

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

October 28, 2025

PRESENT:

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

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

ABSENT:

**Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair**

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 10:01 a.m. in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

**25-0770      AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.**

Mr. Terry Brooks shared an original poem about his reflections on the importance of equal access to safe and affordable housing, regardless of gender.

Ms. Virginia Wiggins introduced herself as a resident of Our Place. She announced that she was not a criminal and was not insane. She described a series of challenges over the course of her life, including medical events, domestic violence, and homelessness. She reported that her rights were being violated daily. She said she was formerly a Safe Embrace resident and currently resided at Our Place. She stated that since Volunteers of America (VOA) took over Our Place operations, the gate no longer closed, which concerned her because it enabled anyone to come on the property. She theorized that anything could happen, and she noted that many women at Our Place were in hiding and feared for their lives. Ms. Wiggins divulged that she was diabetic and was told by Our Place staff that she could no longer administer her insulin in the privacy of her cubby. She said that was a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which she immediately resolved. She related that the refrigerator at Our Place was cleaned out the night before last and the insulin of four residents was mixed. She understood that by law, an emergency shelter had to allow her to keep her insulin. She expressed concern that there was no medicine log or paper trail. She articulated that the day before Labor Day she alerted the manager that restroom sanitation was not at an acceptable level, which she believed

was a violation of federal and State grant requirements. She recounted that she was told to clean the areas she was concerned by, but she did not view that as her responsibility. She declared that she was yelled at like she was a dog or a prisoner. She summarized that even though there were things she could not afford, she was still human and had rights. She remarked that she knew she could overcome adversity because she obtained a degree when she was last homeless. She said she was not trying to just live off of the system, but she was scared by the limitations imposed by her medical conditions. She concluded that she just wanted to be heard and to raise awareness of the issues she saw.

Chair Hill asked interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas to ensure a staff member followed up on the concerns raised by Ms. Wiggins. She said she had also received a complaint from an individual concerned about whether Our Place staff were trained in trauma-informed care.

Ms. Pam Roberts thanked the Board for giving her an opportunity to speak. She reported that she prepared an impactful speech for the meeting but had a chance to speak with ICM Thomas regarding her concerns before delivering it. She explained that her concerns were about the failure to include Senior Advisory Board (SAB) appointments and reappointments on the agenda for either the October 8 or the October 28 Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meetings. She recounted that she was the immediate past chair of the SAB, and she anticipated that they would have a very small board on November 12 because of the delays. She understood that there was a plan in place and the item would be agendized for December 9, which she noted was the day before a scheduled SAB meeting on December 10. She hoped that there would be a full SAB for December 10. She theorized that the SAB was one of the most productive boards in recent history, which she attributed to mutual agreement among members to set aside partisan concerns. She said SAB members did not identify with political labels in their meetings because they felt responsible to all seniors in the County, not just the ones that belonged to a particular political party. She hoped the new SAB members would continue to follow that example, regardless of their political party affiliation. She echoed the concerns expressed by Ms. Wiggins and related that she had a sister who lived in Montana and received Supplemental Security Income (SSI). She asked if Commissioners were aware that more than 450,000 Nevadans were projected to lose Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) assistance. She questioned what the Board had done in anticipation of the loss of service. She felt that the Board needed to take a leadership role and help coordinate efforts to address the food shortage. She acknowledged that the BCC did not control actions taken in Washington, D.C., or battles happening between parties. She discerned that politicians were blaming each other, which she believed did not matter to people locally who were primarily concerned with how to feed themselves and their families. She thanked the Commissioners for their time, observed that they had difficult jobs, and congratulated ICM Thomas on being selected as the new County Manager (CM).

Mr. Drew Ribar opined that a series of events in his life started when he began recording events with his camera at various locations. He recalled that he went to a library, was locked out of the library, and then a librarian slammed a door on his leg and called the police. Mr. Ribar reported that the librarian accused him of injuring her and Drag

Queen Story Hour (DQSH) was stopped. He said he was accused of being violent, but he contended that the camera showed the librarian slamming the door on his leg. He stated that Board members ignored him and nobody reached out to him. He commented that a couple years had passed since that event, and he thought he was figuring out the rationale of the Commissioners. He recounted that, on October 22, Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Amos Stege attacked him in an elevator. He asked whether Board members approved of that. He observed that multiple Commissioners had upcoming campaigns and claimed that they solved problems. He felt that if Commissioners solved problems, they would have reached out to him, and he determined that their campaign messaging was dishonest and obscured what they actually wanted to do, which was increase government bloat. He recalled that 90 percent of taxes in the County went to pay government employees. He noted that funding went towards payroll, not services. He spoke about a former Reno Police Department (RPD) deputy chief who was arrested for solicitation of a minor, and he wondered if there were similar problems elsewhere in government. He noted that Commissioners all seemed to support Our Center, but he questioned whether they were aware of some of the things Our Center supported. He read an excerpt of an article that he felt exemplified the concerns he had about initiatives supported by the County through its work with Our Center. He expressed his disgust.

Ms. Kristen Kennedy introduced herself as the Executive Director of the Domestic Violence Resource Center (DVRC). She stated that October was Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and she wanted to update everyone on the reality of domestic violence in the County and share exciting news about progress on their new shelter. She related that domestic violence was the second highest reported crime in Washoe County. She conveyed that aggravated assault rose 15 percent in Reno and Sparks in 2024, driven largely by domestic violence, and Nevada continued to rank among the top five states for incidents of domestic violence. She supposed those were difficult statistics to hear and likely contrasted with opinions people might hold about living in an amazing community that they were proud to be a part of. She warned against ignoring the fact that domestic violence remained a critical and urgent issue locally. She described that the DVRC focused on solutions for providing more safe housing, more counseling services, and more legal support for people who were abused and often financially controlled. She wanted victims to feel that they had options and could escape. She reported that the DVRC found answers in community partnership and collective action, and they pursued work in those areas over the past two years. She expressed her pride in sharing that they had raised \$29.9 million of their \$31 million goal and were building a 43,000 square foot resource center with on-site shelter. She said the new facility would quadruple their capacity to shelter individuals and their children fleeing violence. She explained that her organization would no longer have to place survivors in motels due to a lack of shelter space or put multiple families in single rooms. She added that they would be able to house all wraparound services on-site and other community partners would be able to deliver direct support within their new campus. She revealed that they were officially breaking ground on November 4 at 11:00 a.m. and she invited the Commissioners to attend. She acknowledged that some Commissioners had scheduling conflicts, but she asked them all to attend and celebrate the momentous occasion if they could. She established that the DVRC expected to open their new shelter in the summer of 2027, and she declared that it would represent hope, safety, and a fresh

start for many people in the community. She thanked the BCC for their partnership and continued leadership over the past 48 years and for allowing her to share the update. She concluded that the DVRC and the BCC were building a safer future for Washoe County together.

Chair Hill noted that the Commissioners had a Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) board meeting on November 4 but would aim to attend the groundbreaking if they got out on time. She congratulated Ms. Kennedy.

Mr. Matthew Wilkie observed that temperatures were dropping, and he wondered what plan the County had for warming shelters. He commented that could have been discussed at a Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) meeting, but he remarked that those meetings were no longer being held. He described that he attended the BCC meeting because of a sense of deep betrayal. He recounted that he was approached by the former chair of WashoeDems to help with a campaign for an up-and-coming political star who was going to run against an 8-year BCC incumbent and change the game. He said that he volunteered to make phone calls and send text messages but ultimately felt disappointed by that individual after they were elected. He believed that person quickly traded conviction for convenience soon after they were elected. He contended that canceling CHAB meetings was sabotage, not reform. He added that the meetings were canceled without notice, transparency, or explanation. He theorized that the meetings were canceled out of fear of community members asking hard questions and advocates holding elected officials accountable. He felt that the Commissioners silenced the one space in which people could come together to talk about homelessness, and he believed that choice was made behind closed doors. He reminded everyone that the homelessness crisis in the County and State was not canceled. He stated that people could be swept off of the sidewalks and accountability could be removed from an agenda. He pointed out that no review of Ordinance 1715 had taken place. He viewed canceling CHAB as cowardice dressed up as leadership. He spoke about a donation that he observed in a Contributions and Expenses (C&E) report from November 2024 that indicated a Commissioner accepted a donation from Herb Simon, who he described as the multi-billionaire owner of the Indiana Pacers. He objected to someone calling themselves a fighter for the people while accepting a donation from a billionaire. He saw the acceptance of that donation as hypocritical. He said the community deserved to know, whether from ICM Thomas or anybody else at the dais, when the CHAB would be reinstated, if ever. He wanted to know why it was stopped, and why that was hidden from the public. He understood the CHAB was created by the BCC as a whole, and he felt it should be dissolved by the BCC as a whole. He added that representatives from multiple jurisdictions served on the CHAB and he did not know why it was dissolved unilaterally. He recalled BCC members professing their belief in transparency, and he challenged them to face the public at meetings, not hide behind a slogan. He asked for the promise made over a year ago for a review of Ordinance 1715 to be kept.

Ms. Jill O'Leary displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She described that she was a property owner in the County and attended the BCC meeting to address a significant failure in the Washoe

County Recorder's Office (WCRO). She recounted that she spoke at a BCC meeting the prior week and County Recorder Kalie Work met her in the lobby on her way out. Ms. O'Leary said Ms. Work took her phone number and suggested she get an attorney to get the lien expunged. Ms. O'Leary described that she learned that a lien existed on her property a year after it was recorded. She reported that on April 10, 2025, she filed a motion for an order to release a lien. She related that the same judge who allowed a proposed judgement to be passed off as a final, binding judgement for the lien struck down her motion on May 7, 2025. Ms. O'Leary explained that her concern was not just about her property, it was about the integrity of public records and the protection of all County property owners. She said that Exhibit One of her document was a copy of the formal challenge to the recorded judgement lien she submitted to the WCRO. She asked the Board to clarify the application of Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 247.145 and other relevant existing laws to ensure the WCRO was properly fulfilling its legal duty. She requested the oversight of the BCC to ensure the integrity of County property records, including a review of the current WCRO intake policy to establish if it was in line with the governing laws.

