same information in excessive detail. He noted that Mr. Bronczyk's comments covered some of the project's benefits, including the addition of 8.5 miles of public walking and equestrian trails, and that 61 percent of the project comprised open space. He reported that the clustering of homes preserved significant open space and provided publicly available trails and connectivity, while providing essential diversity and housing. He showed the slide titled *Staff Recommendation*, noting that the previous PC staff report included an excerpt from the South Valleys Area Plan (SVAP), which identified that the rural framework was not universal across every property in the South Valleys Planning Area. He explained that Priority Policy 5.1 of the SVAP required maintaining large lot sizes outside of the TMSA. He recalled that Mr. Thornley had previously stated that the project property was within the TMSA, which were areas that would receive community sewer and water services. He noted that a septic system could be integrated into a property on a one-acre plot 20 years prior, but that the requirement subsequently changed to a three-acre lot, with such integration currently requiring a five-acre lot. He explained that the minimum lot size required for a septic system to be added to the property had increased, which had to be considered as part of the updated tentative map for the project.

Mr. Snellgrove introduced the *Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA)* slide. He acknowledged that the map on the slide was very dark but noted that the red line represented the TMSA boundary. He explained that the map included the Forest Area Plan, the Southwest Area Plan, and the SVAP, which overlapped with the TMSA in certain areas. He noted that the area outlined in yellow on the map represented the project's property boundary, which fell within the red area indicating the TMSA boundary. He reported that the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning's regional plan identified TMSA service areas as those that would receive municipal services and infrastructure. He stated that the TMSA service areas, in which the project was located, included high-intensity Mixed Use Core, Tier 1 Lands, Tier 2 Lands, and Tier 3 Lands, where regional growth was prioritized. He displayed the slide titled *Long-Term Regional Land Use Planning*. He explained that the slide's map depicted TMSA area neighborhood types, as included in the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. He reported that the circled area at the bottom of the map showed the anticipated approved plan communities. He noted that the development was anticipated in regional planning for 20 years and had continued to be expected in the current 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. He stated that the project's approval advanced the County's long-term vision for the site, which had been envisioned for 20 years, was

incorporated into traffic and school plans, and was anticipated by all regional service providers.

Mr. Snellgrove showed the *Master Plan and Code Items Supporting Common Open Space Development* slide. He explained that there were Master Plan policies that identified and encouraged the project's development. He reported that SVAP Policy 3.2 encouraged common open space development and transfer of development rights to protect wildlife and vegetation. He explained that SVAP Policy 4.3 outlined the protection of critical source water areas, and he identified that both Browns Creek and Steamboat Creek ran across the project property. He stated that SVAP Policy 5 was related to regional parks and trails, and he noted that the project essentially provided a regional park on the property that would be maintained and operated by the HOA, along with over 450 acres of open space, accounting for 61 percent of the site. He explained that SVAP Policy 8.1 was addressed by the project's incorporation of the Virginia and Truckee (V&T) Railroad grade, which would be implemented as a multi-use trail. He noted that the slide included passages from Article 418 of the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) regarding significant hydrologic resources, two of which encouraged common open space developments to avoid hazardous or environmentally sensitive areas.

Mr. Snellgrove displayed the slide titled *Existing Master Plan & Zoning* and recalled that Mr. Thornley had previously mentioned the project's location within the TMSA. He reiterated that the project existed within the Master Plan and zoning designations for the area for over 20 years since the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning settlement. He referred to the maps on the slide and explained that the overlaid classifications varied across many land parcels, were inconsistent, and indicated that not everything was designated as medium-density suburban (mds) or medium-density rural (mdr). He referred to the *Project Slopes* slide and noted that the reason for such variation in classification was demonstrated by the map on the slide. He explained that the areas with higher-density zoning designations on the *Existing Master Plan & Zoning* slide's map corresponded with the green areas representing 0 to 15 percent slope areas on the map included on the *Project Slopes* slide. He noted that the regions of the map on the *Project Slopes* slide highlighted in yellow and orange represented 15 to 30 percent slopes, while the red portions reflected areas with a 30 percent or steeper slope. He explained that the project's site plan was overlaid on the slope map, demonstrating that the developers were focusing on locating the project in the best development areas that were zoned appropriately for the project's use types. He reported that cluster development was being utilized for the project, as recommended by Article 408 of the WCDC and encouraged by the significant hydrologic resource element. He explained that cluster development enabled smaller lot sizes, which were codified as part of the County's regulations.

Mr. Snellgrove showed the slide titled *Environmental Leadership: Common Open Space and Clustering*. He reported that the map on the left side of the slide depicted the project's previous layout, with the current site plan shown on the right. He noted that the layout of the two site plans had not changed much over time and had remained very similar because the developers had worked within the proper areas both in 2006 and 2026. He explained that the two large areas that had changed within that period were outlined in

yellow on the map of the old site plan. He reported that the circle at the bottom of the site plan included attached housing units that had since been removed from the project. He noted that the upper circle depicted an area where developers had since created a wider buffer surrounding Steamboat Creek.

Mr. Snellgrove displayed the *Addressing Community Concerns* slide and recalled that Mr. Bronczyk had previously discussed some of the topics on the slide. He noted that his intent was to draw attention to four major concerns, though he acknowledged that others had been listed on the slide as well. He stated that rural character was a major community concern and noted that 61.6 percent of the project site was comprised of open space. He acknowledged that infrastructure and a fire station were additional concerns, particularly given the lack of fire stations, which was a significant issue in the area. He reported that the project would have a fiscal surplus and involved regional road impact fees (RRIF) and fire fees, which would contribute to the construction of a new consolidated fire station. He acknowledged concerns about the environment and explained that the project installed an 8-foot clean fill cap in the area where mercury was most prevalent. He noted that he would review a slide with additional details on the topic later in the presentation. He stated that the most similar example of mercury remediation in Washoe County was a 4-foot clean fill cap. He reported that eight to nine months were spent working with NNPH and Washoe County Engineering staff to develop an 8-foot clean fill cap. He noted that traffic was an additional community concern and explained that those matters would operate at a level of service B or better, with traffic expected to be approximately half the volume in the area before the freeway opened, when it was formerly the only connection between Carson City and Reno.

Mr. Snellgrove showed the *Mercury Remediation – Most Comprehensive in the Region* slide. He noted that the image on the slide depicted an example of the Talus Valley project, formerly known as the Daybreak project, which previously had mercury on the site. He explained that developers were required to implement a 4-foot cap. He reported that the same mercury expert from the Talus Valley project also worked on the Sierra Reflections project. He stated that the image on the slide demonstrated what capping looked like and showed a rough estimate of how tall eight feet of capping would be, compared to the four feet of capping used for the Talus Valley project. He displayed the slide titled *Water Resources – Better Than Pre-Development* and explained that there would be a reduction in the overall volume of water flowing off the project site. He noted that the excerpt on the slide was part of the hydrology report prepared for the project, which indicated that the post-development ending flow condition would be 490 cubic feet per second (cfs), down from 516 cfs at the start of the project. He introduced the *Traffic and Road Improvements* slide, noting that the project had two access points consisting of roundabouts on Eastlake Boulevard and south of Pagni Lane. He explained that the purple arrows on the slide's map indicated the location of the two roundabouts, while the yellow arrow showed a formalized point of access that would operate as daily gated access into St. James Village and would allow for approved emergency access in the area. He introduced the slide titled *Positive Fiscal Impact* by explaining that the project was analyzed by EKAY Economic Consultants, Incorporated, which identified a fiscally positive situation for the County of \$17.8 million of net surplus and a \$1.9 million surplus

to the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) in addition to the pro rata share that would be paid as an estimated \$6.2 million contribution towards the construction of a new fire station. He explained that the remainder of the presentation would be conducted by Mr. Thornley.

Mr. Thornley displayed the *Legal Findings* slide. He explained that the slide included a quick reference guide for the legal findings at issue in the project. He cited the Staff Report, where he noted County staff had analyzed the project's technical documents, rules in place under the WCC, and concluded that the project complied with all technical standards and design requirements. He reported that coordinating agencies had participated in the process, and he opined that the correct conclusion regarding previous mentions of the Nevada Department of Forestry (NDF), the NDEP, and the USACE was not that they had lacked the chance to provide their input or had been excluded from doing so. Instead, he indicated that those agencies had no comments at that time, as they had received all the materials supplied to other coordinating agencies and ultimately chose not to provide a response. He stated that the Staff Report was supported by nearly 800 pages of technical documents, which he acknowledged was a substantial amount of information to review. He displayed the *Untitled Slide*, noting that he and Mr. Snellgrove greatly appreciated the Board's attention to the issue, as it was important to both himself and the community. He acknowledged that the Board would hear several hours of public comment shortly after the presentation, which he noted was important, but he emphasized that it was not evidence. He opined that the evidence that needed to be considered was the technical studies and reports, which the BCC could use to assess the veracity of the conclusions drawn by County staff. He expressed hope that the Board would give the public the same attention given during the previous staff presentation and the presentation he and Mr. Snellgrove had just provided, and that they would use the time during the public comment portion of Agenda Item 13 to craft their questions to the technical experts in the audience, County staff, and the members of coordinating agencies in attendance at the meeting. He opined that the Board would find that substantial evidence existed which proved the project complied with existing technical standards and the requirements of the WCC.

Commissioner Clark asked Mr. Snellgrove to display the *Positive Fiscal Impact* slide and asked how the \$17.8 million net surplus to the County was calculated, and when those funds would be available. He inquired whether that would occur after the project's construction was complete, and how that money would be conveyed to the County if the project were approved during the meeting. He asked about the process for that transfer of funds and for additional information on the matter. President of the Krater Consulting Group, Ken Crater, introduced himself by noting that he was speaking on behalf of the project owner and applicant. He answered that the \$17.8 million net surplus to Washoe County was based on a 20-year analysis period, once the development commenced. Commissioner Clark acknowledged that the analysis period was 20 years and noted that it corresponded with less than \$1 million in funds per year. He stated that one of his questions was about the expected construction timeline for the project and asked for clarification on whether Mr. Krater suspected the project would take approximately 20 years to construct if approved. Mr. Krater responded that the project should be built out in about 10 years, though he noted it could be completed faster, possibly within the following 5 or 6 years.

He noted that the timeline depended on absorption and clarified that he did not expect it to take anywhere near 20 years. Commissioner Clark asked for an estimate of how long it would take for the project's first homes to begin construction if the project were approved by the Board. Mr. Krater explained that if the project were approved that day, it would take approximately 1 year to obtain all necessary permits, including the conditional letter of map revision and the Sections 404 and 401 permits from the USACE and the NDEP. He reported that following those steps, the final map would be approved, construction would commence, and it would take approximately 1.5 years of grading and home construction before the first Certificate of Occupancy (CO) was approved, which ultimately represented a 2.5-year process.

Commissioner Clark asked for confirmation that it would take approximately 1.5 to 2 years to move the nearly 8 million cubic feet of cut-and-fill material. Mr. Krater answered that a significant portion of the project site would be masqueraded in advance. He explained that enough material would be excavated from the upland area above the meadow, towards the US 395 and Eastlake Boulevard, to be used to generate fill material for the meadow. He explained that the need for such a substantial amount of fill material stemmed from the meadow area requiring approximately 1.25 million cubic yards just to create the 8-foot clean fill cap. He reported that such work would be conducted initially during the process, with 75 percent of the grading likely to occur before construction. Commissioner Clark reiterated his question, asking whether the timeline would be approximately 1.5 years to move the soil for the project, and Mr. Krater estimated it would likely take about 6 to 8 months to move the material. Commissioner Clark noted that during the time the material was being moved, there would be a large amount of contaminated dust particles in the air throughout Washoe Valley. He asked how Mr. Krater envisioned the mercury-contaminated dust particles would be controlled.

