

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

January 13, 2026

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair

Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair

Michael Clark, Commissioner

Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner

Clara Andriola, Commissioner

Janis Galassini, County Clerk

Kate Thomas, County Manager

Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney

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

26-0003 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

County Clerk Jan Galassini displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She stated that Chair Hill had challenged Washoe County employees to donate to the Food Bank of Northern Nevada (FBNN). She noted that the Clerk's Office had sponsored the Silver Sleigh Award for more than 20 years. She expressed excitement that in 2025, 15 departments participated and donated \$12,000 to the FBNN, compared to 2024, when eight departments donated \$7,000. Chair Hill attributed that success to Ms. Galassini's leadership. Ms. Galassini acknowledged Board Records and Minutes Deputy Clerk Jessica Melka for her assistance in coordinating the event with various departments and the FBNN. She explained that donations were collected at the FBNN and that winners were determined based on total donations and the number of full-time employees (FTEs) per department. She reported that the Public Guardian's Office, led by a highly competitive leader, won the competition and received the Silver Sleigh Award. She said the award plaque included winners from previous years and that, due to the number of past recipients, an additional plaque had been added. She noted that the Human Services Agency (HSA), with 449 employees, collected the most donations. Chair Hill remarked that the number of donations was outstanding and reflected the extent to which Washoe County employees cared about the community and supported it during difficult times. She thanked Ms. Galassini for her leadership as the Washoe County Clerk.

Tammy Holt-Still, a representative of District 5, said that the Board would vote that day on changes to the Chair and Vice Chair. She indicated that District 5 had not had representation for Chair for more than 12 years and expressed concern that the Board

would again overlook District 5 when selecting a new Chair. She felt that such a decision was disrespectful and believed that excluding representation from District 5 demonstrated a lack of responsiveness and was improper. She indicated that the District 5 Commissioner was the most senior member of the Board, having served the longest, and suggested that the situation reflected ageism. She urged the Board to deliberate carefully, noting that the public was watching.

Terry Brooks shared an original poem about discrimination based on economics and gender.

Heidi Soper, a Sun Valley resident and Chair of the Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board (CAB), spoke on behalf of Sun Valley residents regarding the Master Plan and proposed zoning changes. She shared that Chris Baker of Manhard Consulting presented to the Sun Valley CAB in November to explain the proposed plans for the 18 acres between First and Second Avenue in Sun Valley. She said he noted that no development was currently planned. She shared that he stated the current approval would allow for 48 single-family dwellings, three dwellings per acre, while the proposed amendments would increase density to 10 to 14 dwellings per acre with open space. She expressed concern that the changes would allow for an additional 252 apartments. She said that, in conjunction with the project on Chocolate Drive, north of Second Avenue, which supported 240 additional apartments and created 492 dwellings, approximately 984 additional vehicles would be commuting on First Avenue, Second Avenue, and West Gepford Parkway, excluding the apartments already built on First Avenue. She thought the elementary school would be surrounded by apartment buildings and heavy traffic, which she found unacceptable. She said the area's infrastructure needed to be improved before adding 492 new dwellings. She noted that Sun Valley had one inadequate main boulevard, one fire department, one paramedics team, a single Wells Fargo automated teller machine (ATM), and lacked a grocery store and medical facility for its more than 22,000 residents. She concluded that the area neither needed nor could support an additional 492 dwellings and potentially 1,000 more residents, not including the additions currently being made to Highland Ranch. She said the Planning Commission (PC) approved the request, despite two abstentions. She indicated that someone had incorrectly reported that Sun Valley did not have a traffic problem. She suggested that anyone who doubted the traffic concerns should drive along the road during peak hours when delays were likely. She respectfully asked that the Board consider those issues before approving the requested changes to the Master Plan and zoning.

Nicholas St. Jon provided and read a document regarding his concerns related to the United States (US) Constitution rights, freedom of speech, allowing signage to be shown on camera, and the public addressing contentious issues, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk.

Cliff Nellis provided and read a document regarding his concerns about the unconstitutional use of metal detectors at the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meetings and the denial of adding agenda items, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk.

Jane Swartley thanked the Board for its hard work. She acknowledged that there were times when opinions differed between the Board and the public, but expressed appreciation for all that the Board had done. She reported that the success of the Cold Springs Family Center Outreach Program had increased substantially. She recognized Commissioner Clark for his support of the program and noted that, through his generous donations, seniors received new winter coats from the Katie Grace Foundation. She added that donations were also used to provide Thanksgiving dinners to seniors. She said that for Christmas, family and friends within the community donated presents for the seniors. She said that the organization had taken on the responsibility of distributing the FBNN senior boxes, likely similar to programs in other districts. She mentioned that implementing the program identified individuals in need who lacked transportation or access to telephones. She believed that many individuals needed assistance from the Cold Springs Family Center Outreach Program and the FBNN. She thanked Commissioner Clark and the Board for their support and emphasized the importance of assisting all seniors.