**25-0771      AGENDA ITEM 4 Announcements/Reports.**

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas explained that openings for boards and committees were typically announced during the second meeting of each month, but because of the holiday, there would only be one Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting on November 18, 2025. She mentioned that there was an opening for the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission with a term of January 1, 2026, through December 31, 2029. She stated that the deadline to apply would be 5:00 p.m. on Friday, November 14, 2025, which was before the next BCC meeting. She noted that there were openings for the Law Library Board of Trustees, for one attorney and one non-attorney position serving a two-year term from February 2026 through January 31, 2028. She said that the deadline to apply would be 11:59 p.m. on October 31, 2025.

Commissioner Garcia shared her appreciation for a comment made by Ms. Pam Roberts and noted that she and Chair Hill were also worried. She expressed her concerns to ICM Thomas regarding the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits and suggested that the County had a responsibility to serve the children, adults, and seniors. She explained that food assistance programs were introduced in 1939 during the Great Depression and expanded in the 1960s, helping to combat the national hunger crisis. She added that the County faced unprecedented circumstances with the food crisis, and the BCC was deeply concerned about the impact on local families.

ICM Thomas noted that her office had received numerous questions about SNAP and thanked the Board for recognizing that, although SNAP was not directly under the Board's purview, Washoe County was a regional leader in the area. She indicated that, in preparation for the suspension of SNAP, the State of Nevada scheduled a special meeting with the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for Thursday, October 28, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. She explained that the meeting was for the consideration of emergency work programs to reallocate approximately \$5.9 million in unspent, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to food insecurity programs to be administered through the Nevada Department of

Agriculture (NDA) and the Food Bank of Northern Nevada (FBNN). She mentioned that the details and logistics for distributing food and commodities were being developed, and details would be shared once finalized. She stated that staff would help distribute the information, but the NDA would work directly with the food bank. She noted that she and Human Services Agency (HSA) staff had been in contact with the food bank to discuss how to best support those in need, especially with the winter weather and the upcoming holidays. She said she had also been in communication with the Governor's Finance Office. She mentioned that one of the County leaders had suggested exploring a potential partnership with Washoe County citizens and organizations to donate directly to the food bank. She stated that staff were working to get a quick response (QR) code so employees could donate directly to the food bank. She thought that the State was considering additional funding, since the \$5.9 million Statewide allocation would likely not have a significant impact, given that SNAP benefits Statewide were typically distributed over \$90 million per month. She shared that she was uncertain about the portion of that number that applied to Washoe County and added that the community needed assistance. She said that any new details regarding State funding would be shared with the Board as they became available.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that the FBNN's website could be easily accessed to make a one-time or monthly donation. She shared that the website was secure and encouraged the community to join her in donating, as many could relate to someone who had been impacted by food insecurity. She said that although she was not prepared with the exact food assistance rates in Washoe County, she felt they were high not only for seniors but also for children. She asked the community to help by either donating money or volunteering their time to the food bank, to uplift and strengthen nonprofit partners during critical times.

Chair Hill asked Commissioner Garcia to discuss the effects that the benefit shortage would have on local community-owned grocers and stores, so that the community could have a better understanding and possibly increase their support over the next few months.

Commissioner Garcia shared that she had scheduled a meeting with the head of real estate from Grocery Outlet to inspect the exterior of a building. She indicated that they would not be able to access the interior because the lease for that building did not expire until the end of 2025. She shared that Scolari's in Sun Valley had closed its store, which served a community of 20,000 people, and left the area without a local grocery store. She added that she continued to connect with private business ventures to explore solutions. She thought that, as Commissioners, there was an opportunity to raise the concerns that constituents faced, and she felt it was becoming increasingly difficult for them to access basic services in Sun Valley, whether through public transportation, arranging rides, or balancing multiple jobs with childcare. She explained that cuts to SNAP benefits amplified stressors that families faced, and she hoped that the community would act immediately to help in any way possible.

Chair Hill asked ICM Thomas to see if the County's communications team could coordinate with other communications teams across the State to strategize messaging. She thought that many residents who were not connected to the news or technology might not realize that their Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) cards would no longer work once their benefits expired. She emphasized the importance of ensuring the community knew where to access food and transportation benefits. She indicated that she and Commissioner Garcia, as members of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) board, could help identify ways to provide transportation vouchers. She suggested that staff work to maintain open communication between the Governor's Office, the National Guard, and communities Statewide to ensure a clear message. She expressed concern that people could go hungry and hoped that something could be done.

ICM Thomas said she appreciated Chair Hill's suggestions and agreed that discussions regarding coordination were needed. She believed there was a misconception about SNAP benefits and how those resources were distributed through the food bank, which provided food rather than money. She commented that staff would work on distributing communications.

Chair Hill appreciated the assistance and wondered if there should be distribution locations at grocery stores. She said she was unsure whether those plans would be implemented, but would share any information that became available.

Commissioner Andriola recognized that October 28, 2025, was National First Responders Day. She acknowledged Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Chief Richard Edwards, along with others who had served as volunteers or were first responders. She shared that Veterans Day would be observed on Friday, November 7, 2025, at the Sparks Senior Center from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. She stated that reservations were not required but were encouraged, and she provided the website and phone number for Senior Services. She thanked Ms. Pamela Baker, Mr. Ryan Gustafson, Ms. Cara Paoli, and others for coordinating the event. She believed that observing Veterans Day was a meaningful way to honor those who had served the Country. She encouraged the public to learn the meaning and historical importance of raising a root beer in salute to veterans. She celebrated that the United States (US) Capitol Christmas Tree, Silver Belle, a 53-foot tree from Nevada, was selected by Congressman Mark Amodei and recently cut near Mt. Rose. She mentioned that fourth-grader Grady Armstrong from Virginia City was chosen by Lieutenant Governor Stavros Anthony as an essay finalist to represent the State. She shared that the Nevada Day celebration would take place on Saturday, November 1, 2025. She indicated that Silver Belle would be part of the parade and would be on display from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at Carson Toyota. She said that Silver Belle would embark on a Whistlestop Tour throughout Nevada, and would visit rural areas and other states as it made its way to represent Nevada for the first time at the US Capitol. She noted that the event was something to celebrate because Mr. Armstrong and his family would be attending the tree lighting in Washington, D.C. She encouraged everyone to follow the journey of the US Capitol Christmas Tree and provided the website for additional information.

Commissioner Clark acknowledged the recent appointment of the new County Manager (CM). He questioned why the decision was made to hold the meet and greet for the CM candidates on a Sunday night in Spanish Springs. He suggested that more employees, political candidates, and elected officials attended than the public. He indicated that a similar event occurred during the hiring of a new TMFPD Fire Chief, which was also held off-site. He stated that since the County already had a centrally located facility with the necessary equipment, the meetings should have been held at the County Complex rather than at remote locations.

Chair Hill explained that many rural constituents had mentioned after the recruitment for Chief Edwards that they preferred a location that was more geographically centered. She added that she had tried to accommodate those requests and would take full accountability for that decision. She said Commissioner Clark's request could be considered for future meetings, but felt that the concerns raised by community members from northern Washoe County, who thought that few meetings were held in the northern part of the County, could offer accessibility to those individuals.

Commissioner Clark noted that when he attended gatherings, he often observed the number of attendees and identified the various groups, including citizens, employees, and political figures. He estimated that approximately 12 people attended the meet-and-greet for the candidates. He stated that he understood why Chair Hill made the decision to move the meeting, but felt that constituents who had requested the location change should have supported the event and attended it, since the County had made accommodations to relocate equipment to a remote location. He congratulated the new CM and believed that the \$150,000 defense fund, added by former CM Eric Brown, should be removed from the new contract. He suggested that the severance pay period should be renegotiated for a shorter timeframe. He mentioned that he would be participating in the Nevada Day parade on a float and expressed his enthusiasm for the event. He felt that given the strong pool of candidates who had applied for the CM position, there was an opportunity to hire one of them as an Assistant County Manager (ACM), since the money had already been spent to vet them. He explained that, although he often supported new candidates with new ideas, due to the budget issues the County faced, there was no time to bring a new employee up to speed on everything occurring within the County. He stated that he supported Ms. Thomas in her new role but thought there was a need for a succession plan for the CM position. He acknowledged the importance of having someone in the ACM position who could learn and grow under the CM's leadership. He emphasized the value of having someone with experience share their knowledge on achieving success and potentially select a candidate who was already vetted. He mentioned that he recently read a report that suggested that Irvine was the safest city in California, with little to no homelessness or crime. He noted that Irvine was approximately 400 miles away from Washoe County and suggested that someone contact a representative from Irvine to see if they would be willing to mentor or share their experiences in maintaining low levels of homelessness and crime. He indicated that Irvine, previously farmland, had grown into a larger city that offered entertainment, manufacturing, an airport, and served as headquarters for many Fortune 500 companies. He believed Washoe County could learn from more successful cities and suggested that, after hiring a new ACM, the County should collaborate

with other cities to emulate their policies and ideas. He expressed concern after hearing Ms. Virginia Wiggins' public comment and felt that she was in a difficult situation. He mentioned an allegation by Mr. Drew Ribar of an assault in an elevator and questioned whether there were security cameras in the elevator. He stated that if elevators did not have cameras, they should be installed to document future incidents. He believed that Mr. Matthew Wilkie had raised legitimate concerns about the lack of Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) meetings. He felt that the committee needed to get back on track to ensure important issues were discussed. He reiterated a prior point about finding a place with minimal homelessness to understand how they achieved those successes.