Mr. Krater stated that the dust issue demonstrated why a substantial amount of time was spent working with Washoe County Engineering and NNPH staff to develop the draft remedial action plan, which detailed the construction process for the mercury-contaminated material. He noted that the draft remedial action plan included several conditions on how the material would be transported to minimize the amount of movement. He explained that all the material would be moved within the meadow and would not be hauled offsite or into the upland area. He reported that a grading plan was designed that provided pocket areas where the material could be excavated and moved without having to relocate it more than once, and he noted that the plan also stipulated the location of stockpiles, should any be needed. He explained that there were three or four areas that ultimately received the mercury-laden material, which would then be capped with eight feet of clean fill material. He noted that the draft remedial action plan also included requirements for dust control and weather issues such as severe thunderstorms and rain, which were matters governed by NNPH. He emphasized that NNPH would take an active role in the construction process by watching the operations to ensure the contractor complied with the draft remedial action plan and that testing was conducted upon completion of the grading to ensure that the mercury levels within the residential area were below the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) thresholds and to verify that everything was processed correctly.

Commissioner Clark stated that he was more concerned about windy days in Washoe Valley, as there were certain days of the year when trucks were knocked over by wind in the South Valleys. Mr. Krater explained that construction would be shut down, everything would need to be properly sealed, and a dust pallet would be placed when high winds occurred. He noted that each of those actions was controlled by the stipulations within the draft remedial action plan. He explained that the draft remedial action plan would be finalized and approved by NNPH upon the submittal and processing of the final project map. He stated that the remedial action plan would then serve as the guiding document for the contractor, who would be charged with following it.

Commissioner Clark recalled that there had been mention of the consolidated fire station and the project's contribution to the facility, noting that it had not yet been built despite having been approved since 2019. He asked for an explanation of how those efforts would be conducted. Mr. Krater reported that he had met with TMFPD Fire Chief Richard Edwards and the former TMFPD Fire Chief Charles Moore on several occasions. He opined that the BCC had made a great selection in choosing Chief Edwards for the role. He reported that he and Chief Edwards were committed to working together to contribute the pro rata share from the project to the consolidated fire station. He explained that Chief Edwards had current cost estimates for that station and had conducted rooftop counts to determine the number of building units the existing station served. He noted that they had already determined the service requirements for the buildings associated with the Sierra Reflections project, and he reiterated that the project developers were committed to contributing their pro rata share for the cost estimate calculated by Chief Edwards. He acknowledged that Chief Edwards had been working diligently to determine those costs and reported that Chief Edwards had met with construction experts in prior months to engage in value engineering. He stated that the developers would do everything they could to help Chief Edwards create a solid, economical fire station. He commended the Board for the last fire station constructed by the TMFPD. He noted that the most recently completed fire station was planned by Hershenow Klippenstein Architects and opined that it was very well thought out.

Commissioner Clark noted that he had more questions, but he wanted to compliment Chief Edwards for having done a great job. He stated that the Board was proud of Chief Edwards and hoped there would be no problems arising from the Reno Fire Department (RFD) seeking to hire him. He asked Mr. Krater when the developer's share of the consolidated fire station's construction funds would be paid, and whether the payment would be made up front or spread over 20 years, as was the case for the \$17.8 million net surplus to the County. He noted that the consolidated fire station's construction cost was estimated to be \$6 million to \$7 million in 2019, but had risen to \$12 million to \$17 million currently. He pondered what the construction cost would increase to over the next 20 years, and he repeated his request for a timeframe for those payments. He asked whether the project developers would provide the funds immediately if the project were approved by the BCC that day, and what it would take to receive that money. Mr. Krater explained that discussions between accounting staff and Chief Edwards indicated that developers would pay their pro rata share of the consolidated fire station upon receiving the building permit for the project. He noted that Chief Edwards had wanted to move the

consolidated fire station's construction forward by receiving enough funds in advance to pay for architectural and engineering designs, which would subsequently allow him to seek bids, learn accurate cost estimates, and consider bonding methods. He reported that, in collaboration with the County, the developers had committed to writing a \$1 million check within 180 days of the final regional plan approval and the expiration of all appeal processes for the project, covering all upfront design costs for architecture and engineering. He explained that Chief Edwards would be given a significant amount of money for the consolidated fire station in advance, which would allow him to move forward with construction by obtaining detailed estimates, bids, and bonding.

Commissioner Clark noted that there were suggestions to use the same plans for the Apple Station at the consolidated fire station, though he acknowledged that some modifications might be needed. He explained that those plans could be reused if necessary. He asked Mr. Krater whether he had additional details that could help the TMFPD develop the consolidated fire station. Mr. Krater reported that he had mentioned to Chief Edwards that he suspected the TMFPD could save substantial funds by transitioning the fire station's design to that of a single-story building. He acknowledged that such a decision was ultimately for Chief Edwards to make and that there were many new regulations regarding employee safety and living quarters for the fire crew that had not existed 20 to 30 years prior. He reported that some changes would need to be made to the existing Apple Station plans to apply them to the consolidated fire station, as it was located on a different site, had unique topography, and different grading. He expressed confidence in the TMFPD's ability to submit the existing plans to a qualified architect and engineer for a design that accounted for those factors. Commissioner Clark inquired whether he was correct in stating that there would be a prorated share paid to the TMFPD for the consolidated fire station, based on when developers received the CO for each property in the project, after escrows closed and residents moved into the homes. Mr. Krater confirmed that his statement was correct, noting that previous discussions had resolved that the contribution would be made based on building permit approval, which would come prior to the issuance of COs. He explained that a formal agreement would be drafted for approval if the project were approved at the meeting to ensure that all the rules had been agreed to by the County and the developer. Commissioner Clark noted that Mr. Krater had stated the project's construction could take 6 to 7 years and asked whether it could take that long for the funds to be conveyed to the TMFPD, which Mr. Krater confirmed. Commissioner Clark noted that there would then be an ability for bonds to be issued, as there was a source of income, and he stated that there would be money provided in advance for the fire station's design.

Vice Chair Garcia referred to the slide titled *Positive Fiscal Impact* and asked how the listed \$1.9 million in surplus provided to the TMFPD was calculated. Mr. Krater explained that EKAY Economic Consultants, Inc., conducted the fiscal impact analysis by considering all revenue the project would generate for the County through various tax streams, such as property and sales taxes. He explained that the analysis also considered the project's service costs, including what the County would need to deliver through road and fire service crews and equipment, to determine how the County budget would be impacted by the project. He noted that the difference was calculated between the

revenue generated by the project and the funds required to support it, resulting in a \$1.9 million net surplus, which he noted was based on a Time Value of Money (TVM) concept.

Chair Andriola stated that the Board would proceed by hearing public comment. She reminded those in attendance that everyone wanted to hear who the next speaker was and what they would say, and she requested that any external expressions of enthusiasm be held while people provided their comments.

On the call for public comment, Jeannette Porrazzo was not present when called to speak.

Ryan Ramsdell read a document regarding his concerns related to the Sierra Reflections appeal, what he believed were unmet findings within the application, and recommended that the application be resubmitted to meet the Master Plan and WCDC, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Beverly Silva read a document regarding her concerns related to Sierra Reflections' character, issues with the existing water and sewer system, and unfulfilled promises made to the St. James Village residents, which she believed would occur again if the Sierra Reflections project was approved, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Larry Moulton read a document regarding his concerns related to the South Valleys being a rural community, how the Sierra Reflections project went against the Master Plan approved two years previously, and the petition that contained 1,828 hand-signed signatures against the project, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Richard Cooper read a document outlining his concerns regarding historical preservation related to the Sierra Reflections project and why he believed the application could not meet the required findings for approval, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Delia Greenhalgh read a document outlining her concerns about her reasoning for the Sierra Reflections application not meeting the required findings for approval, specifically related to historical sites and the Master Plan, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Loretta Low read a document regarding her concerns about the Sierra Reflections development not maintaining the rural character and lifestyle of Washoe Valley residents based on the impairment of elements such as horses, livestock, ranch-style homes, scenic vistas, open spaces, and dark skies, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Bob Burke read a document outlining his concerns about Sierra Reflections' failure to comply with the WCDC, lack of consistency regarding the Master Plan, and

failure to maintain the rural character of the South Valleys, specifically regarding agriculture and livestock, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board.

Lisa Dayton read a document regarding her concerns related to the Sierra Reflections applicant density calculation, including the area of concern, density, development constraints, slopes greater than 30 percent, and AE floodways, a copy of which was distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She noted that the definition of *density* and *development constraints area (DCA)* was located on the first page of her document.

Kevin Kemp read a document regarding his concerns about the proposed density in the Sierra Reflections tentative map and the omission of critical neighborhood design standards in the Master Plan and land use designations, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Michelle Santo read from a document outlining her concerns about the proposed density for the Sierra Reflections development and subdivision map, which showed the proposed parcel size was below permitted zoning. She pointed out that her document included aerial views of the closest urban neighborhood. Copies were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Charlie Hyatt read from a document regarding her concerns about the patio homes and urban densities for the Sierra Reflections development, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She wondered whether the Board would assume financial responsibility to extend urban services if the BCC approved the appeal.

Chair Andriola said she wanted to ensure each speaker had the opportunity to share their thoughts. She mentioned that, legally, everything said during public comment was included on the record.

Anna Quinn, a 15-year resident of Washoe Valley, read from a document stating that Sierra Reflections' application was incomplete regarding endangered species, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Clare Holland read from a document about Sierra Reflections' application being incomplete regarding sensitive migration routes, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Karen Critor read from a document regarding pollution issues that Sierra Reflections would cause in Steamboat Creek, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Sandi Sullivan read from a document explaining that she believed that there was an error on the Sierra Reflections application regarding tree removal, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Gayle Bowers read from a document and shared her concerns regarding potential violations of the Steamboat Creek Restoration Plan if the tentative subdivision received approval, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Will Cowan read from a document and spoke about flooding issues related to the proposed Sierra Reflections subdivision, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Joost Reidel, a resident of Pleasant Valley and a hydrogeologist for over 30 years, highlighted elements that pertained to flooding that he felt violated the WDCD Article 418 and NRS 534 regarding water rights. He read from a document and spoke about the flooding impacts of the stream and loss of wetland, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Tim Salyer read from a document outlining his concerns about the planned roundabouts' inadequate size, proposed speed, and lack of bicycle and merge lanes within the Sierra Reflections development, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Marilyn Naylor read from a document and shared her concerns regarding the scenic byway protection and potential disregard of NRS and WDCD, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Erica Bruemmer read from a document that mentioned school and traffic impacts associated with the Sierra Reflections development, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Chair Andriola acknowledged the importance of allowing everyone to share their comments, which she appreciated and respected.

Cameron McSweeney read from a document outlining her concerns about obtaining homeowners' insurance for homes within the Sierra Reflections proposed development, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Lynda Bell read from a document and shared her concerns about constrained emergency services for the fire department, the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority Health (REMSA Health), and law enforcement if the Sierra Reflections subdivision received approval. Copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Chair Andriola urged the audience to listen respectfully to all public comments without disruption.

Tom Johnson read a document a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board. He noted that an acre-foot of water was equivalent to 325,851 gallons. He shared that in 1993, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) drilled two wells in St. James Village to provide water for the development. He mentioned that those two wells were originally rated at 715 gallons per minute and subsequently derated to 175 gallons per minute. He indicated that in 2018, a test pump of the Falcon Capital Well near the Chocolate Nugget Factory and Interstate 580 showed that over 10 days of pumping, the water level dropped by more than 100 feet (ft). He explained that according to TMWA's website, the average annual usage per individual was 60,615 gallons. He suggested that, with 2.5 people per dwelling and 940 dwellings, the total was 142,445,250 gallons, or 452 acre-ft of water. He shared that there were 81 additional units in St. James still to be developed, which represented another 40 acre-ft of water. He noted that, according to the US Geological Survey and the Nevada Division of Water Resources, Pleasant Valley was already drawing 2,770 acre-ft per year. He said that the sustainable drawdown as of 2022 was approximately 3,000 acre-ft per year, which was the latest available data. He mentioned that the Nevada Division of Water Resources already showed the well as fully pumped and overallocated. He added that the same source showed the Washoe Valley Aquifer as fully appropriated. He believed that the PC's policy was not to approve any development that would negatively impact adjacent properties. He indicated that the PC's denial of the Sierra Reflections application was in accordance with Washoe County policies. He stated that, per page 5 of TMWA's work order number 24-0113, groundwater levels in the South Truckee Meadows had declined by 70 ft since the 1960s due to unsustainable pumping rates. He said that groundwater depletion posed challenges for municipal and domestic well owners and threatened the reliability of previously dedicated water supplies. He noted that on page 3 of the same work order, long-term water extraction was expected to influence groundwater in domestic wells in Washoe Valley. He shared that, despite the existing demand being a fraction of the wells' capacity, the static water levels in the two St. James Village wells had been declining since the wells were first installed. He suggested that the data indicated a consistent decline in water levels across both monitoring and production wells, with a slow leveling off over the last four years. He thought that the impact of declining subsurface water supplies caused hardships for municipal and domestic well owners and threatened the sustainability of water supplies previously committed for service. He said that groundwater levels in the area were declining, and evidence indicated that additional groundwater withdrawals would exceed the basin's sustainable yield, causing continued declines in aquifer levels and conflicting with existing water rights. He pointed out that one of the comments in the work order stated that Brown's Creek would be redirected to replenish the aquifer at St. James Village, which he believed would make little Washoe Lake become non-existent.