Jill O'Leary provided documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She said she was a 63-year-old Washoe County resident who, in October, appeared before the Board and requested oversight of the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO) policy that allowed a non-statutory legibility notice to be used to record documents as liens. She asserted that Nevada law did not authorize that practice and noted that, despite multiple requests, she had received neither a response nor any indication that the matter was under review. She stated that she formally submitted to the public record her requests made to the District Attorney (DA) for criminal review, along with a companion request to the Attorney General (AG) for review and follow-up action. She noted that the referrals outlined serious concerns, including alleged elder exploitation, fraudulent court filings, altered medical records, misuse of civil processes, and the unlawful release of more than 1,000 pages of her private financial information through an undocketed and legally defective writ of execution. She explained that, based on the same writ, Fidelity restricted withdrawals from her checking account, Individual Retirement Arrangement (IRA), Roth IRA, health savings account (HSA), and other retirement assets that were expressly exempt under Nevada law. She said that she had been denied access to the courts to correct the issue, leaving her exempt retirement assets restricted without legal authority. She believed that the actions implicated Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 200.5092 through 5099, NRS Chapter 205, NRS 21.075 through 090, NRS 31.291, and other statutes governing the proper use of judicial process. She thought that the NRS also demonstrated how the WCRO's acceptance of a non-statutory legibility notice enabled a proposed judgment, rather than a final judgment, to be recorded as a lien, thereby facilitating additional unlawful actions that could affect any resident subject to similar filings. She respectfully requested that the Board acknowledge receipt of her request to the DA for criminal review, as well as the accompanying request to the AG for review and action for the public record, and provide a clear response regarding oversight of the WCRO policies that enabled the events. She suggested that the issues raised were Countywide in nature and that allowing them to go unaddressed undermined public confidence in the integrity of Washoe County's recording systems and the judicial processes that depend on them.

Cynthia Perine, a resident of District 5 and a precinct captain for the Northwest Reno area, urged the Board to consider recognizing District 5 when selecting a new Chair. She felt that District 5 had been overlooked for the past 12 years and argued that the privilege and honor of Chair should be given to a representative from District 5 who had served faithfully and honorably for many years. She believed that opportunity was a matter of good practice, probity, proper management, and common sense. She mentioned that she was a tax-paying citizen who indirectly paid the Commissioners' salaries. She thanked the Board for its consideration of her request.

Janet Butcher read from a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She said she assumed additional individuals would have been bused in to speak about recent events. She noted that she loved her family, friends, and neighbors and wanted them to be safe, but felt that some on the dais may not share that concern. She stated that she supported the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and other law enforcement agencies. She stated that ICE had provided a list of what she described as the most egregious criminal aliens arrested during a recent enforcement surge in the sanctuary state of Minnesota. She characterized the list as deeply disturbing and said it included individuals convicted of serious crimes, including child rapists, sodomizers, and convicted killers, many of whom had longstanding deportation orders, with several from Laos, Somalia, and Sudan. She expressed gratitude to Governor Joe Lombardo, stating that, in her view, he had implemented the correct policies, unlike Democratic governors. She asserted that ICE did not bring chaos to the area, but that the Democratic open border policy had. She read a statement from ICE Director Todd Lyons, in which he stated that, regardless of what he described as staged political theatrics, ICE would continue arresting individuals identified as the most dangerous criminal illegal aliens in Minnesota and elsewhere. She explained that she did not understand why anyone would want to associate with the individuals referenced and added that they were not her neighbors. She said that, according to Mr. Lyons' statement, some of the criminal aliens arrested had final orders of removal dating back as much as 30 years, but had remained free to commit crimes. She explained that Mr. Lyons' statement declared that ICE arrests prevented recidivism and made communities safer. She questioned why the public would oppose such actions, suggesting that opposition stemmed from resistance to anything associated with President Donald Trump. She said that, in her view, there was a simple way to avoid chaos or confrontation with law enforcement, which was to comply with the law. She indicated that demonstrations should consist of standing on a sidewalk with signs and should not involve throwing objects, blocking officers, damaging vehicles, charging law enforcement, or entering their personal space. She thought that avoiding such actions would promote safety and allow law enforcement to perform their duties without interference. She opined that law enforcement would not object to demonstrations conducted in a lawful and responsible manner.

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

Elizabeth Gambrel shared comments regarding Items 13 and 14, which addressed hazardous material on a Gerlach property. She explained that numerous public

meetings had been held as part of the process to advance the project through the PC. She said that staff and others followed all applicable rules, regulations, and laws, and held open discussions with the Gerlach community about the proposals, project handling, and measures to ensure safety, wildlife protection, and fire hazard mitigation. She indicated that some individuals who were not year-round residents of Gerlach, particularly those involved with Burning Man, were upset with the proposal. She shared her confusion, noting that she believed most of those individuals' concerns had occurred during the Burning Man event. She expressed her support for approving Items 13 and 14 as written. She commended staff for the excellent work, highlighting the attention to detail, precision, and thoroughness. She suggested that the company initiating the project would bring well-paying jobs to local Gerlach residents, which included a retirement plan and medical benefits, which was a rarity in the area. She thought the Board might recall that Ormat planned a large project in Gerlach but ultimately did not hire anyone locally. She commented on Agenda Item 16 and noted that, due to the housing shortage in Gerlach, firefighters and school staff were living in hotel rooms. She emphasized that the lack of housing had been an ongoing concern and thanked the County for its continued support in addressing the issue. She mentioned that adequate housing would need to be available for the individuals employed by the project.