## **PROCLAMATIONS**

**25-0772**     **5A1** Proclamation for the week of November 4-11, 2025 as Operation Green Light for Veterans 2025. (All Commission Districts.).

Commissioner Andriola read the proclamation. She encouraged any veterans in attendance to join her at the podium. She thanked the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) for honoring Operation Green Light for five years. She noted that the courts were turning their lights green in honor of Operation Green Light on November 4 through 11. She said there were many individuals who had given their honor and dedication to serving the United States (US). She recalled that she grew up in a military family and that veterans were near and dear to her.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Pamela Baker displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that she was a US Air Force veteran, a Vietnam War veteran, and a service-connected disabled veteran. She believed that a veteran was someone who, upon their enlistment or commission into the US Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the US Public Health Service (USPHS), swore an oath to support and defend the US Constitution. She felt that the most expensive thing everyone owned was their freedom guaranteed by the Constitution, and that freedom was not free. She explained that 6 percent of the population were veterans, who represented 100 percent of the US population. She noted that veterans paid the price owed for freedom by those who could or would not serve. She speculated that veterans were the smallest demographic but had the highest rate of volunteerism. She relayed words from Gold Star Mother Georgie Carter Krell, whose 19-year-old son was killed in action (KIA) in Vietnam, and said that death for freedom was not the worst thing that could happen to a veteran, being forgotten was. She said that veterans succumbed to suicide at more than twice the rate of non-veterans due to what she believed was being forgotten. She reported that Operation Green Light for veterans was a Nationwide effort, spearheaded by the National Association of Counties (NACo), to not only remember veterans but also reduce the significant rate of veteran suicides. She said that green lights displayed from November 4 through 11 were to remember, honor, and support veterans and welcome them home. She hoped to live in a society where people asked for veteran autographs while idolizing them with the same zeal and enthusiasm as celebrities. She recommended that those who were not veterans should invite a veteran to Thanksgiving, Christmas, or any other holiday

gathering, as they often missed many holidays with friends and family while serving away from home. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Baker for her service.

Nevada Department of Veterans Services (NDVS) Deputy Director of Benefits Rommel Ferrer thanked the Board for their unwavering support, partnership, and care shown for veterans and their families. He recognized Commissioner Andriola for her initiatives, selfless service, and her efforts in promoting the strengthening of the NDVS's mission to serve Nevada veterans, while honoring their remarkable legacy. He thanked the Board for their public service and appreciated the trust they had in the NDVS team. He looked forward to further collaboration. Chair Hill thanked Mr. Ferrer for his service.

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

**10:57 a.m.**     **The Board recessed for a photo.**

**11:00 a.m.**     **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

### **PRESENTATIONS**

**25-0773**     **AGENDA ITEM 6A1** Presentation by Gabrielle Enfield, Community Reinvestment Manager, regarding a status update for Community Reinvestment and the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) grant (\$91,587,038) awarded to Washoe County pursuant to the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA). Manager. (All Commission Districts.).

Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Community Reinvestment; Overview; How We Deliver; ARPA-SLFRF; Funding Status; State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds – 2025 Annual Report; Timeline; Washoe Opioid Abatement & Recovery Fund; Needs Assessment; Funding Status; Amount Expended; Grants Management; Grants Management – Supporting Countywide Success; Grants Management – Alternative Funding; Community Development Block Grant (2 slides); Federal Appropriations; Federal Appropriations – Awarded & Pending Projects; Federal Appropriations Timeline; Federal Appropriations Submission Timeline; Questions?. She indicated that the programs and projects were implemented through collaboration with departments, nonprofits, and stakeholders. She reported that over \$91.5 million was received through State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF), which were allocated by the Board prior to the December 2025 deadline. She noted that there were 131 projects, evenly distributed between internal and external. She stated that three projects were implemented to support the administration of the projects, and she was proud to report that 90 projects were completed. She explained that several more projects would be completed by December and June.

Ms. Enfield noted that an annual report was required to be submitted to the United States (US) Department of the Treasury (TREAS), which she thought was a good opportunity to summarize and detail the various projects funded by the program. She read and relayed the information listed on the *State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds – 2025 Annual Report* slide, which outlined the four primary funding categories. She noted that a copy of the Washoe County Recovery Plan report was listed on the County website and provided the document, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She said that it was a significant achievement to ensure that all funds were allocated and that none were returned to the TREAS. She reported that the County was on target to expend the funds by the next deadline of December 2026. She explained that a project dashboard was deployed, which could be found on the County's website and allowed for transparency and performance tracking. She believed that the County invested in numerous long-term solutions, ranging from homelessness to mental health, through funds such as the Washoe County Behavioral Health Center's purchase and renovation.

Ms. Enfield noted that another primary project of community reinvestment was the Washoe Opioid Abatement and Recovery Fund (WOARF). She explained that Grants and Community Program Analyst Lauren Beal was in charge of and responsible for the program. She believed that Ms. Beal had worked hard to conduct a successful needs assessment, which involved more than 600 respondents, focus groups, and key informant interviews. She recalled a meeting from September 24, where community members provided input on strategies, and that Ms. Beal would be present at the December Board meeting to discuss the results of the needs assessment. She mentioned that the County was expected to receive more than \$42 million over the next 19 years, with \$10.3 million already received. She stated that the next round of funding would be allocated based on the most recent assessment and would be implemented in 2026. She referred to the *Amount Expended* slide and stated that \$1.5 million was spent on WOARF-funded projects.

Ms. Enfield explained that the Grants Management Program was led by County Grants Administrator Connie Lucido, who focused on providing leadership and policy to ensure that the County departments followed funding requirements. She noted that Ms. Lucido supported the development with new and pending grants, which were outlined on the *Grants Management – Alternative Funding* slide. She said that about \$3.5 million in grant requests were pending. She stated that the County was collaborating with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on final documentation for the Safe Streets and Roads for All grant, and that the Truckee River Fund Agreement was anticipated to be on the agenda soon. She mentioned that the second Safe Streets and Roads for All grant would provide planning for pedestrian safety in unincorporated areas. She recalled that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) had previously collaborated with the County on planning grants, which would expand to the entire County, including Reno and Sparks.

Ms. Enfield reported that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) was a Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-funded program for which the County applied through the State of Nevada. She relayed that two projects were funded through the CDBG, as listed on the *Community Development Block Grant* second slide, which included the completed Gerlach project and the Sidehill Drive Pedestrian Americans

with Disabilities Act (ADA) Improvements Project, which was pending environmental review. She noted that the CDBG fiscal year (FY) 2026 process would begin in July 2026 for awards available in July 2027. She recalled that the County had been successful in the past when receiving federal appropriations and listed the awarded and pending projects on the *Federal Appropriations – Awarded & Pending Projects* slide. She mentioned that all federally funded projects were required to undergo an environmental review process, which could be lengthy and complex. She stated that the Sheriff's Office Mobile Incident Command vehicle would cost \$3 million, had been approved by the congressional committees, and was expected to be included in the federal appropriations bill that was usually passed prior to October 1. She concluded by stating that potential applications for the next round of funding would be submitted in March 2026.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Ms. Enfield for the update and believed the report and dashboard were phenomenal. She appreciated the dedication to transparency and recognized that Ms. Enfield was part of a small team that deserved recognition. She recalled that many counties lacked the capacity and staff to manage, allocate, and spend funds from the State. She commended Ms. Enfield's team for sifting through information and wants to identify which projects were a priority through the needs assessment. She asked how Ms. Enfield and her team would move forward through the process and how her team would evolve and change to continue serving in a similar capacity. Ms. Enfield noted that her team was decreasing work related to the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) and progressing to identify other projects while supporting the Office of the County Manager (OCM) and nonprofit capacity building. She reported that a staff member recently resigned, and the department chose not to fill the position to ensure that the team could focus on existing projects while supporting the County's priorities.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Enfield and echoed Commissioner Garcia's sentiments. She speculated that not everyone would appreciate the compliance reporting that Ms. Enfield's team provided. She noted that the work performed was labor-intensive, as it ensured that processes were completed correctly, which she considered very important. She wished to celebrate the great work that Ms. Enfield and her team had contributed, as it would benefit the County in the long term.

Commissioner Clark asked Ms. Enfield about the Seven Magic Mountains (SMM) relocation and installation on page 95 of the Washoe County Recovery Plan document. He opined that the SMM project had undergone a change in course and wondered if there were any other projects that had experienced similar changes. Ms. Enfield explained that the report was due by the end of July and included all projects that were planned for approval at that time. She believed that there were other projects that had changed since the report was completed. She mentioned that SMM would be discussed in 2026 since plans had changed. She stated that, for transparency, the County's American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) webpage included a summary of every Board item that her team presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), which was updated every time a project was obligated, reduced, or moved. Commissioner Clark wondered if there were any other projects that were deobligated. Ms. Enfield noted that she could not recall any new deobligated projects.