**3:20 p.m.**      **The Board recessed.**

**3:34 p.m.**      **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

Chair Andriola expressed her appreciation for the audience's patience, professionalism, and understanding.

Elaine Martin read from a document outlining her concerns about the Serpa Well Pumping Test within the Sierra Reflections application, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Bill Naylor read from a document outlining floodplain preservation within the Sierra Reflections application, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Joyce Newman read from a document and spoke about the seismic and liquefaction risks to public health and welfare, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Tom Callicrate read from a document regarding geologic hazards and health risks associated with Sierra Reflections, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Shea Clark Smith read from a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He shared his concerns regarding mercury levels in the soil and how proposed remediation could create additional issues. He noted that moving toxic soil around the property and hoping it would disappear by burying it, should not be an option. He stated that Map 8 also showed ten-acre parcels that were not adequately sampled, with only one sample per acre.

Kelly Dean read from a document regarding his concerns related to the first Community Park, including the impact of the proposed retaining wall on the natural environment, the areas of natural significance, and the use of contaminated soil to build the park, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Judy Coulter read from a document regarding her concerns related to the compliance of Article 424, Hillside Development, and the grading of the Sierra Reflections development, including the impact on the natural topography. Copies were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Curtis Coulter read from a document regarding his concerns related to compliance with Article 424, Hillside Development, including structure placement and standards for multiple buildings, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Mike Sullivan read from a document regarding his concerns related to all five of the required findings documented in Article 408, Common Open Space Development, Section 110.408.28, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Kurt Carlson read from a document regarding the validity of financial information provided by the Applicant, along with the Applicant's claim support for the proposed Washoe Valley Fire Station, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Cliff Low asked the Board whether they knew that their constituents had the qualifications and resources to provide the detailed, specific, and substantiated information they presented during the Public Comment. He noted there was no need to answer at the current time. He then provided and read from a document regarding his concerns that the required findings for a discretionary land-use application were not met, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Bob Rusk stated that he was a 45-year resident of Washoe Valley and a former two-term Washoe County Commissioner and two-term minority leader in the Nevada State Assembly. He declared that he would never do that again. He then read from a document outlining his concerns about the application not being in compliance with the elements and major principles of the Master Plan. Copies were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Aaron Sutherland requested that the Board uphold the PC's unanimous decision. He stated that he had served for 24 years as a Chief Pilot for the Nevada Army National Guard, had been in the Nevada Office of Emergency Management (NV OEM), had worked as a wildland firefighter, and was also a certified safety professional and NDOT accident investigator. He shared his story of moving his family from Reno to Pleasant Valley 16 years prior because of the caliber of the residents, including those who had spoken before him and those who would speak after. He stated he was the president of the Pleasant Steamboat Valley Landowners Association (PSVLA), which represented 320 residential homes and 11 businesses. He explained they were all requesting that the Board deny the Sierra Reflections application. He stated that 51 percent of the homes they had evaluated between Mt. Rose Highway and Eastlake Boulevard had residents raising agricultural animals, including poultry, beef, swine, cattle, and goats, and that all of those residents were downstream from both Brown's Creek and Steamboat Creek. He stated that the disturbance of the superfund would create environmental hazards, both aquatic and airborne. He explained that it would violate Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 29 1910.126. He noted that the Clark County School District had to close a middle school for over a week in 2016 after a quarter cup of mercury was found there. He pointed out that the Sierra Reflections project would be moving approximately 4 million cubic feet of contaminated material. He stated that over the previous 24 months, there had been six fatalities along that stretch of road and that the project would create chokepoints into Technical Large Animal Rescue (TLAR) locations in the local area. He noted that one was a large-animal veterinary hospital that handled injured animals. He stated the development was placed in the same location as a 2012 fire. He stated he had fought that fire, and that the head of the fire moved at over 40 miles an hour. He told the Board they were talking about tripling the number of people living in the area. He added that they needed to look at the previous year's Desert Research Institute (DRI) report, which stated that from 1997 to

2024, Reno had the warmest growing climate in the US, increasing by almost 11 degrees over that 40-year period. He asked the Board to deny the approval.

Taylor Hodges was not present when called to speak.

Linda Harrison read from a document regarding her concerns related to the traffic in Washoe Valley, due to weather conditions, roundabouts, and additional vehicles caused by the Sierra Reflections project, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She also noted a 600-foot well would drain all water from the old Washoe City wells.

Addison Ramsdell noted that she turned 18 last November, that it would be her first year to vote, and that she had a few comments. She stated that Nevada was the driest state in the Country, that the groundwater was closely related to the snowpack, and that the snowpack could fluctuate greatly from year to year. She mentioned that Washoe County Planning stated that TMWA did not anticipate long-term negative impacts on groundwater, but there was no mention of short-term impacts. She asked whether the County would pay to lower the adjoining wells or to deliver water. She asked what would happen when Sierra Reflections pumped water during high-demand periods and a neighbor lost water for a short time. She stated that while that may not count as a long-term negative impact, it was a short-term impact. She stated that a finding of no negative impact on groundwater could not be made because quality reports from trusted sources were not provided. She alleged that Sierra Reflections' development should be denied. She referred to the Nevada Supreme Court case *Sustainable Growth v. Jumpers, LLC*, that ruled that zoning regulations must conform to the Master Plan, and noted that she believed the proposed project did not. She noted that when she looked around the room, she saw a community that existed and cared, and that the development would alter that community and its rural character. She stated it would be an urban development in a rural setting.

William Murphy was not present when called to speak.

Matthew Gomez was not present when called to speak.

Jessica Hoffman displayed a photo of her daughters, who she noted were named Indigo and Juniper. No copy was submitted for the public record. She mentioned Indigo loved LEGOLAND, school, and talking. Juniper, she added, loved unicorns, rainbows, and art projects. She noted that it was Juniper's sixth birthday, but instead of celebrating with her daughter after school, she was before the Board because the Sierra Reflections project would impact the community's future and its residents. She stated that her family had lived in Washoe Valley since 2019, after finding it by accident after getting caught in a snowstorm while traveling from out of town. She shared that visibility was so low during the storm that they left the highway and ended up in Washoe Valley, where they felt it was one of the most beautiful and magical places they had ever been, and subsequently decided to relocate to the area. She added that they returned in the summer of 2019, found a house, and on the day their offer was accepted, she learned she was pregnant with their daughter, Juniper. She shared how they moved from a very large city

so their children could have more space, clean air, and room to play. She stated that, while they had not added any farm animals yet, their dog, Wiggles, was living her best life. She quoted her daughter from the night before, saying Juniper was scared and asked her father what to do if she had another nightmare of their house being on fire. She stated Juniper was four and a half years old during the Davis Fire and that Juniper was still traumatized by the experience. She stated that one of Juniper's friends lived in the old Winter's mansion, and that within minutes the fire had jumped over US 395 and Interstate 580. She added that the fire had started burning the giant cottonwoods on the old Winter's mansion property and encircling vegetation. She stated that the family living in the mansion fled, not knowing whether they would have a home to return to or what their future would look like. She mentioned the family arrived at her house on the other side of the lake. She stated they arrived crying, drenched in sweat, and smelling of smoke. She noted that her daughter Juniper still had vivid memories of that occurrence. She added that the family decided to travel to Reno for safety but later called and said there was a wall of flames to the north around Little Washoe Lake, along with bumper-to-bumper traffic. Soon, she noted, her own home lost power, water, and phone service. She shared how they decided to travel to Carson City. Reaching the end of her time, she asked the Board to deny the project. Chair Andriola wished Juniper a happy birthday.

Mark Ashworth provided a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He stated he had been a resident of Washoe Valley since 1985. He noted that he was a realtor but did not represent the Sierra Nevada Realtors (SNR), the Nevada Association of Realtors, or the National Association of Realtors (NAR) with his comments. He explained that he had been asked by Jeannette Porrazzo to inform the Commissioners that a lis pendens and injunction had been filed with the County against the project. He alleged the project was flawed in many ways, but that he would focus on water and fire. He claimed that Washoe County estimated 168 gallons per household for daily use, according to the association's president, and that there were 320 homes in Pleasant Valley and Steamboat Springs. He noted that it equated to an average daily use of 53,818 gallons and an annual use of 19,643,424 gallons. He then considered that adding 940 new homes, per the project, would require 211,907 gallons of daily use water and 76,434,446 gallons annually. He alleged that they were informed that TMWA would initially supply water from two wells in the St. James Village area, and that two additional 900-ft commercial wells would be drilled at a later date. He stated that the Washoe County website indicated that the County allowed an 8- to 16-inch-diameter for commercial wells. He added that the standing water level depended on the well's location, but, for illustration, he would use 20 ft. He stated that created a column of standing water 880 ft long, or 9,194 gallons. In order to meet the demand, he suggested that each of those wells would need to refresh 11 times every day. He stated that it was only a matter of time before the aquifer was depleted and Pleasant Valley wells would be affected. He added that there were fire concerns and that water availability was estimated at two hours. He claimed that one way to calculate the required water flow to fight a fire was to divide the dwelling's square footage by three. He noted a 1,500 square foot home with an 800 square foot garage would require approximately 767 gallons per minute to fight a fire for 20 minutes at 15,340 gallons. He stated that if multiple structures were burning simultaneously, there would not be enough water to respond to all of them. He referred the Board to *Exhibit One* in his

packet and reminded them of the Washoe Estates Fire of 2012. He alleged that 3,177 acres had burned, 28 structures were destroyed, and one life was lost. He also reminded the Board of the 2021 Petrilla Fire and the 2024 Davis Fire. He stated that *Exhibit Two* of his packet was a report from the Loveland, Colorado, newspaper about their attempts to extinguish the Marshall Fire in 2026, in which the research engineer stated that spacing was a problem. He claimed it related to density and quoted from the article that *too many houses too close together, and the proximity to native vegetation and high winds, created a firestorm.*

Jeffrey Fisher lamented that he could not be as articulate or prepared as the previous speakers, whom he described as amazing. He noted that over the past several weeks, he had reviewed the ideas, statements, and commitments from the County Commissioners during their last election cycles. He commented that several statements and promises made by the Commissioners were related to the topic at hand. He stated those as transparency, community safety, skepticism of growth driven by overreach, quality of life, nature conservation, balancing housing needs within the current infrastructure, and the topic he felt was the most important: listening to their constituents. He stated that a previous speaker said that the project was currently in specification, but he doubted that after hearing other earlier speakers. He hoped that after hearing about the negative impacts alleged by the community, including the personal impacts the project would have on the community and the environment, the Commissioners would return home that night consoled that they upheld their commitment and promises by voting against Sierra Reflections.