Chair Hill appreciated Ms. Enfield and the work her team performed. She thanked Ms. Enfield for presenting the updates. Ms. Enfield thanked County staff, the BCC, the Community Services Department (CSD), and the Human Services Agency (HSA) for their hard work and the implementation of the projects. Chair Hill believed that the report was impactful and that the money would be missed.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Hill announced that the Consent Agenda Items would be heard prior to Agenda Item 6A2

\* \* \* \* \*

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8F1, EXCLUDING AGENDA ITEM 8C1 HEARD SEPARATELY**

**25-0774**      **8A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meeting of September 16, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0775**      **8B1** Recommendation to approve the reclassification of three Public Administrator Estate Investigator positions, pay grade 14, to the new job classification title of Deputy Probate Estate Manager II, pay grade 14; the creation of a new job classification titled Deputy Probate Estate Manager I, pay grade 13, establishing a new flexibly staffed series, Deputy Probate Estate Manager I/II; (Public Administrator's Office); reclassification of a Communications Call Taker, pay grade 11, to Supervising Communications Specialist, pay grade 15 (Sheriff's Office) [\$37,973-offset with other position changes]; delimit a vacant Communications Call Taker position #70010855 (Sheriff's Office) [savings \$94,664]; reclassification of a Behavioral Health Program Coordinator, pay grade 19, to Human Services Program Specialist, pay grade 17 [savings \$64,763]; reclassification of a Management Analyst, pay grade 16, to Human Services Program Specialist, pay grade 17 [\$20,926] (Office of the County Manager); reclassification of a Division Director - Housing and Homeless Services, pay grade 21 to Division Director – Human Services, pay grade 21; reclassification of an Eligibility Supervisor, pay grade 13, to Senior Human Services Support Specialist, pay grade 13 (Human Services Agency) as reviewed and evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee; a change in the job classification title from Lead Public Administrator Estate Investigator to Lead Deputy Probate Estate Manager; delimit the job classification title of Public Administrator Estate Investigator (Public Administrator's Office); a change in the job classification title from Assistant to County Manager to Executive Assistant to the County Manager (Office of the County Manager); delimit the job classification title of Division Director - Housing and Homeless Services (Human Services Agency); a change in the job classification title from Family Support Specialist to Child Support

Collections Specialist; a change in the job classification title from Family Support Supervisor to Child Support Collections Supervisor (District Attorney's Office) and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes. Total fiscal impact is [net savings of \$100,528]. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0776**      **8C2** 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 [\$197,017.96] for projects that have been completed under budget, cancelled, or no longer need the previously approved levels of funding:

- Juvenile Services Mental Health \$9,777.57
- High Sierra Area Health Education Center \$1.47
- Civil Rights and Equity Engagement \$187,238.92

Approve increased allocations to following approved project in the amount of [\$197,017.96]:

- Washoe Behavioral Health Center (formerly West Hills) Facility Upgrades in the amount of \$197,017.96

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

**25-0777**      **8D1** Recommendation to approve and accept grant funding from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services in the amount of \$142,863.00 [no County match] personnel and toxicology expenses related to investigating drug-related deaths, to perform advanced toxicology testing on decedents, and to input data into the Overdose Data to Action (OD2A) system for a retroactive term of September 1, 2025 through August 31, 2026; and if approved, authorize the Chief Medical Examiner & Coroner of the Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office to sign the grant award documents necessary to receive the grant; and direct Finance to make the necessary amendments to the Regional Medical Examiner's Office's Fiscal Year 2026 budget to reflect the receipt and use of the grant funds. Regional Medical Examiner. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0778**      **8D2** Recommendation to approve and accept grant funding from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services in the amount of \$63,875.00 [no County match] for personnel expenses relating to the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) program, for a retroactive term of September 1, 2025 through August 31, 2026; and if approved, authorize the Chief Medical Examiner & Coroner of the Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office to sign the grant award

documents necessary to receive the grant; and direct Finance to make the necessary amendments to the Regional Medical Examiner's Office's Fiscal Year 2026 budget to reflect the receipt and use of the grant funds. Regional Medical Examiner. (All Commission Districts.).

- 25-0779**      **8E1** Recommendation to approve budget amendment totaling an increase of [\$47,367.00;no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Public Health 291 State Funds Grant, retroactive to July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026, for Northern Nevada Public Health in support of various health initiatives to include prevention of tobacco use in youth, providing immunizations, conducting STI surveillance and reporting, and providing continuing training to public health staff and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0780**      **8E2** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of \$5,000.00 in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Anthem Blue Cross Donation account for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support the Maternal, Child & Adolescent Health Program, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0781**      **8F1** Request by the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD), through the Washoe County Clerk, and pursuant to Washoe County Code (WCC) 2.030, to initiate amendments to WCC Chapter 60 (Fire Prevention and Protection) to update the editions of the International Fire Code and International Wildland-Urban Interface Codes adopted by reference from the 2018 editions to the 2024 editions, with modifications to make them applicable to conditions within Washoe County. And, if supported, direct the County Clerk to submit the request to the District Attorney's Office for preparation of a proposed ordinance in accordance with WCC 2.040. Truckee Meadows Fire District. (All Commission Districts.).

Commissioner Andriola pulled Agenda Item 8C1 from the Consent Agenda.

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

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8F1, with the exclusion of Item 8C1, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8F1, with the exclusion of Item 8C1, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**25-0782**

**8C1** Recommendation, in accordance with the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund Obligation Interim Final Rule to replace previously approved allocation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) in the amount of [\$139,690.17] for a project which has been unable to perform their scope of work. The replacement project is within the same scope and for the same purpose. Approve associated resolution and authorize the Interim County Manager to sign necessary award documents, for the award of [\$139,690.17] to the State of Nevada Department of Veterans Services, a government entity.

Terminate subaward for [\$139,690.17] Nation's Finest - Veterans Services to support 1.5 Veteran Service Officer (VSO) positions to provide veterans with personalized assistance with applications and appeals for veterans' benefits.

-Replacement subaward \$139,690.17 to Nevada Department of Veterans Services - to support two Veteran Services Officers (VSO) positions to provide veterans with personalized assistance with applications and appeals for veterans' benefits.

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

Commissioner Andriola said that she wanted to focus on Agenda Item 8A1 and hoped that Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield could present the framework for the item. She emphasized the importance of highlighting the significant work Ms. Enfield had accomplished and the benefits the agreement between Washoe County and the Nevada Department of Veterans Services (NDVS) would bring to the community. She mentioned that she had met Colonel Mary Devine and her team, and noted that constituent Ms. Pamela Baker had been instrumental in sharing information. She acknowledged the hard work of Human Services Agency (HSA) Director Ryan Gustafson and his team, Division Director Cara Paoli, and others who helped address gaps in veteran services. She recognized Ms. Glenna Smith, whom she had worked with in various capacities, for her dedication to serving veterans. She observed that the community had long lacked representation for a Veterans Service Officer (VSO) and expressed her deep appreciation for veterans. She said that since becoming a Commissioner, she had consistently advocated for veterans and would continue to do so. She believed that the approval of the VSO position was a meaningful achievement for both the community and its veterans. She thanked the NDVS team and Colonel Devine for their leadership and support.

Ms. Enfield noted that in September 2024, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) awarded \$150,000 to Nation's Finest to support the VSO position. She explained that the role of a VSO was to assist veterans in applying for their benefits

by offering support, ensuring they received the assistance they needed, and guiding them through the complex process, while addressing any challenges they encountered. She shared that Nation's Finest had a staff member who left and noted that the organization faced significant challenges hiring new personnel for the VSO positions. She mentioned that, through considerable effort by Commissioner Andriola and Mr. Gustafson, who worked in coordination with the Nevada Department of Veterans Services (NDVS), a unique opportunity emerged to establish a replacement contract. She indicated that the replacement position was one way that State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) could be reallocated. She expressed her enthusiasm that the services, scope of work, and project could now be carried out by the NDVS. She stated that the agreement allowed the remaining \$139,000 to support the same activities through September 2026.

Commissioner Andriola added that two gentlemen in the audience were members of Operation Green Light and Nation's Finest. She acknowledged Nation's Finest for their hard work on the initial VSO contract and added that minor changes were needed that would improve the contract for the NDVS, which she was grateful for.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Pamela Baker read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She said that she represented veterans' services and expressed her gratitude to Commissioner Andriola. She indicated that she had spent 30 years attempting to join the other 49 states' counties in establishing a Washoe County VSO. She stated that, with the support of Commissioner Andriola and the team she had assembled, the VSO would finally come to fruition.

Commissioner Andriola recognized Ms. Smith and Chief Information Officer (CIO) Justin Klatt for their support of Agenda Item 8C1.

NDVS Deputy Director of Benefits Rommel Ferrer thanked Commissioner Andriola for her work on the initiative. He indicated that the initiative would create opportunities throughout the State and in other counties. He explained that there were approximately 215,000 veterans Statewide, and there were only about 20 accredited VSOs. He mentioned that having two accredited VSOs in the County was a significant advantage in assisting veterans and their families with the benefits they had earned. He expressed his appreciation for the initiative and his optimism regarding the value it would add through the NDVS.

Commissioner Andriola shared that she, Colonel Devine, and her staff toured the Cares Campus and the Resource Center. She indicated that Mr. Ferrer would work with HSA staff to develop a schedule through Mr. Gustafson so that the Washoe County VSOs would know their locations and times. She explained that the VSOs would rotate among the various locations.

Ms. Baker challenged the community to join her in raising funds that would help make the VSO positions permanent. She stated that she would match contributions up to \$65,000 and encouraged everyone to make a donation.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Baker and remarked that veterans continued to serve their communities, which she found remarkable. She suggested that additional caseworkers were needed to help individuals navigate complex government systems. She believed that the program would be a valuable asset to the community.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8C1 be approved, authorized, terminated, and directed.

**25-0783**      **AGENDA ITEM 6A2** Presentation on the unaudited FY2025 year-end general fund budget-to-actual revenue and expenditures in addition to potential updates on the FY2026 budget-to-actual revenue and expenditures. Finance. (All Commission Districts.).

Budget Manager Lori Cooke greeted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Revenues/Sources as of October 21, 2025; Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Consolidated Tax Distributions Through June 2025; Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Expenditures/Uses as of October 21, 2025; Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Fund Balance as of October 21, 2025; Fiscal Year 2026 General Fund Unaudited Revenues/Sources through September 30, 2025; Fiscal Year 2026 General Fund Unaudited Consolidated Tax Distributions Through July 2025; Fiscal Years 2025 & 2026 General Fund Unaudited Fund Balance as of October 21, 2025; Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Process.