Lynda S. Fisher read from a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She stated that a few issues regarding density had been brought to the Board's attention. She referenced earlier speakers and said they had done extensive research on traffic, water, population growth, and the movement of large amounts of materials. She asked the Board to listen to what those speakers had to say. She alleged that the developer had failed to fulfill its commitments to Washoe County, as observed in St. James Village. She stated that at the last PC meeting, residents who had lived there for many years testified that the developer's promises had still not been fulfilled, including any commitments the developer made to the development. She added that under WCC 110.608.25, adequate public facilities development could only be approved when adequate. Those facilities, she stated, included roads, emergency services, utilities, drainage systems, and public infrastructure necessary to serve the community, including but not limited to schools, police services, and fire departments. She noted that they knew the emergency exit in the event of a wildfire was not present, and she could not see Washoe County waiting until they received one million dollars from someone in 20 years. She stated that although one of the speakers representing the developers said the information submitted by the committee lacked proof and research, that could not be further from the truth. She stated she was proud to be part of the community.

Maureen Collins read from a document regarding her concerns related to the five required findings from the Staff Report, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She noted that important facts were not considered,

Michelle Moreno read from a document regarding her concerns related to the five required findings in the Staff Report and the lack of justifications. Copies were placed on file with the Clerk.

Kathy Howard noted that she had been a resident of Pleasant Valley since 1992. She believed that the Sierra Reflections project failed to address public safety during emergencies such as fires or floods. She said she had a small box in her garage containing evacuation supplies, such as clothes and dog food, along with a laminated sign to place on her fence to alert first responders that her family had evacuated. She relayed that she was used to evacuating; however, she was still concerned about wildfires in the area. She recalled that she was a former WCSD math and science teacher. She speculated that if 900 cars were evacuating the area, there would be a 15-mile-per-hour (mph) speed limit within a 3-mile period, which she calculated would take two-tenths of an hour, multiplied by 60, would equal 12 minutes to get the first car out of the area. She said that if there were 900 cars with 25 ft of designated space per vehicle, it would create 22,500 ft of distance or 4.26 miles, then divided by the number of miles each car would need to travel, 7.26 total miles at 15 mph, it would take 29 minutes to move the first car.

Paul Howard provided a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He recalled watching the BCC, PC, and citizens at work and believed that democracy and government were works in progress. He noted that he was a combat veteran. He referred to his document titled *Projected Sierra Reflections development* and indicated that the development plan was to remove the previously stated 160,000 cubic yards of mercury-contaminated soil to an adjacent property, leaving the development property with an eight-foot cap, which he felt was not a safe method for disposing of toxic contaminants. He speculated that the mercury could liquefy in the general project area, leaving a lack of safe disposal of toxic material. He said there was no record of methylation testing. He indicated that methylation was a process that could and did occur in the floodplain and must be considered in evaluating the property. He said there was no discussion of mercury production in the geological and geothermal structures on the property, which he said was noted by the NDEP. He asserted that no official statement had been made to the Board. He felt the plans for soil capping were inadequate due to wind loading in the project area.

Jim Noriega thanked his fellow citizens for providing well-researched testimonies. He recalled that the Board noted potential legal liability if the project was denied; however, after being made aware of the noncompliant WCDCs, lack of required findings, and missing data, if the Board approved the project, it would be built on a known EPA Superfund Site. He reported that there were many successful lawsuits across the Country, such as New Orleans, East Chicago, Indiana, Richmond, California, Montana, and others. He believed the lawsuits were successful because the approving authority failed to disclose the property's toxic history and did not adequately inform residents. He wondered whether the County and developer were required to make the disclosures to prospective buyers, as he had not seen provisions for buyer disclosure. He speculated that lawsuits might succeed on grounds of negligent oversight, as the approving authority relied on fraudulent or inadequate reports from the contractors. He pointed out that there were

discrepancies detailed in the executive media summary on pages 18 and 19. He opined that the data may be incomplete and, therefore, inadequate for approval. He said the developers indicated the County could expect about \$17.9 million over about 20 years, which he stated may be beneficial to the County if it were served with a lawsuit. He requested that the Board deny the appeal.

Kyle Bou thanked the Board for listening to his community's comments. He noted that he was a new Washoe County resident and was younger; therefore, he believed he would have a long and prosperous future in the area. He speculated that water would likely be diverted from the Steamboat Ditch because there was no mention of the wet pond areas that would obtain water. He relayed that there was also no mention of taking water for the new project, which he thought would impact downstream water users such as Big Ditch, which took water for Steamboat and Damonte Ranch, because those areas were higher priorities. He opined that the ponds would dry up. He recalled speaking with the president of Big Ditch, who acknowledged that the ponds would divert water from irrigation districts, including the Truckee River. He asserted that the findings could not be made and requested that the Board deny the project.

Barbara Twitchell noted that she was a 38-year resident of Pleasant Valley. She said that her home was located on an acre in a 100-year floodplain. She recalled having lived through floods three times and thought the 100-year floodplain meant the flood only occurred every 100 years. She said that living through floods, the damage they created, and the reconstruction of her home post-flood was not something she wished on anyone. She explained that while she loved the region, experiencing the floods was the hardest time in her life. She said she had mitigated her property and hoped she had prepared enough so that flooding would not occur again. She relayed that she worried about the developers building over 900 homes in the floodplain, what those homeowners would do, and how it would affect what she had worked to build for 38 years. She said that she had a well and worried about too little or too much water on her property. She believed that Washoe Valley had a delicate aquifer that the 900 homes would affect, and that the developers could not guarantee it would not. She felt that the developers were asking the Board to ignore the expertise of hired planners and the will of the BCC's constituents. She recalled conversations with Commissioner Clark and urged the Board to listen to the constituents and experts.

Rick Blake asserted that he was proud to be a resident of the South Valleys. He said that many residents of the area had been evacuated more than once due to fires in the proposed development site. He believed that the developer addressed the public's concerns with fire-retardant paint and roofing, which he opined would do nothing to prevent wildfires. He speculated that the new homes would have substantial amounts of wood, including decks, gazebos, fences, newly planted trees, fuel, and fertilizer. He felt that insurance companies would increase residents' rates because of the increased fuel being added to the area. He reported that he had to cut down five cottonwood trees because his insurance told him they were too close to the house. He said he researched other home insurance policies, but as soon as they visited the property for an assessment, they told him the area was a massive fire zone. He assumed that the insurance companies would use the

subdivision as another excuse not to insure homeowners. He expressed concern regarding mercury in the area and said that children would be playing in poison because they would build dirt bike and mountain bike paths wherever they wanted, due to the kids not understanding the impact of mercury.

Judy Price provided a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak and noted that she and her sister had lived in Washoe Valley on Washoe Drive since 1960. She said that she had experienced many fires and floods. She believed there was more to development than zoning and hoped the Board would consider sustainability. She recalled that her father used to tell her sister and her to watch their property's water and zoning because developers would want more wealth. She said that land, water, and the skies were God-given resources given to the community by a creator, and that Agenda Item 13 was a man-manufactured environment. She indicated that she loved inclusion and wanted people to move to Washoe Valley, but the area also needed to be sustained for the entire Truckee Meadows. She noted that the Board had a 91 percent disapproval rate among constituents; therefore, she was confused as to why the item had made it to the agenda. She said she understood planning but believed the County could not afford the Sierra Reflections development. She mentioned that the developers had already begun grading during the evenings. She said she had not heard anyone mention that the Office of the State Engineer Water Master was involved in the project. She asserted that NDOT was not prepared for the project's impact on the region. She said that she had 20 years of real estate experience and 20 years of representing the State of Nevada as a public servant. She speculated that the Board should not trust blindly.

Marijke Bekken provided and read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She urged the Board to affirm the denial of Agenda Item 13. She said that Washoe Valley was a rural-to-semi-rural area, and that the proposed lots ranged from an average of 0.2 acres to as small as 0.07 acres. She believed that the lots did not conform to even mds without using the artifice of clustering. She said that, under clustering, the developer defined unbuildable areas as open space and overbuilt the rest so that, on average, minimum lot sizes were met throughout the project. She pointed out that page 13 of the original proposal was disingenuous because it implied that around 330 acres were zoned three homes per acre, making 985 homes built, but almost half of the total acres, including at least some of the mds's zoned acres, were unbuildable. She said that the chart implied that the smallest losses were a third of an acre rather than much less than a tenth of an acre. She noted that lots in the valley were usually large, but the new homes could have tiny yards with as little as ten feet between the windows of one house and its neighbor. She said the proposal did not keep with the neighborhood's character, as required by the Master Plan. She expressed concern regarding major traffic issues due to the 9,000 new daily trips expected in the area. She said that NDOT reported 10,800 new average daily trips along the highway, and that nearly 4,500 new trips would create a 40 percent increase. She felt that traffic was a major issue and would be worse in emergency situations, with roundabouts slowing traffic and increasing accidents by over 60 percent. She opined that there would be more issues with the proposed roundabouts because, barring weather issues, they would not improve flow. She said that under the proposal, the development

would get water; however, she wondered where the rest of the community would get theirs. She asserted that page 91 of the original application stated that the water rights holder utilizing water sources adjacent to or in proximity to the development shall continue to have access to the full water rights. She said that water would flow if the community wells lowered the creeks' levels, while all surface water rights downstream would be affected, and more water would be pumped out of the aquifer than would be recharged. She believed that would impact all groundwater rights in the valleys. She relayed that the proposed sewer would remove water from the area, which was generally not allowed, and that the proposed use was not consistent with the Master Plan because development should mirror existing patterns and density. She reiterated that homes on lots under 0.07 acres did not meet the mission statement, creating issues such as water and traffic. She reported that intense development was not reasonable in the area and that the approval of Agenda Item 13 would be detrimental to the welfare of current residents and the character of the surrounding area.

Brigitta Rosenbaum said that the proposed project would substantially change the character of Pleasant Valley and Washoe Valley. She reported that the local fire station, which the developer stated was funded in 2023, had not yet been rebuilt and had no known timetable for reconstruction. She said there were fire risks in the valley due to wind, and residents were unable to obtain quasi-affordable fire insurance because insurance companies would issue only a limited number of policies in fire-prone areas. She speculated that the homes would either have no insurance or those who managed to get insurance would find their policies canceled or highly priced. She recalled that the Davis Creek Fire increased her parents' fire insurance from \$794 to over \$2,000 a year. She said that further traffic increases would be substantial, given that no alternate routes were available. She believed the proposed roundabouts were unsafe and that asking vehicles to practically stop at the base of a steep hill on a 50 mph highway, which could be icy in winter, was an accident waiting to happen. She recalled that a serious accident happened recently when a 62-year-old local cyclist, Susan Mae Goodenow, was killed on US 395 near Pagni Lane when a vehicle crossed multiple lanes and struck two bicyclists in the designated bicycle lane. She mentioned that the tragic accident highlighted the safety risks that already existed on that stretch of road, even before additional traffic was added. She said that the proposed roundabout would be placed at the bottom of the hill, where drivers were already managing speed, visibility, and reaction time. She indicated that she witnessed the aftermath of the crash and that the road was completely shut down for hours. She relayed that the experience made her aware of how dangerous the area could be, and that adding a roundabout and significantly increasing traffic raised serious concerns about whether it would improve safety or, instead, create another high-risk conflict point. She urged the Board to affirm the PC's denial of the project.

Daniel March was not present when called to speak.

Cheryl Pricco was not present when called to speak.

Iris Jehle-Peppard was not present when called to speak.

Teri Bartl believed that the community had shredded the developer's proposal with their facts. She recalled that the developer of St. James Village originally lived in the area, had a vested interest, and loved the community, but when he passed away, his relatives seized the area, with no concern for the community's best interests other than selling the property and making money. She asserted that she had a vested interest in the region's growth and was proud to be part of the community. She said the developer of St. James Village had not removed a single dead tree on the property, even though the HOA had tried to work with him. She believed that the dead trees reduced the property value and the developer's value. She recalled her extensive background in forestry, forest management, timber management, and firefighting. She asked the developer to dispose of the dead trees for the sake of decency and community.

Iris Jehle-Peppard indicated that she was the Executive Director of One Truckee River (OTR), a public-private partnership (P3) focused on implementing the OTR Management Plan. She said that phase one of the plan was unanimously approved by the three local jurisdictions in 2016, through a collaborative partnership that brought diverse perspectives together. She noted that her comments were not representative of the OTR, but as the Executive Director, she had the OTR's mission in mind to ensure a healthy, thriving, and sustainable river that was connected to the hearts and minds of the community. She expressed concerns about the six aqua resources, including wetlands, and Steamboat Creek that drained into the Truckee River in the proposed development area. She asked the Commissioners to listen to concerns about the proposed significant regional project. She said the community was in a critical time, when the choices made affected the Master Plan and other plans, such as the OTR Management Plan. She mentioned that the OTR focused on preserving the natural resources shared with the County, valuing open spaces, and protecting water resources and quality. She urged the Board to stand by those values and to preserve open space while protecting water quality by limiting development near waterways and ensuring a landscape that reflected native vegetation.

Mark Toomey noted that he, his two sons, their wives, and his 14 grandchildren lived in Washoe Valley. He reported that, apart from the Nevada Supreme Court case, *Sustainable Growth Initiative Committee v. Jumpers, LLC (2006)*, zoning regulations must comply with the Master Plan. He said that NRS 278.250 required that zoning regulations be adopted in accordance with the Master Plan for land use, and be designed to preserve the quality of air and water resources, while also promoting the conservation of open space and the protection of other natural and scenic resources from unreasonable impairment, and to protect life and property. He indicated that NRS 278.160 required an analysis of the land's suitability for residential development, including a determination of whether the existing infrastructure was sufficient to meet the community's current needs and projected growth. He believed that the proposed development required significant alterations to the natural topography, including the elimination of hilltops and the filling of valleys in the meadow with over 4,000,000 cubic yards of material. He believed this created unmade findings because the scenic views were not to be preserved within the land's physical limitations. He said that the land must promote health and general welfare. He recalled that on January 6, 2026, the PC asked a representative from the development to ensure that the high levels of mercury would not be distributed or carried

downstream to contaminate neighboring properties. He asserted that his 14 grandchildren would be the determinant due to the proposed development. He wondered how the project would provide and sustain safety, security, and health within the community. He said that Sierra Reflections wanted to import water from another basin, but a finding that there would be no damage to the existing structure could not be made. He opined that the proposed plan did not comply with NRS or the Master Plan and did not consider the infrastructure needed to sustain the development in a rural setting. He requested that the Board deny the appeal.

Lee Boydston thanked the Board for allowing him to speak and noted that the developers were probably good people; however, they were building for profit. He noted that he had performed extensive for-profit real estate work over the years and was currently on the Board of Directors of the Commercial Investment Corporation. He believed there was nothing wrong with for-profit, provided it was not at the expense of the surrounding neighbors. He speculated that the project would affect property values in Pleasant Valley and Washoe Valley. He reiterated that profit at the risk of neighbors was inappropriate, but he trusted the Board to protect the homeowners.

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

Chair Andriola stated that the Board would take a recess until 5:30 p.m.

**5:15 p.m.**      **The Board recessed.**

**5:30 p.m.**      **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

Chair Andriola asked CDDA Large to share the bearing of the comments made regarding pending litigation. CDDA Large indicated that the District Attorney's (DAs) Office monitored all cases in which the County was named as a party in lawsuits, even if they had not yet been served. He recalled that on January 6, 2026, Ms. Porrizzo filed a lawsuit against the State, the County, and about 20 other defendants appearing pro se and in forma pauperis (IFP), pursuant to the Court's rules. He said that a recommendation was provided by Magistrate Judge Carla Baldwin on January 27, 2026, with the finding that Ms. Porrizzo had attempted to sue on behalf of various groups, which she was prohibited to do as a pro se litigant. An additional finding stated that she lacked standing to sue on any of the claims in her individual capacity and recommended that the District Judge dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim and dismiss it with prejudice because the complaint could not be fixed. He reported that Ms. Porrizzo filed two documents with the US District Court for the District of Nevada seeking a temporary restraining order (TRO) and a preliminary injunction. He noted that, contrary to what was heard during public comment, no injunction had been issued by the County, and there was no pending litigation that would stop the Board from making decisions. He clarified that Ms. Porrizzo's lawsuit was not due to its lack of credibility, but that it attempted to bypass NRS 278, which provided an exclusive remedy for challenging the Board's land-use

decision. Chair Andriola thanked CDDA Large for the clarification and asserted that she believed the information was important for the public to understand.

Commissioner Clark announced that he was proud of his neighbors for attending the January 6, 2026, meeting and the current BCC meeting. He believed that many people came to provide public comment just to talk, which he did not agree with; however, he felt that the commenters in attendance had legitimate points. He said that there were people from many professions in his neighborhood, such as geologists and hydrologists, who provided good input. He noted that the Board was not in a court of law and that no one was sworn in to give testimony; however, the NRS, regulations, and codes presented were factual. He appreciated his neighbors bringing their information to the Board. He said that over the last several thousand years, individuals have become accustomed to living indoors, creating an appreciation for builders and those who contribute to housing. He opined that the public commenters were not opposed to development but did not agree with the Sierra Reflections project. He speculated that there might be future development; however, he represented District 2 and felt he needed to support his community.

Commissioner Clark recalled that public commenters expressed concern about insurance, realtors, water, and dams. He said he drove US 395 every day on his way home and checked whether a certain beaver dam was still in place because it sometimes got blown over or taken down by ranchers. He asserted that he and his neighbors lived in a rural community because they wanted to be there. He said that his community wanted to be left alone and was the last to receive services, such as road plowing. He acknowledged they had to perform their own self-rescue. He believed that when individuals lived in rural areas, they had to perform tasks independently, which fostered resilience within the community. He expressed appreciation to the former WCSD teacher who provided a math lesson on the traffic that would result from the new development. He asserted that he was concerned about the facts the community brought to the Board's attention and announced that he would make a motion to uphold the PC's initial decision of January 6, 2026. Chair Andriola announced that she understood attendees appreciated the several hours of testimony and requested that they keep their emotions internal to give the Board and everyone else a chance to provide their comments and questions.

Commissioner Hill expressed concerns about public safety and fire. She recalled that the Davis Fire was traumatic for the community and the region. She speculated that another wildfire would occur and that, while the community and the Board wanted a fire station in Washoe Valley, there was a lack of funding. She believed there was a misconception about funding for a new fire station and recalled that some community members claimed money was spent elsewhere, which she said was not true. She asserted that the County never had the money for a new fire station in Washoe Valley and that the County was seeking funding. She explained that the County did not have the capital for the fire station; however, it was a priority of the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC). She asked TMFPD Chief Edwards what the TMFPD and the County had done while working toward funding a new fire station and organizing an evacuation study.

Chief Edwards displayed an aerial image of Washoe Valley. No copy was submitted for the public record. He pointed out a location on US 395 where the proposed site for a new consolidated fire station would be marked with a yellow dot. He said the six-acre property had been owned by the TMFPD for several years. He recalled that when he was appointed Fire Chief in July of 2025, a Washoe Valley fire station was a major concern. He reported that, upon researching the matter, he found that the lack of a fire station was due to insufficient funds. He explained that while the BCC approved the project, funding had not been earmarked to bring the station to fruition, which he said was a major challenge for his administrative team lately. He noted that the District was not in a financial position to bond a new project of that magnitude while providing the monies to pay the bond annually. He said that the TMFPD was researching other funding options for the project, including the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) as a grant donor and local philanthropic groups.

Chief Edwards explained that services from Fire Station 32 met all District response time standards and exceeded REMSA Health's Emergency Medical Services (EMS) response standards. He said that the project would be served by Fire Station 32 until the new Washoe Valley fire station could be built. He noted that the project would also be served by Fire Station 38, which would access Sierra Reflections via St. James Village, since a connector would be provided through the proposed development. He reported that in Washoe Valley there were two additional volunteer fire stations, Fire Station 320 and Fire Station 300, along with the NDF.

Chief Edwards explained that extensive work had been done regarding evacuation studies. He said that the TMFPD had been provided with a small portion of the work performed in partnership with Emergency Management (EM) as part of adopting a new mapping program through Perimeter to accelerate evacuations. He mentioned that the TMFPD also partnered with local law enforcement because, while the TMFPD was actively engaged in fire suppression, they relied on EM and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) to coordinate evacuations and remove people from harm's way. He reported that he was not familiar with the entire Sierra Reflections process and was unsure whether the recommendations could sustain evacuations for the development, so he would refer to EM because he believed they were the experts.

Chair Andriola opined that many of the public commenters could apply for the PC because they had done extensive research; however, she noted that staff were experts and that the Board would rely on them. She explained that if there were flaws in the application, staff needed to share those and note how those concerns would be mitigated. She indicated that Tom Callicrate provided comments regarding liability issues related to the Sierra Reflections application and mercury. She asked whether the application intentionally omitted critical information regarding regulatory and compliance requirements that could expose the County to liability. Mr. Bronczyk said that, based on the submitted materials, Sierra Reflections met completion requirements. He reported that CSD Planning and Development reviewed all studies and shared them with experts. He mentioned that the application went through multiple iterations; however, the final iteration contained no deficiencies or concerns about omissions. He asserted that many technical

experts employed by the County were in attendance, including an engineering representative, Chief Edwards, Planning staff, and a NNPH representative.

Chair Andriola stated that a lot of testimony and information was provided and pointed out that the application was reviewed by 31 agencies, with 13 responding with specific conditions, resulting in over 100 total conditions. She asked about the process for reporting soil mercury levels, the compliance requirements when mercury is detected, whether any information was omitted, and the future process for mercury located in a project. NNPH Environmental Health Specialist Supervisor, Wesley Rubio, indicated that research on the Sierra Reflection project had been underway for about a year. He said that the developers and staff began discussing soil samples toward the end of the project. He reported that he worked closely with the developers, Mr. Bronczyk, Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd, Engineering and Capital Projects Division Director Dwayne Smith, and Senior Licensed Engineer Janelle Thomas, to develop a sampling plan that was coherent for both development and public health and safety. He said that NNPH used the most stringent requirements available under federal law, namely those of the US EPA. He indicated that the EPA had a previous set of standards that was reduced shortly before the project was proposed. He said that the Sierra Reflections project underwent the most stringent standards set in the US, which were 7.1 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) of mercury in soil under a residential unit and 30 mg/kg of mercury contamination for commercial. He noted that when sampling residential projects, the staff worked closely with the consultant to develop a sampling plan and protocol, which was reviewed and approved. He recalled that the property was divided into three zones. The first was known for contamination. He said the second zone was the actual stream, which ran to the top of the bank, while the last zone was higher than the others in the area. He asserted that staff had received information regarding limited mercury found in the area, which contributed to the three-zone separation. He said there was extensive sampling in the contamination zone, which led to the developer's grading plan. He mentioned that the grading plan allowed the developer to explain how they would grade and meet requirements for planning, building, and engineering, to which staff would then review to ensure their proposal met the requirements to build and was feasible.

Mr. Rubio stated that he was unaware of any omission of data or of any review based on the information available on the ground, the current process, and the developers' proposed grading. He said the staff was reviewing the sampling and the developers were preparing a proposed grading plan, which was why the project was still in draft form and had not yet received a permit. He relayed that the next steps and the developer's permitting were dependent on the Board's approval of Agenda Item 13. He said that if there was approval, staff would be able to review the final grading plan, which included many additional requirements to allow the developers to proceed with construction. He indicated that for Sierra Reflections to be built, they must have the remaining infrastructure in place, which would set the rest of the elevations for staff to follow up on the remaining sampling to ensure the developers met the requirements to move forward. He asserted that if the project were approved, final sampling requirements would be performed by licensed professionals and signed by engineers for submission for review, as with every other residential site. He reported that residential properties,

including areas under the home and within the property boundaries, from the ground surface to eight feet, could contain no more than 7.1 mg/kg of mercury. He said that roadways were also considered, and if engineering or utilities had to redo a sewer or water line, the developer needed to ensure the entire right of way, from one edge of the sidewalk to the other, and to the bottom of the trench, met no more than 30 mg/kg of mercury due to a time weighted average for workers. He asserted that staff were researching from start to finish before the project began and would continue to evaluate based on the grading plan and beyond. He said that any changes to the grading plan might require additional sampling. Chair Andriola asked what would happen if more than the allowed amount of mercury was found in the sampling. He said that if more mercury were found than allowed, the developers would need to change plans.