Ms. Cooke displayed the slide titled *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Revenues/Sources as of October 21, 2025*. She explained that the information on the slide was identical to the data she had presented during her previous update to the Board. She noted that there would be no variances in the prior information the Board had received, but she wanted to revisit the matters she had previously discussed. She reported that there were no changes to any of the General Fund's revenue sources, including taxes or consolidated tax (c-tax). She wanted to draw attention to the unrealized gain or loss (URGL). She explained that if the URGL was listed as a positive number, it represented an unrealized gain (URG); if it was negative, it represented an unrealized loss (URL). She referred to the mark-to-market (MTM) valuation method associated with URGL by providing a comparison to real estate. She noted that a home's value would fluctuate at different points in time based on the market, and MTM could be used to evaluate whether a profit would be made or whether there would be a potential loss if the home were sold. She clarified that if that hypothetical house were not sold, there would be no actual funds gained or lost, as the URGL merely represented potential values. She reported that the County's URGL was calculated at a relatively large number during fiscal year (FY) 2025, which she said she mentioned to remind the Board that the listed value did not represent an actualized cash entry.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Consolidated Tax Distributions Through June 2025* slide. She stated that c-tax was the

second largest revenue source for the County and recalled that she had extensively discussed the topic with the Board. She reported that the State of Nevada held two town hall meetings on October 21, 2025, and October 23, 2025. She stated that several staff members, including herself, had attended those meetings remotely. She explained that the figures listed on the slide had been updated to show the values for FY 2025 through June, which the State of Nevada had difficulty providing to the County due to the State's transition to a new financial system and a recent cyberattack. She elaborated that the values she included on the current slide differed from those in her previous presentation because the figures had been updated with data spanning through the end of FY 2025, which concluded in June of 2025.

Ms. Cooke explained that the numbers in the chart on the left of the slide indicated a 4.1 percent increase in taxable sales reported. She noted that she would discuss later how that value might change based on the new financial system information that staff were given during the State of Nevada's town hall meetings. She referred to the central chart on the slide and explained that the County's total c-tax distributions in FY 2025 were listed at a value of \$162.9 million. She noted the data in the slide's rightmost chart, explaining that staff referred to the County's Basic City-County Relief Tax (BCCRT) and Supplemental City-County Relief Tax (SCCRT) as the pure sales tax, as those values were based on and directly related to Washoe County's taxable sales. She provided examples of the notable components of the BCCRT and SCCRT distribution values, remarking that she was providing the information for those who might not remember it or might be interested in additional details. She explained that one component of those distributions was the excise tax on cigarettes and alcohol, which represented a minimal portion of what the County received in BCCRT and SCCRT. She noted that the final two components of BCCRT and SCCRT were the governmental service tax from the registration of automobiles collected by the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the County's Real Property Transfer Tax (RPTT) that was collected by the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO) when the transfer of a property occurred. She explained that the County's distributions were also impacted by fees and other revenue associated with the pure sales tax, which were provided to the State of Nevada. The State would then invest the funds provided from those components into the c-tax distributions before sending them back to the County. She explained that the combined value of the fees and other revenue from the pure sales tax represented approximately 15 to 16 percent of Washoe County's total c-tax distributions. She indicated that the comprehensive SCCRT and BCCRT distributions corresponded to 83 to 85 percent of the County's total c-tax distributions. She noted that the presentation also included more current information related to FY 2026.

Ms. Cooke introduced the slide titled *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Expenditures/Uses as of October 21, 2025*. She observed that the data on the slide matched the staff's most recent findings that had been previously presented to the BCC, as nothing within that presentation had changed since staff began working on the FY 2025 audit and finalization process. She explained that the highlighted amounts on the slide demonstrated that the County's salary savings estimation for FY 2025 had ultimately not been realized, which she clarified did not mean the organization had exceeded its budget, but rather that the anticipated savings had not been achieved. She displayed the slide titled

*Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Fund Balance as of October 21, 2025*, noting that despite not reaching the estimated savings she had mentioned, the County finished FY 2025 better than anticipated based on its ending fund balance. She reported that the net change to the fund balance would be approximately \$2.5 million if the URG were not included in that figure. She explained that, given the large overall budget amount, staff viewed the ending fund balance as having remained at a relatively flat level, despite the \$2.5 million net change she had described. She considered that to be a good outcome, and she opined that it was ultimately better than using the fund balance. However, she did not think it necessarily represented a significant gain or a large amount, as the estimated ending fund balance and the actual fund balance were ultimately fairly similar to one another, despite the numbers themselves appearing to be substantial in size.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Fiscal Year 2026 General Fund Unaudited Revenues/Sources through September 30, 2025*, slide and explained that she would discuss the first quarter of FY 2026. She noted that she should have begun her presentation by reporting to the Board that County Comptroller Cathy Hill was apologetic about not being able to attend the BCC meeting during the presentation, as she was otherwise occupied at the Second Judicial District Court. Ms. Cooke clarified that the numbers on the slide represented unaudited figures. She indicated that the graphs on the slide showed a comparison of the General Fund budgets during the FY 2025 period of July 1, 2024, to September 30, 2024, and for FY 2026, from July 1, 2025, to September 30, 2025. She indicated that, based on the analysis of trends, the FY 2026 statistics were in line with those of FY 2025 during the same period. She indicated that, from the perspective of trending and analysis, the data was on par and roughly where staff expected it to be for the first quarter of FY 2026. She noted that the values of the General Fund expenditures and transfers out associated with the FY 2026 budget and year-to-date (YTD) actuals were slightly higher than those for the same period in FY 2025. She reported that the driving factor for that difference during the first quarter of FY 2025 and FY 2026 was the budgeting of salary savings. She explained that staff would anticipate for each FY's salary savings while developing the budget. She elaborated that as the data for what had actually occurred was received, those values would be closer to the budgeted amounts because the salary savings had been accounted for when creating the budget. She stated that based on the trends and what typically occurred during the first quarter or the beginning of every FY, staff found nothing within the data that caused them to be concerned from a fiscal management and tracking perspective.

Ms. Cooke introduced the *Fiscal Year 2026 General Fund Unaudited Consolidated Tax Distributions Through July 2025* slide by explaining that it included details about c-tax for FY 2026. She reported that the data on the slide for FY 2026 only reflected the County's first c-tax distribution from July of 2025. She explained that additional updated information regarding the County's c-tax had been received by staff the previous day. She elaborated that because she had already submitted her presentation prior to that information being provided to staff, the slide only reflected the first distribution from July 2025.

Ms. Cooke provided a broad overview of what had transpired in the past regarding c-tax distributions and how staff reported it. She speculated that anyone reviewing previous budget presentations might notice that the FY 2024 County taxable sales had not previously been listed as \$12.06 billion but instead were formerly reported as \$12.118 billion. She explained that those figures were impacted by the State of Nevada's new approach for outstanding payments related to a period that had already lapsed, which was further affected by the final date for the related reports to be received by the State. She noted that the system's approach to that process had represented an issue since the implementation of the State's new financial system the previous year. She explained that the final date for each period was at the end of every month. She recalled that the County had received only half of its November 2024 c-tax distribution in January 2025, and that the State had subsequently provided an extension of the period at that time to ensure the County would receive a full 12 months' worth of distributions. As a result of the extension, the County eventually received a June 2025 distribution that was adjusted in response and was nearly three times larger than usual, which ultimately balanced out the previous discrepancy. She attributed the cause of the issue mainly to the timing of the vendor's implementation of the State of Nevada's new financial system. She reported that the State had since updated the process to allow for a 15-day timeframe to finalize a period rather than having it end on the last day of each month. She indicated that staff anticipated future distributions to normalize after the October distribution, which the County had received notice of the previous day. She did not think the County had yet received the cash for that October distribution. She clarified that the information she had provided was based on what the State told staff the day prior.

Ms. Cooke provided an example to further describe the State of Nevada's updated system for receiving outstanding payments from previous periods. She described a hypothetical situation where an April taxable sales report from a vendor merchant had not been processed in time due to several possible reasons, such as the report lacking necessary information from the vendor or the Nevada Department of Taxation (NDT) first needing to complete its finalization procedures. She explained that either of those reasons for delays could mean that the reported sales would not be reflected in the April distribution. She explained that distributions were typically received by the County two months after the end of each monthly period, so in the example she had provided, the County would receive the April distribution in June. She reported that the State of Nevada's procedure for handling outstanding payments from previous periods had since been updated. Under the new process, once the delay was resolved, April's reported taxable sales would be retroactively included in April's distribution rather than being posted in June's distribution. She explained that the County would consequently see adjustments for the taxable sales values for prior months. She elaborated that with the new system, the cumulative amounts for YTD figures may not match when summing the data gathered at different points in time from July through June, due to the potential for adjustments being made to past periods. She noted that what she had described to the Board was her understanding of the system based on how it had been explained to staff. She said that previously, when staff reviewed data to learn what had happened at any given point in time, they would be aware that what the County received in a June distribution, for example, would actually reflect what had been reported for April's taxable sales due to the two-

month delay in receiving distributions. She noted that whenever staff examined historical trends going forward, they would consequently have to consider that there were 20 or more years of potential April activity that had been reported as June distributions due to the State's change in the process. She opined that the adjustments to the system made tracking historical information challenging because people could no longer be certain whether they would be comparing data associated with the same timeframes.