Chair Andriola asked whether mercury levels in the sample that were above the allowed limit could risk impeding the entire project. Mr. Rubio said that, legally, NNPH could issue a stop-work order to cease all construction activity on the entire site, which he stated would occur if the development exceeded contamination levels or if there were stockpiles of contaminated soil that were not properly covered under the remediation action plan. He asserted that developers were required to label locations on their grading plans to indicate where specific piles would be located, so the public and staff knew where they were. He noted that if the developers exceeded the mercury limit, they would have to redo all their previous work. He reiterated that the regulations were in place to protect staff, the County, and the public.

Chair Andriola asked if the density calculations were not presented in compliance. Mr. Bronczyk asked whether Chair Andriola wanted clarification regarding density-related issues in regional planning and the definition of density. Chair Andriola confirmed that was what she wanted clarified. Mr. Bronczyk said that density was based on the 2006 review of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. He recalled reaching out to the County's regional planning counterparts and asking them to perform a density calculation for 612 acres without development constraints. He reported that the calculation concluded with 1,058 dwelling units allowed on the project site; however, the BCC capped Sierra Reflections at 995. He said that, based on the zoning and regional planning review, the density complied with the requirements.

Chair Andriola asked what the next steps were regarding regional planning. Mr. Bronczyk said that zoning conformance had already occurred because the project had regional significance due to the number of units proposed. He noted that projects with more than 625 units were considered of regional significance. Chair Andriola reported that she was a member of the Regional Planning Commission and said the board had an extensive process to ensure compliance with the Master Plan. She believed that the staff was doing a great job and asked again for further public understanding of whether the staff had conducted the required density calculations and whether it was compliant. Mr. Bronczyk confirmed that staff performed their jobs in accordance with the specified requirements. Chair Andriola recalled public comments that the scenic byways were not being taken into consideration. Mr. Bronczyk noted that he was familiar with the scenic byway; however, another member of staff would be better equipped to answer her questions regarding that.

He said there were two scenic byways in the development, starting at the southern roundabout and continuing south.

Chair Andriola wished to hear the staff's perspective on the roundabouts, including their compliance with safety and emergency vehicles. Mr. Smith said that he had been with the County for over a decade and appreciated the hard work that the community put in and the questions they asked. He asserted that County staff had spent over two and a half years, since the previous failed tentative map, working with the applicant to identify issues. He reminded the Board that the map was tentative and would lead, like any other map to final designs, hydrology reports, traffic reports, and other regulatory permits, such as those from the USACE and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) that would address wetland concerns, Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMRs), and Letter of Map Revisions (LOMRs). He said he appreciated the public's involvement and understood that many concerns needed to be addressed, and he was happy to do so.

Mr. Smith urged the Board to ask questions and said that many agencies were involved in the development process and that every project underwent rigorous procedures. He relayed that staff invested time in reviewing the applications, seeking input from other reviewers, and ensuring that conditions and issues were captured for the developer's representative's acceptance. He noted that roundabouts were unpopular in the area; however, they significantly reduced traffic speeds and deadly crashes. He believed that roundabouts were effective tools that individuals needed to get used to. He referred to the Neil Road and Geiger Grade roundabouts. He mentioned that when a developer was researching alternatives, the County's first requirement was safety. He reported that the roundabouts in the application underwent rigorous review by NDOT, who provided comments and relayed no issues. He said that Washoe County Engineering performed the same review because the County did not rely solely on the applicant to produce traffic studies. He asserted that traffic studies were very important because they provided staff with an understanding of existing traffic volumes and the level of service at intersections and roadways. He said that once a traffic study was reviewed, the applicant then had to build additional demands into the project. He explained that the additional demands the County required of Sierra Reflections, regarding the roundabout requirements, met the County's required level of service. He said that the County would accept both the internal and external roadways associated with the project, which was why staff had to ensure grades were appropriately followed. He reported that the County had a maximum grade of 8 percent on residential roadways, but when adjustments were needed due to topography, the County had the authority to make small changes. He said there was one internal roadway in the project for which the grade was requested to be increased, and he indicated he had the authority to approve up to a 10 percent increase, which did not exceed the WCDC requirement due to a variance request as part of the tentative map process. He expressed confidence that the internal roadways met Washoe County Engineering expectations for width, slopes, and grades.

Chair Andriola recalled sewer concerns in the area and noted that 20 years ago, new sewer infrastructure was installed in Washoe Valley. She asked how the new additional infrastructure, sewer capacity, and wells would be impacted by the Sierra

Reflections project. She asked if there were any purposeful or inadvertent omissions to the application that Mr. Smith would have been responsible for. Mr. Smith indicated that all applications were reviewed at the same level of seriousness, using the same tools, standards, and WCDC requirements. He recalled no issues that would have led to omissions in the project review. Chair Andriola asked if residents' wells could be impacted by the project. Mr. Smith said the sewer was the developer's responsibility to Washoe County. He mentioned that the St. James Village project was also a Washoe County development and was developed under the requirement that it would ultimately receive municipal sewer services, making every lot within St. James Village have both a current septic system and a dry sewer out in the private roadways. He said that the State required the development to be approved in that manner in anticipation of a future municipal sewer project within St. James Village. He noted that the applicant for Sierra Reflections also owned St. James Village. He speculated that when the Sierra Reflections project was originally approved, there was a concept that the project would be a bridge to allow for the St. James Village dry sewer to become active and to convey flows from St. James Village downhill into Sierra Reflections through an interceptor, force mains, lift stations, and other infrastructure that would move the wastewater slowly to a point where County infrastructure could pick it up and convey it to the STMWRF.

Mr. Smith noted that the two developments were similar in terms of expectations and requirements. He recalled that St. James Village had a development requirement to be municipally sewered under a 2016 agreement approved by the BCC. He said that the off-site and on-site infrastructure for sewer flows was to be conveyed to a point of connection identified in the 2016 agreement, near the other side of Steamboat. He indicated that there was existing infrastructure for the County, and that if the developers built that day, there would only be enough space for about 300 homes. He asserted that, as of August 2025, the Board had approved the first Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) agreement for the Pleasant Valley Interceptor and identified Sierra Nevada Construction Inc. (SNC) as the contractor to extend the larger, permanent infrastructure to the same point of connection because the County anticipated extending infrastructure ahead of the Sierra Reflections project. He reported that the second GMP would be proposed in June or July, with the third GMP by the end of 2026.

Mr. Smith said he had no concerns regarding sanitary sewer conveyance and that the off-site improvements built by Sierra Reflections were solely the benefit and cost of Sierra Reflections and St. James Village. He recalled that two years previously, he had presented to the Board and informed them about the sewer rate study and County connection fees for the Pleasant Valley Interceptor, St. James Village, and Sierra Reflections. He noted that anyone who reached the connection had to pay a surcharge. He asserted that the public did not pay for sanitary sewer infrastructure. He noted that the County had issued the notice of completion for the STMWRF expansion project the previous week; therefore, not only was appropriate and reliable conveyance capacity available, but also treatment capacity.

Chair Andriola recalled that Joyce Newman mentioned the geotechnical report was outdated. She clarified that she had written her note incorrectly and that Ms.

Newman had not said the information was incorrect; however, someone else had alleged the information was incorrect. Mr. Smith said that geotechnical investigations and reports were critical not only for homes and buildings but also for roadways, utility corridors, and sanitary sewer lift stations. He indicated that staff worked collaboratively with building officials and engineering to ensure geotechnical recommendations and investigations were performed and that the information was captured and relayed in the final plans for project approval. He believed that extensive work was performed to develop a broader approach to ensure the final geotechnical design and report could be submitted with the final maps, and that foundation dimensions were adequate to support a lift station sitting on liquefiable material. He said that the inspection was equally as critical as the design to ensure that facilities were adequate and met the County's expectations in the future.

Chair Andriola reiterated that St. James Village and Sierra Reflections had the same developer and that many public commenters addressed allegations of a lack of commitment and failure to meet expectations on the developer's part. She requested legal clarification of the County's role regarding concerns from residents who believed the developer had not fulfilled commitments in St. James Village. CDDA Large asserted that the reputation of the developer was not within the Board's purview or to be voted on by the Board. He said that the tentative map was before the Board for a decision on whether the findings were relevant to the specific application presented to the Board. He reiterated that the reputation, marring, and hearsay of the developer were not grounds for a motion because they were speculative. He pointed out that Mr. Smith had stated staff could enforce requirements regarding conditions of approval and permitting. He said that the Board's job was to review the evidence before them to determine whether the findings could be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Chair Andriola noted that zoning was part of the Sierra Reflections project and recalled that, since 2003, the Board's procedure required it to make all findings before approving the project. She asked CDDA Large to explain the difference between the Master Plan and zoning requirements. CDDA Large indicated that the zoning on the property was residential, as established in the previously approved agreement. He said that the policy decision on whether to build homes on the site was outside the Board's purview. He asserted that the question before the Board was whether the proposed project complied with the Master Plan. He said that the zoning predated two previous master plans and had existed continuously throughout the entire period. He pointed out that the applicant's comments regarding zoning requirements were accurate pursuant to NRS 278.349, which stated that a master plan was one of the findings in the tentative map, unless an existing zoning ordinance was inconsistent with the Master Plan, then the zoning ordinance took precedence. He reiterated that the Board was ensuring the findings could be met. He said that if there was a specific zoning ordinance in conflict with the Master Plan, it would need to be addressed by the Board in the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Herman indicated that she was ready to second Commissioner Clark's motion to uphold the PC's decision. Chair Andriola noted that she had not called for a motion but appreciated Commissioner Herman's willingness to put her motion on record.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked everyone for their attendance, including staff and CDDA Large, and expressed appreciation to former Commissioner Bob Rusk for his service and public comments. She noted that she enjoyed following Chair Andriola's comments because she believed that Chair Andriola asked many of the technical questions she had wanted answered. She asserted that there were key differences between the PC and the BCC. She said she had great respect for the PC but wanted to highlight that the PC had 6 days to review all pertinent information related to Sierra Reflections with no staff briefing, whereas she had 61 days to research and review the Sierra Reflections project. She recalled that the Board received a development in legal training on February 1, 2026. She said that she watched the PC meeting, rewatched it again later in the month, met with developers, met with Cliff Low and Bill Naylor, attended a staff briefing, and drove out to the property in Washoe Valley after her child's horse therapy session. She noted that she had participated in multiple conversations with Chief Edwards and the DA's Office and believed that she had invested an excruciating amount of time, energy, and effort into studying Sierra Reflections.

Vice Chair Garcia reported that her first area of concern was the plan's consistency. She requested information from Mr. Bronczyk because she felt there was a clear message from the public that the application did not meet numerous codes or findings. She asked when the staff began reviewing the application. Mr. Bronczyk stated that the initial submittal was on August 8, 2024. Vice Chair Garcia asked if staff had reviewed all WCDCs. Mr. Bronczyk noted that the County reviewed all WCDCs associated with submittals. He clarified that not all WCDCs were listed within the Staff Report; otherwise, the Staff Report would be substantial. He opined that it was Planning's policy not to condition WCDC. Vice Chair Garcia asked if every applicant must comply with every item in the WCDC or request a variance. Mr. Bronczyk affirmed. Vice Chair Garcia recalled that Mr. Smith had mentioned a variance related to a road that had been approved and asked whether there were any other variances or modifications under review by the WCDC. Mr. Bronczyk stated that there were no other variances or modifications.

Vice Chair Garcia hoped that her questions and Mr. Bronczyk's answers eased some of the public's concerns about whether the WCDC was studied, reviewed, and adhered to. She recalled reading in the Master Plan about rural communities, livestock, agriculture, ranching, dark skies, equestrian, open space, and recreation opportunities. She relayed that she initially wondered why the project was proposed in a rural area, but had recalled Master Plan Policy 3.3 regarding residential clustering and Policy 5.1 regarding maintaining large lot sizes outside the TMSA. She said that she had asked if Sierra Reflections was within the TMSA and was told it was. She mentioned that urban growth in the Reno and Sparks area was expected to occur within the TMSA, which she said was common in city-type development, since utilities already existed or were being expanded. She explained that because the Sierra Reflections project was within the TMSA, it would be difficult for the Board to defend itself in court if the project were denied. She reiterated that she had expressed similar concerns as the public commenters regarding wildfires in the area, but she understood that the developers were to build in accordance with the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (IWUIC) and had already discussed building materials and landscaping to assist in mitigating fire issues. She asserted that there were

concerns about the lack of fire infrastructure in the South Valleys that remained a top priority for her. She said that Chief Edwards was assisting her with understanding what infrastructure was needed.

Vice Chair Garcia noted that there were about 2,500 residential structures, 150 commercial structures, and 940 new proposed rooftops. She said she did not want to discuss the existing volunteer stations or the NDF building, which had already been discussed by Chief Edwards. She explained that Chief Edwards' vision was to transform Station 32, which had a 25-year-old modular and a 50-year-old bay, into a facility where the Wildland Division could be relocated from its very expensive lease in Verdi. She felt that the relocation would not only bring cost savings but also provide a better space for the wildland crew. She speculated that everyone in attendance wanted a consolidated fire station and noted that there was already land available for it. She said the new location offered better access to US 395 and a South Valleys community room with office space for the WCSO. She pointed out that the TMFPD did not have the funds to build a fire station because the cost to build one had doubled since 2021 and could exceed \$20 million. She asserted that time was of the essence and that she was concerned that a new fire station could soon be beyond the County's reach.

Vice Chair Garcia mentioned that she had listened to the public comment on the financial analysis because she said that even the backup material for Agenda Item 13 did not contain a verified financial analysis. She noted she asked questions and reviewed a 2022 meeting that reported the fiscal analysis of a \$500 per unit assessment fee paid at the time of the Certificate of Occupancy (CO), was listed nowhere else. She recalled asking CDDA Large about the pro rata share from 2022. She asked CDDA Large about the 31 percent reflection regarding the pro rata share. CDDA Large indicated that the pro rata share for the project was \$6.2 million, which reflected 31 percent of the rooftops, calculated by the Fire Chief and based on a \$20 million valuation for building the fire station. Vice Chair Garcia noted that Agenda Item 13 could help the County move closer to achieving a consolidated fire station. She said that insurance companies considered only the distance to the nearest fire station, which led her to recently consider denying the project, based on the issuance not being detrimental. She asserted that she was open and transparent because fire was a priority. She recalled that after attending a briefing on Agenda Item 13, three fires and one fatality occurred in Sun Valley. She pointed out that many of the PC commissioners denied the project based on fire safety concerns and recalled that many commenters expressed similar concerns due to the Davis Fire. She said that *Attachment C* on page 96 limited the County's defense in court if Agenda Item 13 was denied, due to the four proposed conditions of the TMFPD indicating that fire concerns could be mitigated.

Vice Chair Garcia noted that over the past few days, she had advocated for access to funding that would be immediately available. She asked CDDA Large to explain her proposed amended condition of approval, stating that she had worked diligently with CDDA Large, Chief Edwards, and the developer to reach a compromise. CDDA Large reported that Vice Chair Garcia spearheaded a compromise with Chief Edwards, the DA's Office, and the developer regarding a proposed amendment to condition of approval 7.D. He said that the condition of approval of the tentative map for Sierra Reflections

subdivision included that the developer shall enter into a written agreement in a form acceptable to the TMFPD to pay its pro rata share towards the planning, designing, engineering, land acquisition, if applicable, and construction of a new fire station to serve the project area. He explained that the pro rata share would be calculated on a per unit basis, consistent with the District's adopted methodology and a \$1 million advance payment would be made. He noted that the credit towards the share shall be placed in an escrow account from which amounts necessary to complete planning, design, engineering, land acquisition, or construction of the fire station may be drawn. He said that the deposit must occur no later than 180 days from the day after the last day of the appeal period for the final action of the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency on the tentative map, and that the balance of the pro rata share for a unit shall be deemed paid at the time of the building permit, until the exhaustion of the advance payment credit, and thereafter paid on a per unit basis at the time of the building permit for the unit. He asserted that the agreement shall include provisions addressing timing, payment, method of calculation, credit for prior payments, if any, and any other terms as may be necessary to ensure fairness, proportional cost allocation, and the implementation of the condition.

Chair Andriola asked those in attendance to be respectful and professional, and practice patience during Board discussion and comments. She said that she understood the discussion was not easy; however, the Board had a job to perform. Vice Chair Garcia asserted that she, too, was concerned about the timeline of creating a consolidated fire station and that even though Sierra Reflections would not be in her district, she had felt a sense of urgency. She said that the Board was composed of all Fire Commissioners who cared about the well-being and safety of their constituents; therefore, she believed that if there was an opportunity to assess whether service could be provided to better serve and protect those constituents, she would pursue it.

Vice Chair Garcia asked CDDA Large to provide details of the 180-day timeline. CDDA Large reported that the 180 days began on the last day of the appeal period following the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency's final action on the tentative map. He said that after the final action, the project would go to conformance review, in which the developers would place the deposit into an escrow account. Vice Chair Garcia said she had witnessed Chief Richards' care for the community and knew he wanted to see a solution to the public's fire concerns in Washoe Valley. She said she relied on the staff's opinions and recommendations, expert analysis, and the legal briefings. She believed that the \$1 million advance payment would help the County get one step closer to a consolidated fire station. Chair Andriola reminded those in attendance to be respectful of Vice Chair Garcia's comments. Vice Chair Garcia said that with the completed architectural and engineering plans, Chief Edwards and Chair Andriola would be better equipped to begin fundraising efforts. She felt it was important to move quickly; however, she wished to hear her fellow Commissioner's comments, as she was not the only voter.

Chair Andriola thanked staff, Chief Edwards, and those in attendance for their hard work and asked CDDA Large to share the legal framework to which the Board was required to make decisions for Agenda Item 13. She asserted that she supported transparency and noted that she had met with staff, called Chief Edwards, and met with the

applicant, Cliff Low, and Bill Naylor. She believed that there was much complexity and hard work that went into citing the information provided related to Agenda Item 13. She recalled asking Mr. Low and Mr. Naylor whether they had met with staff or shared all the public commenters' information before the PC meeting, and she said they answered no. She recommended that if anyone had details or concerns about an agenda item, they reach out to the staff for clarification, as some information was omitted from the Staff Report due to the vast amount of information available for the project. She speculated that staff would be happy to provide further information when necessary. She felt that everyone in the community cared; however, the Board had a legal responsibility. She recalled that the BCC had a legal briefing, unrelated to Agenda Item 13, that provided the Board with details on how to make decisions and what was required of them as Commissioners. She opined that the only difference between a Commissioner and a judge was that Commissioners did not wear robes. She opined that they both faced the same consequences and impacts as the County and taxpayers. She said that it was important to understand concerns and legal requirements. She noted that many of the public's concerns were addressed or would be addressed by staff or other agencies. She explained that if something did not comply, either additional conditions would be proposed or the project would cease. She mentioned that the approval of Agenda Item 13 was not the final approval of the entire project and stated that a long process lay ahead.

CDDA Large noted that the appeal from the PC denial of the tentative subdivision map and a SUP case number, with respect to the legal findings for the SUP pursuant to WCC 110.810.30, included the following five findings: consistency, improvements, site suitability, issuance not detrimental, and effect on military installation. He mentioned that the findings for common and open space development, 18.408.28, were to preserve or provide open space, protect natural and scenic resources, achieve more efficient land use, minimize road construction, and encourage a sense of community. He said that the findings for the tentative map planned consistency, design or improvement, type of development, availability of services, fish or wildlife, public health easements, access, dedications, and energy. He explained that the Board's purview was to review the submission de novo to determine whether substantial evidence existed in the record and to determine whether the 20 findings could be made for the project.

Commissioner Hill thanked Vice Chair Garcia for her work. She noted that she understood the community's frustration and the State's property rights rule. She believed that the only way she would approve Agenda Item 13 was if she could agree that the finding of *issuance not detrimental* could be made. She reported that while the developers of Sierra Reflections claimed credit for the \$1 million pro rata agreement, it was Vice Chair Garcia's effort and hard work that pushed the developers, even as they continued to engage in counter efforts against the \$1 million. She explained that if the County denied Agenda Item 13, the County would be sued. She said those in attendance could disagree; however, she recalled that other agencies throughout the State were in trouble because developers pursued legal action after denials and had successfully won cases. She asserted that she did not want a judge to make land use decisions for the County. She said she wanted to be strong for the community and make the right long-term decision, but noted that she could meet all the conditions, even if it was disappointing.

Commissioner Clark requested that individuals in attendance not leave. He said that Vice Chair Garcia had a doctorate degree, and while he believed she was a very intelligent person, her background was not in real estate or real estate finance. He reported having over 50 years of experience as a real estate broker and 40 years as a mortgage broker and mentioned that his companies had loaned out billions of dollars. He relayed that he was not interested in financing and noted that he was the former Washoe County Assessor. He said that he used to handle billions of dollars in assessed value. He pointed out that the Sierra Reflections project included over 900 units, which he speculated would be sold for \$1 million each, making it close to a \$1 billion subdivision. He asserted that the residents of Washoe Valley were promised a fire station years earlier, and he speculated that the County had instead used the extra funds for the Cares Campus and other miscellaneous items that he described as wasteful. He said that Washoe Valley would now receive a fire station, but it would be at the cost of the community's quality of life. He noted that he was revolted by the fact that there was billions of dollars' worth of value in the development, and that the County was selling Washoe Valley for \$1 million. He said that he would not approve Agenda Item 13. He recalled that the BCC meeting began with a fellow Commissioner complaining about a developer offering campaign funds in exchange for her vote of approval for a project in her district, and he felt that the deal between Sierra Reflections and the fire station was similar. He reported that the fire station would cost \$16 million and that \$1 million was not even a 10 percent down payment. He said that Washoe Valley was his district and he would support the people of his community.

Chair Andriola said that Agenda Item 13 was a difficult topic for many and indicated that the Board would take a recess, if those in attendance could not contain their emotions.

**6:55 p.m.**      **The Board recessed.**

**7:03 p.m.**      **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

CDDA Large indicated that, pursuant to the restrictions and orderly conduct of business identified in the BCC Agenda, the presiding officer may order a person or persons removed for their conduct or for disruptions to the order and safety of the meeting. He stated that a warning about disruptive conduct or comments made may or may not be given prior to removal. He said that the Board had, pursuant to that forum restriction, cleared Chambers except for staff. Commissioner Hill asked if the public knew they could reenter Chambers. Chair Andriola said that the security staff would inform them.

Vice Chair Garcia asked Commissioner Clark to share his efforts and conversations that supported the construction of a consolidated fire station in his district.

Commissioner Clark stated that he had met regularly with Chief Edwards. He noted that he had also contacted the federal government and Nevada State Treasurer Zach Conine to identify potential funding sources. He indicated that he had discussed funding options with business leaders and private donors. He asserted that finding a solution was extremely important and that he had worked tirelessly to do so. He speculated

that his predecessor derailed the fire station project by attempting to award a contract to a friend who was also a contractor. He alleged that at the time, the fire station could have been built for approximately \$6 million, but the current cost would likely be more than double that. He indicated that if he were managing a \$1 billion development project, he would purchase the entire fire station for the community rather than just a portion of it.