Ms. Cooke described how the second part of the State's financial system changeover was associated with the idea that it had been implemented so that distributions would occur faster. She explained that merchants were required to submit their taxable sales information by the last day of the following month. Therefore, if they wanted to finalize their September report, the information for that month would not be due until October 31 of the same year. She noted that she had not known previously that there had been a change in that process. She stated that, as of January 1, 2026, the new filing deadline for vendors would be the 20th day of the following month for the period being reported, rather than the last day of the month. She explained that the new deadline provided additional time for the NDT to process the information from vendors in order to reconcile any irregularities and allow the related funds to be posted and released for distribution. She reported that various issues contributed to the challenges of tracking and analyzing budget forecasts that were happening simultaneously. She noted that one of the added challenges was caused by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) having consolidated business classification codes in 2022. She explained that the NAICS system classified different business activities, such as construction, construction equipment, or construction rentals, through various code numbers that were categorized into groups. She elaborated that certain NCAIS codes had been consolidated in 2022. She noted that the old State of Nevada financial system could provide the historical NCAIS codes before their re-classification, with data spanning from 2012 onward, which had allowed people to review the codes individually and compare the historical code classifications with the updated information. She reported that the State's new financial system could only use the updated 2022 consolidated NCAIS classification codes, which meant that anyone reviewing historical records for those codes had to be mindful to ensure they were aware of whether the code they were researching had been consolidated, as they might otherwise try to compare a code that no longer existed or was not being used after being combined into another code. She acknowledged that the State of Nevada was very aware of the challenges the County was facing. She opined that the State had taken all the comments and input they received very seriously, as they had conducted town hall meetings, provided presentation materials, and created a YouTube video to inform everyone that things were supposed to return to normal.

Ms. Cooke indicated that she would discuss the information County staff received from the State of Nevada the day prior. She reminded the Board that the County had not received the RPTT and Government Services Tax (GST) portions of the distribution on July 1, 2025, due to the State of Nevada's financial system's deadlines. She clarified that the WCRO and the DMV were on time and had done everything required to ensure the distribution was received by the County in its entirety. However, the RPTT and GST were not included in July's distribution. She reported that the County had received

notice of the issue with July's distribution the day prior. She stated that the FY 2026 cumulative distribution amount from the July 1, 2025, distribution was approximately 7.5 percent higher than the prior FY, which was more aligned with what was reflected by the taxable sales data. She noted that there was still a question of whether the data being compared between the current and previous FYs had been collected for two different 30-day periods. She suggested that staff would need additional time to accrue more data in order to understand those trends more accurately. She noted that the NDT's website publicly reported revenue statistics and information throughout the duration of the FY. She explained that the statistics on that website had been posted for the currently completed two months of FY 2026 and showed that the Washoe County taxable sales data had increased by 7.8 percent. She opined that the increase was good news, though it had been surprising. She reiterated that some of her concerns were that the taxable sales statistic on the slide for FY 2026 only included data for one month, and the value for percentage change was not accurately reflective of any single revenue month for comparison due to the difference in the State's filing periods between FY 2025 and 2026. She emphasized that those factors had been an enormous challenge when it came to trying to forecast or figure out where the County's budget would be in the future. She noted that the taxable sales represented a large portion of Washoe County's General Fund revenue, and the County had debt issuances that were supported with the e-tax revenue, which is why staff focused so heavily on it. She acknowledged that the State had faced challenges as well and clarified that she was not trying to pass the blame onto them.

Ms. Cooke displayed the slide titled *Fiscal Years 2025 & 2026 General Fund Unaudited Fund Balance as of October 21, 2025*. She explained that FY 2026's data was trending as staff had expected it to upon comparing the figures for both FY 2025 and FY 2026. She reported that FY 2025 had a better ending fund balance than staff had expected, and the distribution for July of 2025 during FY 2026 had been lower than anticipated. She reminded the Board that the information shown on the slide would be updated in the following budget presentation and would include tables and charts rather than exclusively verbal reports. She noted that staff still needed to create those materials with the recently received data, but she wanted to share that information with the Board. She explained that staff would continue monitoring the growth in expenditures compared to the increase in revenue, as there were still certain unbudgeted expenditures that needed to be included in future budget forecasts. She disclosed that staff had recently processed another personnel cost plan to simulate trends in personnel costs, which was the County's most substantial expenditure category. She emphasized the need to simulate those plans properly, noting that her team had completed those efforts the previous Thursday and would be reviewing the plan to ensure accuracy. She described some of the other listed unbudgeted expenditures on the slide, including Senate Bill (SB) 116 from the State's legislative session in 2025. She reported that the actual expenditures and transfers were trending as expected. She mentioned that the personnel cost plan staff conducted previously was for pay period 19 and had indicated that the County was on target to achieve the desired 3 percent goal that had been budgeted for salary savings. She acknowledged that many factors could impact that positive trend.

Ms. Cooke reviewed the *Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Process* slide. She explained that FY 2027 would run from July 1, 2026, to June 30, 2027. She noted that staff expected to have a preliminary fiscal outlook on January 20, 2026, which was a date similar to the previous year. She explained that staff had identified a date for the BCC budget workshop for FY 2027. She reported that staff would continue conducting the internal budget congress within her department. She stated that the budget congress was new as of the previous year, and she had received great input from staff regarding potential areas of improvement. She noted those meetings were generally well-received. She explained that staff would continue providing monthly budget updates to the BCC. She noted that staff would target conducting the presentations during the third BCC meeting of each month to ensure that details from the prior month and anticipated financial information would be available to share with the Board. She explained that future update presentations would be provided during BCC meetings in February and March, with a presentation on the County Manager's (CM) recommended FY 2027 budget anticipated to be given on April 14, 2026. The public hearing for the FY 2027 final budget was expected to be conducted on May 19, 2026. She noted that those dates were subject to change, as there were statutory limitations on when the public hearing for the final budget could be held. She acknowledged that while the dates she provided were only estimates that could change in the future, staff would continue to provide briefings to each of the Commissioners, converse with other departments, and follow whatever direction was given to them by interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Cooke and opined that it was helpful to know where progress was being made. She expressed anticipation for the BCC workshop meeting in January. She stated that she did not envy Ms. Cooke's position and acknowledged that it was currently tough for her to project budgets. She voiced her surprise about the FY 2025 property tax being less than budgeted and asked if Ms. Cooke could provide the Board with some insight on that matter.

Ms. Cooke responded that staff were considering involving property taxes subject matter experts from the Assessor's Office and the Treasurer's Office to identify whether the issue in FY 2025 was an anomaly. She noted that staff would adjust accordingly to determine how that irregularity would be reflected in the budget. She explained that if there were an anomaly, staff would have to reconcile to the State's pro forma or make a very good argument as to why the County did not want to use the number provided by the State, which she opined would have both benefits and disadvantages. She elaborated that if staff decided they needed to make other adjustments, they would subsequently have to identify where those would be implemented into the budget forecast. She explained that the ending values for property taxes were slightly below what staff had estimated they would be for FY 2025, and if FY 2026 showed signs of trending in a similar way, staff needed to make those adjustments to the budget forecast. She opined that the County was fortunate that the issue was ultimately not a negative material impact to the organization, but she acknowledged that it had been in FY 2013. She explained that if there was something else within the formula that was impacting the budget, staff wanted to know about it as soon as possible. She reiterated that collaborative work would be conducted

with the Assessor's and Treasurer's Offices to compile any information staff could obtain on the matter.

Chair Hill inquired whether the issue was attributed to a lack of growth, a depreciation of property taxes, or another factor that staff still needed to identify. Ms. Cooke answered that she had an opinion on what might have led to the decrease, although she did not want to provide it, as she was likely wrong. Chair Hill invited Ms. Cooke to speak with her at another time because she was curious what her thoughts were about the issue. Ms. Cooke agreed and noted that her opinion on the matter was strictly anecdotal.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Ms. Cooke for the presentation and update. She stated that she was glad to hear that the FY 2025 ending fund balance was better than expected. She acknowledged that Ms. Cooke was facing serious challenges in trying to forecast all of the c-tax revenues. She noted that it had been approximately six months since the Board expressed concerns about implementing a potential Countywide hiring freeze on April 15, 2025. She recalled that during the April 22, 2025, BCC meeting, discussions took place regarding vacancy salary savings. She explained that the County had over 3,100 employees across 24 departments, and she asked Ms. Cooke to update the Board on the vacancy salary savings. She acknowledged that Ms. Cooke had mentioned in the past that the County budgeted for salary savings, but it did not have the salary savings that staff anticipated. Commissioner Garcia hoped Ms. Cooke would provide additional details on that point, as the salary savings had a significant impact on finalizing FY 2025.

Ms. Cooke explained that the County's highest cost was personnel, which was similar to most other agencies and businesses, aside from those that were capital-intensive. She noted that while she had not provided the related figures in the current presentation, she could prepare them for a future meeting. She recalled that Commissioner Clark had made comments in the past related to the fact that the County had certain departments that operated with a much higher percentage of personnel than others. She explained that the higher personnel cost of those departments was simply the nature of how the funds within those departments financially operated. She noted that there were different options to discuss that could address the escalation of costs, which would have varying degrees of impact on employees. She explained that the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) of the United States (US) and Canada, as well as other agencies, outlined certain best practices for those options. She elaborated that one of the GFOA's recommended best practices was a hiring freeze, which she clarified was not meant to be perceived as inherently negative. She noted that the practices she referred to were not necessarily being recommended at the time, but were only mentioned. She explained that there were different types of hiring freezes and various methods for navigating the process. She recalled that the conversations about hiring freezes with the Board in the past had been to discuss whether it was a policy decision that the BCC wanted to proceed with, which was ultimately not the direction they chose to take.