Vice Chair Garcia said she agreed with some of Commissioner Clark's comments and understood that he had encountered significant difficulties because of his predecessor. She acknowledged his frustration with prior actions taken before the current Commissioners were sworn in and those impacts on the County. She stated that the Commissioners, who also served as Fire Commissioners, were a team committed to the well-being and safety of all constituents. She hoped the Commissioners could work together to find a solution. She mentioned that although Commissioner Clark had prior discussions about funding solutions, nothing had come to fruition, and that a timely solution was critical. She explained that, in an effort to benefit the County, she asked questions and focused on the pro rata share. She remarked that, in a perfect world, the developer would fully fund the construction of a new fire station. She emphasized the importance of securing a consolidated fire station for the Commissioners and the entire community. She mentioned that she took offense to a prior comment by Commissioner Clark that suggested the residents were being sold out for \$1 million. She pointed out that she was not on the Commission back in 2022, but upon reviewing the 2022 meeting, she discovered the pro rata share was not part of the discussion. She indicated that she saw an opportunity for the County to benefit from a difficult situation and had raised challenging questions to find a possible solution. She noted that Commissioner Clark's prior discussions with the private developer had not been successful, and she thought that, given the ideas and contacts among the Commissioners, a collaborative effort could make the consolidated fire station a reality. She believed that timely decisions would be essential to securing the revenues, opportunities, and funding mechanisms needed to move the project forward. She added that delays would only increase construction costs. She thanked Commissioner Clark for the opportunity to explain her reasoning and acknowledged his frustration with prior interactions in his district in which she had not been involved. She stated that he did not need to agree with her approach, but she expressed hope that her due diligence and willingness to ask difficult questions to meet the findings in the Staff Report were understood. She recognized that the Commissioners would not always agree, and said that was acceptable, but emphasized that she had worked diligently to be prepared and to identify beneficial solutions.

Commissioner Clark explained that his comments were not intended as a personal attack on Vice Chair Garcia. He said he respected her educational background and accomplishments. He commented that it was important to fully support someone who was a subject matter expert. He noted that he had a financial background and other areas of expertise to contribute, but often felt his suggestions were dismissed by other Board members. He mentioned that although the discussion had been difficult, he respected her knowledge. He expressed frustration with how the project had been handled and believed that the County had greater leverage and could have done more. He shared an example of a recent County lease in which he suggested that staff request six months of free rent, which

resulted in savings of nearly \$250,000. He said that the County had buying power, a billion-dollar budget, and control over the development of much of the land. He hoped that any agreement reached would be meaningful. He speculated that some residents were frustrated and felt they were being sold out for a relatively small amount. He described the residents as genuine and hardworking and believed that the development would negatively impact their quality of life. He shared a story about a resident whose father purchased a parcel of land over 50 years ago for \$500, and he added that all residents deserved a good quality of life. He explained that when meeting with staff, he felt as though he were part of a high-pressure sales pitch and stated that he disagreed with those tactics. He said that he wanted to understand the facts of the situation rather than feel pressured to agree with a position he did not support. He mentioned that he was unaware that some residents held specialized licenses, including geologists, hydrologists, and scientists. He asked CM Thomas whether the County employed hydrologists or chemists. CM Thomas responded that the County did not employ staff with those particular specialized backgrounds and that such technical expertise would be contracted as needed, as it would not be practical to maintain full-time positions for those roles.

Commissioner Clark shared that many residents with specialty licenses and professional backgrounds had presented valid concerns to the Board. He referenced Bob Rusk's comment, who stated that the Board appointed the PC members, and recalled Mr. Rusk's opinion that if the BCC regularly overturned the PC's decisions, then there was no need for a PC. He thought it was important to trust staff and appointed boards. He acknowledged that his comments might come across as direct but stated that his intent was solely to improve outcomes. He remarked he did not support participation awards or similar approaches. He noted that he valued a straightforward, traditional approach and clear communication, open discussion, and respectful resolution. He suggested that, once a meeting concluded, he would move on without carrying any frustration or conflict forward. He emphasized his responsibility to represent and defend the taxpayers who elected him.

Vice Chair Garcia agreed that Commissioner Clark was a subject-matter expert in his field and stated that, as stewards of taxpayer dollars, she did not want to see the County incur a potential lawsuit costing upwards of \$50 million. She said that although she could not predict the future, her comments reflected her reasoning and the difficulty of her decision. She reiterated that the appellant argued the PC had abused its discretion, disregarded substantial evidence, and acted contrary to staff approval and expert analysis. She suggested that Commissioner Clark placed significant weight on expertise but disregarded the staff's expertise. She said that she had thoroughly explained her reasoning and recognized that not all the Commissioners would agree, but she hoped that the Board could move forward respectfully. She noted that with the fire station in mind, she believed she had made the appropriate recommendation and stood by her reasoning.

Commissioner Clark mentioned that the appellant claimed they were not treated fairly by the PC, which had been appointed by the Board. He suggested that such claims were part of human nature and remarked that for \$1 billion, he might also say he had not been treated fairly. He thought that money could persuade people to act, but that the decision should be made by a judge. He stated that decisions should not be based on

the fear of litigation. While he expressed respect for Vice Chair Garcia, he said he disagreed with her decision.

Chair Andriola thanked those in attendance for their professionalism and hoped that the public understood that policies and procedures must be followed. She shared that all boards and commissions, including the Commissioners, went through extensive training. She stated that the Commissioners were actively undergoing training and acknowledged that each member of the Board had diverse backgrounds and expertise. She questioned how anyone serving in a quasi-judicial role could be expected to fully understand their responsibilities and legal requirements without proper training. She referenced Commissioner Clark's example regarding the need for the PC and shared that the Board had not always unanimously overturned or affirmed the PC's decisions. She shared that the BCC had an obligation to act within the law and said she was proud to follow it, even when her personal opinion differed from a decision. She explained that each Commissioner could empathize with those affected by the proposed project, but the Board was required to follow the established decision-making framework. She shared that she had spent countless hours reviewing each condition and asking questions as she reviewed the materials Mr. Low and Mr. Naylor provided. She noted that she had spoken to staff to put on the record some of the things that were said. She praised everyone who put in the effort to prepare their statements. She suggested that Mr. Naylor and Mr. Low meet with staff to obtain detailed information, even though they might not agree with the recommendations. She explained that staff had an obligation and compliance requirement to ensure the accuracy of information provided, and that subject-matter experts were consulted when necessary.

Chair Andriola opined that the presentation for Agenda Item 13 was the best presentation she had ever seen. She mentioned that she had watched the more than four-hour PC meeting, rewatching portions, taking notes, and making comments for each speaker. She suggested that any omission could create a liability for the County and potentially lead to legal consequences, and she emphasized that such decisions should not be taken lightly. She expressed respect for everyone who took the time to conduct research, including the Commissioners who had devoted many hours. She emphasized the importance of always coming to the Chambers fully prepared. She remarked that many public commenters did an excellent job and demonstrated an impressive knowledge of Code that most people would not be familiar with.

Commissioner Clark motioned, seconded by Commissioner Herman, to affirm the Planning Commission's decision and deny WTM24-001 (Sierra Reflections) and Special Use Permit Case No. WSUP25-0019 (Sierra Reflections Infrastructure). County Clerk Jan Galassini performed a roll call vote at CDDA Large's request. The motion failed on a 2-3 vote, with Chair Andriola, Vice Chair Garcia, and Commissioner Hill voting no.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, County Clerk Jan Galassini performed a roll call vote at CDDA Large's request, which motion duly carried on a 3-2 vote, with Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Herman voting no, it was moved to Reverse the Planning Commission's decision and approve WTM24-001 (Sierra Reflections) and Special Use Permit Case No. WSUP25-0019 (Sierra Reflections Infrastructure), subject to the conditions of approval provided in Exhibit A of Attachment C, including the Proposed Amended Condition of Approval 7(d) as outlined earlier in the meeting by CDDA Large.

Chair Andriola said that there was more business to conduct, and Commissioner Clark stated that he was done for the day.

**7:28 p.m.**      **Commissioner Clark left the meeting.**

**26-0167**      **AGENDA ITEM 14** Public Comment.

Cliff Low joked that no one was surprised he was lengthening the meeting by another three minutes with his public comment. He expressed disappointment with the vote. He believed that for most, if not all, of the Commissioners, the decision was difficult. He admitted he did not agree that the Board could make all of the required findings based on what they had heard from experts, which the County's own staff admitted they did not have. He noted that the potential consequences of the project were still some time away and speculated that most of the Commissioners would be out of office by then. He felt that when things happened to people in the County or city, they wondered how it happened. He stated that when people asked that question after feeling the consequences of the project, his response would be that it happened a while ago. He shared his concerns about traffic backups, especially in emergency situations; mercury-related illnesses; delays in the delivery of emergency services; wells going dry; worsening flooding; and finances that would not pan out. He pointed out that those consequences were still years away. He stated that the Commissioners' votes indicated their belief that those negative consequences would not happen, though he would have to disagree. He shared that the bigger question he had was whether Washoe County Planning was responsible for ensuring the agreed-upon conditions were upheld, and whether Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) had the resources and budget to ensure compliance with all the conditions. He doubted someone would be appointed to watch over the project at all times, but he felt that was what would be needed to have any chance of avoiding the negative consequences he listed. He stated that if the Board could trust whomever the developer turned out to be, all claims and results would still need to be verified. He stated that the residents were counting on the Board to make sure that the right people followed up on the project and its promises, and that it all happened the way it was supposed to and kept people out of danger.

Richard Stone brought up the fire station and said not everyone in Washoe Valley agreed that the consolidated fire station was the best answer. He shared that, if they looked at the valley's geography, with the lake in the middle, residents would be better served by two smaller fire stations on each side. He believed that would provide quicker response by a smaller team, with the other team on its way. He stated residents could

receive the full response of the fire department, but that no matter which side of the lake one lived on, they would receive a quicker response. He understood that a single station met the legal requirements, but stated that for fire safety and health, a faster response beats a massive response every time. He added that he also had an observatory in Washoe Valley and was very concerned that the development appeared to extend above East Lake and over the top of the hill. He expressed concern about the outside lighting causing issues. He requested that the Board investigate the lighting situation. He stated he had shared his concerns about the fire department with the Fire Chief. He stated that he understood Washoe Valley needed better fire support and that he was better off on his side of the valley than on the other. He acknowledged that budgets were a problem, but that two smaller fire stations would be better than one single station in Washoe Valley. He expressed appreciation for the thought the Commissioners had put into their decision, but was sad they voted as they did, and that if he was lucky, the negative impacts would be far enough in the future that he would not have to feel them quite as much. He stated that the residents loved Washoe Valley and enjoyed living in Nevada, and he thanked the Commissioners for their service.

Marjike Bekken expressed that none of the constituents present for the hearing wanted to trade their quality of life for a fire station. She stated they would love an additional fire station, but that their area had survived many fires without one, so the fire station was not the critical point for them. She reiterated that the constituents felt not only that the density was not suitable for their community, but that there were additional issues, such as mercury levels, water needs, sewer access, and endangered species, that were part of a discussion that seemed to focus only on their complaints about population density. She added that one concern raised by those in the lobby was what she had heard from Vice Chair Garcia: essentially, that the County should do nothing out of fear of a lawsuit. She expressed that with the new homes, she expected her home value to halve. She explained that the new homes would mean the property tax base would plummet, leading to current residents leaving because of a drop in quality of life. She expressed that the Board adopted a very narrow definition of what the commenters were trying to say and focused only on a few issues. She felt that it seemed disingenuous of the Board when constituents pointed out information missing from the staff proposal, and also not presented during the earlier presentations. She noted the Board simply asked the staff whether they had considered the issues and took their word for it. She thanked the Board for their time and their patience with the upset audience members. She reiterated that she felt the Board was overly restrictive in the content of their discussions.

**26-0168**      **AGENDA ITEM 15** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas addressed that they all recognized the Board was responsible for setting policy, and said she respected that function very much but as the CM, her responsibility was the safety of the organization and its facilities. Referring to Chair Andriola, she stated that she knew calling for a recess was not easy, but section 6.8 of the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) Rules of Procedure stated that in an emergency, such as fire, threats of violence, or disruptions, including the inability to retain good order, the Board could declare the meeting recessed. She stated it was not the

first time that it had happened. She noted it was an attempt to diffuse individuals. She apologized for it being disruptive, but she, as CM, and the Board, as policymakers, could not tolerate people yelling inappropriate statements from the audience. She declared the Chambers was a place of decorum, and people respected it. She stated she appreciated Chair Andriola's leadership in making appropriate moves to protect the staff, constituents, and policymakers in attendance.

Commissioner Herman expressed that it was probably best that her microphone was muted.

\* \* \* \* \*

**7:39 p.m.** There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**CLARA ANDRIOLA**, Chair  
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

---

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

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