Ms. Cooke clarified that the estimate for FY 2025's vacancy salary savings was calculated based on the expenditures at a time when the vacant positions had been filled, which had ultimately fluctuated. She elaborated that when staff budgeted those

salary savings ahead of time, they subsequently saw less variation regarding the ending fund balance, as staff had already accounted for those savings in the budget. She explained that the cost plans showed early on in FY 2026 that the trend for those savings was on track to achieve the estimated annual savings goal. She noted that the annual three percent goal of vacancy salary savings reflected a monetary value in the General Fund of approximately \$10 to \$11 million. She indicated that while she did not want to misspeak on the exact values as she did not have the data in front of her, she thought that the number of payouts in the first quarter of FY 2026 had a YTD value of approximately \$1.4 million, which was higher than it was in the first quarter of FY 2025, which had only been about \$995,000 to \$997,000. She acknowledged that the increase was notable and was associated with instances of internal candidates being promoted or new candidates being hired at a position's base pay, which were usually less expensive employees. She described those events as natural turnover, noting that the associated expenses were what staff targeted when trying to achieve the 3 percent savings she had mentioned previously. She clarified that staff had run analyses to identify the percentage to target, but she emphasized that it had not been calculated by reviewing the percentage of the total employee population that would be eligible for retirement within a year. She thought that there was a single person on staff who had served in the County for 40 or 45 years, and she noted that the point when someone retired was a personal choice that could not always be predicted. She reported that staff were regularly monitoring the averages of those factors because they lacked the variation in the ending fund balance that she had previously mentioned. She explained that there was typically an established framework around hiring freezes with certain criteria. She acknowledged that there would occasionally be exceptions to hiring freezes when a position became vacant but could not remain unfilled.

Ms. Cooke expressed uncertainty about whether she had answered Commissioner Garcia's question. She reiterated that there was a little bit less flexibility in the ending General Fund balance but opined that the trends seemed to be okay. She noted that hiring freezes were typically the least impactful action, as they did not directly impact current employees. She acknowledged that hiring freezes could potentially affect a department if a vacant position could not be filled. She explained that those vacancies had their own impact, but the hiring freeze did not involve laying people off, which had been a communicated priority of the Board. She reiterated that the hiring freeze was one of the least impactful actions the County could take, particularly considering that multi-year collective bargaining agreements were in place. She noted that some things were already approved and would proceed regardless of other factors, such as changes in the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) or events with group insurance. She emphasized that while there were many options for an agency to address expenses or costs, they would be governed by policy and limitations imposed by State law or collective bargaining. She suggested that one of the first actions an agency could take was a soft hiring freeze, which meant that when a position became vacant, the County would not fill it for three months. She described that following a soft hiring freeze, staff thought the order of potential actions, if necessary, would be a hard hiring freeze, followed by enacting position layoffs through attrition, and finally, actual layoffs. She noted that there were a variety of other creative options that could be implemented between each of those actions, such as voluntary part-time work. She opined that the County was not yet at the point where those measures were

needed, as the organization was trending as anticipated, and staff would continue to monitor the situation.

Commissioner Garcia thought that the last sentence Ms. Cooke said was the main point of her earlier question. She suspected that the Board would continue to face more difficult decisions ahead, and she did not want to avoid discussing the challenging topics. She opined that the conversations should instead be embraced and communicated to County personnel, because the Board had clearly said they wanted to take care of the people who were already employed with the organization. She stated that the BCC did not want to put staff or the departments under a tremendous amount of pressure to the extent that employee morale decreased and the staff became less effective in their jobs. She emphasized the importance of personnel doing their best work every day to deliver the highest possible services to the community. She opined that, as the budget continued to tighten and forecasted shortfalls persisted, the BCC needed to discuss the matter more, as salary savings had been a primary aspect of the conversations the Board had in April. She thought that those matters had been dormant and that it would be helpful for the Board to revisit them and discuss the issues further in the upcoming updates they planned to receive from Ms. Cooke. She anticipated hearing from Ms. Cooke again in January.

ICM Thomas thought that Commissioner Garcia had already mentioned what she intended to discuss. She wanted to reiterate that the issue had been distinctly acknowledged since Ms. Cooke had brought it to the Board's attention. She opined that Ms. Cooke had since heard some creative solutions, including one that had been presented during the meeting by Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield about a vacant position that staff would keep unfilled while assessing what was needed instead of immediately filling it. She acknowledged that such a postponement demonstrated staff trust in the organization, as employees who were fearful of a hiring freeze might fill positions immediately out of concern for a potential hiring freeze. She wanted to applaud the work that the organization had done to extensively evaluate and adjust positions as they became vacant.

Chair Hill stated that the County's employees were highly committed and some of the hardest workers who were prepared to take on additional work. She believed everyone would have to become versatile in their roles. She explained that the situation reminded her of the 2008 Great Recession. She emphasized the importance of ensuring the Board continued to discuss the matter and agreed with Commissioner Garcia's comments about clarifying that the Board was thinking about the implications of all potential decisions.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Cooke and echoed gratitude for her and her team. She noted that there was a substantial amount of uncertainty, and new goals were always being set. She explained that it felt like as soon as an issue was settled, another would be discovered that needed further attention. She stated that she had previously said she genuinely believed Washoe County's purpose was to deliver essential customer service. She acknowledged that while the Board had heard many comments about wages within various departments compared to other sectors, the County staff delivered essential

services to the community. She explained that she had faced several difficult decisions during the 2008 Great Recession, which had been brought to mind by Chair Hill's previous comments on the topic. She opined that the County was experiencing even more unique circumstances than they had in 2008. She thought the one thing that had remained constant was uncertainty. She wanted to approach the situation from a perspective that would not scare anyone or create further uncertainty and proposed establishing a plan and continuing the discussions that had already been shared.

Commissioner Andriola expressed her excitement at the upcoming budget workshop. She thanked ICM Thomas for leading the efforts to hold the budget workshop and implement the recommendation from the Raftelis report to conduct those meetings. She thought the budget and the related issues the County was facing represented the most integral topic that the Board could discuss. She referred to Commissioner Garcia's earlier point regarding the need to conduct those discussions, and she acknowledged that they would not be easy. She asked Ms. Cooke what the projected schedule was for her to meet with all of the County's departments. Chair Hill inquired if Ms. Cooke had said that those actions would be taken following the budget workshop. ICM Thomas clarified that the budget congress would be the meeting of all the County's departments, which she thought was scheduled for February 3, 2026, and Ms. Cooke confirmed that was the tentative date. Commissioner Andriola noted that the date for the budget congress was after the budget workshop, which Ms. Cooke affirmed. Ms. Cooke explained that the budget congress with all the departments would be conducted following the initial outlook presentation and budget workshop, within the week immediately following the workshop meeting. She explained that once the budget congress meeting had concluded, staff would follow up with departments individually as needed.

Commissioner Andriola expressed certainty that all of the County's departments were investigating potential unrealized savings, which she hoped would be substantial. She thought it would be helpful to share some of the information she had learned during a previous conversation with Washoe County School District (WCSD) President Elizabeth Smith. Commissioner Andriola recalled that she had spoken with Ms. Smith during some of the BCC's earlier budget discussions, which Commissioner Garcia had mentioned had happened in April. She provided an example from her conversation with Ms. Smith that the WCSD had previously not comprehensively investigated its organization's insurance policies. She clarified that she was not suggesting that the WCSD had done anything inappropriate or that Washoe County was not doing the same. She explained that she only wanted to offer her understanding of the situation as an example. She reported that, as a result of the insurance policy investigation, the WCSD found several million dollars in savings within their budget, which was comparable to Washoe County's budget when considering the relative total dollar amounts of the two budgets. She recalled Ms. Enfield having given an example during an earlier presentation about investigating the blending of positions and how departments did not need to consider breaking out of job silos as the only way to approach leveraging interactions with different departments. She thought that the budget workshop would help the BCC consider issues from a policy standpoint. She anticipated identifying how the Board could define essential positions. She recalled having said in the past that adhering to statutes and compliance was a top priority,

and she clarified that she was not suggesting that there were no other equally important areas. She thought that prioritization was essential to consider, and she noted that she was not attempting to give Ms. Cooke direction, as she was only offering her thoughts because she had mentioned the same things before. Commissioner Andriola noted that everyone wanted the budget to be successful and for nobody to be laid off. She hoped that was something each of the Commissioners would agree on. She opined that the matter was not only about the current budget forecast, but also about the stability of the County's future operations. She expressed sympathy for Ms. Cooke's troubles with the NAICS codes compilation because she had similarly worked with those codes. She acknowledged that searching for the NAICS codes, only to have them not appear, must create a difficult situation that she could not imagine. She asked Ms. Cooke whether there was an automation for searching for the NAICS codes, or if she had to cross-reference them with different data instead.

Ms. Cooke reported that a positive outcome of the State's financial system change was that staff could subsequently get reports in the form of an Excel file. She explained that before the system changed, the reports were only provided as PDF files, which did not easily convert to Excel due to the different formats. She noted that the PDF file format required staff to manually type information into Excel spreadsheets to determine final calculations and identify any issues that would alert them to significant variances that needed to be addressed. She opined that the new Excel format of reports from the State would provide additional advantages for automating pivot tables and comparing data from previous years. She reminded the Board that staff would need an entire year of data to make those annual comparisons, due to the change in the State's financial system. She elaborated that there would be additional difficulty in comparing data from previous FYs or even the 2008 Great Recession, due to the compilation of NCAIS codes. She acknowledged that Nevada was one of the most impacted states and had one of the slowest recoveries from the issues in the housing market following the 2008 Great Recession, particularly in terms of property values within the State. She noted that there were many factors associated with a decrease in homes being constructed, as the decline in new homes subsequently meant that people were not purchasing appliances, buying blinds, or paying for landscaping services for their homes. She explained that staff could see the broader impacts in different business types following economic downturns in specific industries based on the NCAIS codes. She noted that she was uncertain about the significance of the NCAIS code consolidation, as she had not had the time to determine how many codes were combined or the severity of the variance the update represented compared to the old system in terms of its impact on analysis. She anticipated greater efficiency in the staff's ability to conduct that kind of analysis in the future, as the data in the reports could be provided as an Excel file.

Commissioner Andriola acknowledged that things could change each minute. She explained that while Ms. Cooke was presenting and later answering Commissioner Garcia's questions, she had thought about the fact that there were compliance requirements, such as submitting filings to the State by specific deadlines, that needed to be met for the budget. She recalled having asked Ms. Cooke a question the previous year about what might happen if changes were needed to the budget. She

commended Ms. Cooke for trying to get the budget right, which she acknowledged took effort to refine. She believed that, based on her numerous conversations with the Assessor and Treasurer, as well as her participation on the Investment Committee, there was an opportunity to gain a better understanding of what was forecasted by those departments and what the core reasons were for some of the issues that Ms. Cooke had mentioned wanting to tell the Chair at another time. She opined that there was a perception that the County had a lot of funding, yet more expenses were occurring than revenue was being generated. She hoped that the Board could develop a clearer understanding of that. She asked Chair Hill to consider having the Treasurer share the Investment Committee's outlook with the Board and the Chief Financial Officer (CFO). She thought that the Board and the CFO should hear about the forecasts. She commended the Treasurer and the Investment Committee for making the decision to utilize a request for proposal (RFP) process, as she had seen the beneficial results of doing so. She hoped Chair Hill would consider her request, as there were certain things she believed everyone needed to be aware of. Chair Hill agreed to that point.

Commissioner Andriola remarked that if someone were to ask several economists about an issue, they would likely provide different responses. She explained that their answers would not be certain, but she opined that there was potential for analysis that would be beneficial in guiding the Board's direction on difficult decisions. She wanted to thank all of the department leadership in advance for investigating opportunities for potential unrealized savings, which she hoped would be substantial. She thanked them for also researching how they could think differently about delivering their essential services, what additional measures staff could take, and methods for sharing changes with the community. She expressed appreciation for Chair Hill having given her the time to speak on the topics she had mentioned. She thanked Ms. Cooke for trying to present fluctuating information. She requested that Ms. Cooke email her presentation to the Board as well as any updated information she had. She referred to Commissioner Garcia's previous comments about the importance of the BCC having as much information as possible. She anticipated future briefings on the matter from ICM Thomas, which she hoped would occur sooner and more often. She opined that those changes would be helpful and requested that they be implemented.

Chair Hill noted that the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) was reviewing the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's (TMFPD) profit and losses every month. She expressed uncertainty about whether that was an appropriate action for the BCC to take and looked to Ms. Cooke and ICM Thomas to discuss those efforts further. She emphasized the need to keep the Board informed, regardless of whether it was a brief presentation, and to ensure that the Commissioners and community understood the matter comprehensively. She opined that there had been many misperceptions circulating in the community about the County's budget, the reasons it was being impacted, and why the organization was not keeping up with its costs. She thought that the City of Reno was doing a great job of articulating the issues with the tax system. She believed that there might be an opportunity for the BCC to convey those matters to the community. She apologized for increasing the amount of work Ms. Cooke would have to do and asked if she could identify how those measures could be implemented into the current meeting schedule.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Cooke for her report. He opined that gathering more information was always beneficial, as it helped the Board determine the necessary actions for the future. He emphasized that information was a critical component of what the Board did. He thought that Ms. Cooke was a very dedicated person. He suspected that she spent most of her time thinking about her work. He stated that her dedication to her role was apparent and thanked her again for her hard work.

## **DONATIONS**

**12:17 p.m.** Commissioner Andriola left the meeting.

**25-0784**      **7A1** Recommendation to accept cash donations totaling \$37,386.86: [\$19,689.86 to Lazy 5 Summer Music Series, general donations for Regional Parks and Open Space, Bowers Mansion, Galena Campfire program, Lazy 5 Park, Iron Ranger Program, Bartley Ranch Regional Park, and Davis Creek Park]; [\$457.00 from the donation drop box at the May Museum]; [\$17,240.00 to the Arboretum for bricks, general maintenance and support] and accept in-kind donations from Timothy Terrell, individual [valued at \$2,999.00] and Creg Garcia, individual [valued at \$800] for Regional Parks and Open Space programs and facilities; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0785**      **7B1** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an estimated market value of [\$14,337]; and (2) accept monetary donations to Washoe County Human Services Agency Child Protective Services Fund to support welfare activities in the amount of [\$18,834.50], from multiple donors as described in this staff report, retroactive for the period of July 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. The item donors are: (1) St. Paul's UMC (backpacks and school supplies), (2) April F. (clothing, suitcase, DVDs), (3) Grace Church (shoes), (4) Assistance League (school supplies), (5) Lori B. (bedding, suitcases), (6) Deanne G. (suitcases), (7) Teriann A. Toy Inc. (toys), (8) Nicholas B. (nursery items), and anonymous donations of a new girls swim suit, large stuffed animals and teen boys clothes. The monetary donors are: (1) Lynette Bonnett Agency (\$1,500), Reno Aces (\$360), A and H Insurance (\$465), Alma Chilson dba Chilson Homes (\$500), Valerie Cooke (\$300), Elevance Health (\$1,500), EMPWR Collective (\$79), NABIP Northern Nevada (\$1,686.50), Lugo Framing (\$1,500), Northern Nevada HOPES (\$1,000), Q&D Construction (\$1,000), SK Baseball LLC dba Reno Aces (\$2,500), Summit Christian Church (\$1,500), Tayona Tate (\$250), Wild Island (\$500), Frame Off Family Car Club (\$600), Constance and Gary Prudden (\$100), various unknown donors (\$1,414) and juror donations (\$2,080). Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0786**      **7B2** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an

estimated market value of [\$600.00] from multiple donors as described in this staff report, and (2) accept monetary donations in the amount of [\$944.55] from Turie Adkisson-Cagulat, to support Cares Campus, Our Place, CrossRoads and other homeless services retroactive for the period of July 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025. The item donors are: Sean J. (clothing and shoes), Anonymous (cups and kitchenware), Salvation Army (kitchen table, kitchen chair, dresser, kitchen starter kit), Katie Grace (boxes of food, hygiene and cleaning supplies), Connecting Consciousness (used clothing, shoes, books), Reno Suites (beds, televisions, sheets and towels), and Reno Suites - Harrah's (televisions, mini refrigerators, mattresses, box springs and other furniture and small appliances). Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0787**

**7B3** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an estimated market value of [\$187.00]; and (2) accept monetary donations in the amount of [\$10,030.40] to the Human Services Agency Senior Services Fund used to support seniors in our community from multiple donors as described in this staff report, retroactive for the period July 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. The item donors are: (1) Susan L. (box fans) and (2) Barbara G. (fans). The monetary donors are: LPL Financial (\$10,000) and two unknown donors (\$30.40). Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.).

Commissioner Garcia recognized the cash and in-kind donations, as well as the monetary donations. She highlighted a monetary donation of \$10,000 received from LPL Financial, and she thanked them for their generous gift.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Andriola absent, it was ordered that Agenda Items 7A1 through 7B3 be accepted and directed.

### **BLOCK VOTE**

**25-0788**

**AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to accept a private grant award of up to \$3,300,401.14 from the Dave and Cheryl Duffield Foundation, on a reimbursement basis, to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office to support the Incline Law Enforcement Team operations beginning July 1, 2026 and continuing annually thereafter, subject to mutual agreement between the parties. Sheriff. (Commission District 1.).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Andriola absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be accepted.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**25-0789**      **AGENDA ITEM 10**      Consideration of the Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt an amendment to the South Valleys Regulatory Zone map to change the zoning on four (4) parcels (APNs: 017-410-60, 050-571-24, 25, & 26) totaling ±80 acres, as follows: (a) ±35.5 acres located at 18090 Marango Rd (APN: 017-410-60) from Low Density Rural (LDR-1 unit per 10 acres) to Medium Density Rural (MDR-1 unit per 5 acres); and (b) ±9.7 acres located over all four (4) parcels (APNs: 017-410-60, 050-571-24, 25, & 26) from General Rural (GR-1 unit per 40 acres) to Open Space (OS). The existing MDR regulatory zoning over ±34.7 acres located on three of the parcels (APNs: 050-571-24, 25, & 26) will remain; and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. The site is located at 18090 Marango Rd and the 3 parcels to the south. The Board of County Commissioners may adopt the proposed amendment, may adopt the proposed amendment with modifications, or may deny the proposed amendment after the public hearing. If the Board denies a proposed amendment, the reason(s) for the denial (i.e., which findings cannot be made) shall either be stated in the motion or discussed on the record by the individual Board members. Community Services. (Commission District 2.).

Chair Hill asked if the Board desired a staff presentation on the agenda item and it was determined that no presentation was needed.

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Chair Hill, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Andriola absent, the adoption was ordered for Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0003 to amend the South Valleys Regulatory Zone map to change the zoning on four (4) parcels (APNs: 017-410-60, 050-571-24, 25, & 26) totaling ±80 acres, as follows: (a) ±35.5 acres located at 18090 Marango Rd (APN: 017-410-60) from Low Density Rural (LDR-1 unit per 10 acres) to Medium Density Rural (MDR-1 unit per 5 acres); and (b) ±9.7 acres located over all four (4) parcels (APNs: 017-410-60, 050-571-24, 25, & 26) from General Rural (GR-1 unit per 40 acres) to Open Space (OS). The existing MDR regulatory zoning over ±34.7 acres located on three of the parcels (APNs: 050-571-24, 25, & 26) will remain; and further authorize the Chair to sign the resolution to that effect. The Board is able to make the following findings for the regulatory zone amendment as required by Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d): Consistency with Master Plan; Compatible Land Uses; Response to Change Conditions, more desirable use; Availability of Facilities; No Adverse

Effects; Desired Pattern of Growth; Effect on a Military Installation When a Military Installation is Required to be Noticed.

**25-0790      AGENDA ITEM 11 Public Comment.**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**25-0791      AGENDA ITEM 12 Announcements/Reports.**

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas clarified that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting in November would be held on November 18, 2025.

\* \* \* \* \*

**12:21 p.m.** There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**ALEXIS HILL, Chair**  
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

---

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

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