26-0004 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas indicated that Item 8E4 was pulled from the Consent Agenda due to an incorrect attachment that did not include substantive changes from the previous iteration. She apologized for pulling the item; however, she noted that the item would be heard on January 20, 2026. She reported that July 4, 2026, marked the Nation's semi-quincentennial anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. She said that there would be an event held in celebration of the semi-quincentennial at the courthouse on January 14, 2026, organized by the Historic Reno Preservation Society. She announced that an event would be held monthly in honor of the semi-quincentennial and explained that the first event, on January 14, 2026, would take place at the Virginia Street entrance to the courthouse, which she said was normally closed to the public. She expressed excitement toward the Commissioners leading the first celebration. She urged those interested to attend and mentioned there would also be traditional patriotic music performed by a renowned violinist from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). She noted that a brief history of the Bowers Mansion would take place and that each month a different organization or dignitary would lead the celebration, with the upcoming hosts being Alternate Public Defender (APD) Kate Hickman, Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Sheriff Darin Balaam, District Attorney (DA) Christopher Hicks, and Public Defender (PD) Evelyn Grosenick.

Vice Chair Herman explained that she had discussed the upcoming election and efficiency with some individuals and relayed that some people had recommended hand-voting by precinct. She believed that hand-counting votes and paper ballots made people feel a part of the election. She suggested that the County create different precinct sections in the new Registrar of Voters (ROV) building for individuals to hand-count votes in smaller groups.

Commissioner Garcia reported that a Nationwide, nonpartisan campaign called America the Entrepreneurial was created to celebrate the Nation's 250th anniversary. She indicated that the campaign was to support America's entrepreneurial spirit. She explained that the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) had made efforts to connect with the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) for the campaign. She recalled that Nevada was the first state in the Nation to enact the Right to Start Act, Assembly Bill (AB) 77, to support entrepreneurship in the State. She noted that the Office of Entrepreneurship within the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) was created, consisting of a few staff members with a budget written at the State level. She urged the Board to participate in the campaign and said that she would provide CM Thomas with further information. She believed that the campaign would not be laborious in terms of communication and effort. She felt that it would be beneficial if the County and the Cities of Reno and Sparks collaborated to support entrepreneurs in the State. Chair Hill asserted that small businesses were the County's biggest employers and that it was essential to help them.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Commissioner Garcia for the information and believed that NACO would mention the campaign at its next meeting. She expressed appreciation toward the staff for hosting the first of three public meetings regarding the Washoe County Equine Code update. She recalled that an update was held the previous night in the South Valleys and that several individuals commented on the meeting's format and presentation. She hoped that everyone interested would participate and reported that the next meeting would be on January 22, 2026, via Zoom, and on January 27, 2026, in person at the Spanish Springs Library. She pointed out that additional equine information was available on the Washoe County website, under the Planning Department's page. She said the County was limited in its capacity for change; however, she was committed to contacting other agencies regarding equine business regulations.

Commissioner Andriola asked CM Thomas to conduct a health check of the County's defenses against cybercrime, as many agencies had experienced ransomware, cyber fraud, and stalking. She noted that the County and taxpayers relied on digital systems and wanted to ensure the County protected them through sound data governance. She reported that the obligation to protect the community was codified in State law by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 603A.210, which mandated specific operational standards for public bodies throughout the State. She requested that CM Thomas oversee the County departments in a review process to ensure compliance, strengthen digital systems, and restore application data governance policies for review and consideration by the Board. Chair Hill felt Commissioner Andriola's request was a good idea and essential in keeping digital systems safe.

Commissioner Clark thanked the Health Department staff, CM Thomas, City of Reno Manager Jackie Bryant, and the City of Reno staff for assisting the owners of Marcolino's Italia Restaurant in obtaining their business license, plumbing, electrical, and health department-related items while avoiding issues and concerns the former Rapsallion owners endured. He believed that small businesses were America's backbone and that the County should help individuals navigate their business concerns. He speculated that most

small businesses wished to specialize in their craft and were not interested in understanding the workings of County requirements. He felt that performing a process once or twice in one's life did not make someone an expert, and he believed it was incumbent upon County staff to act as interpreters for individuals without providing legal advice. He recalled asking CM Thomas whether the County could start filming individuals who succeeded through the business license process so others could better understand what they had to go through. He believed that the County should have a resource library that explained the complex business licensing system; otherwise, it could be confusing for people to navigate. He stated that Reno Mayor Hillary Schieve also thought it would be a good idea to have a regional overview of the process from all agencies involved.

Commissioner Clark reported that he participated in a ride-along with the WCSO's Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team and stated that he could not be more impressed with the team's good work. He noted that many times, Commissioners focused on their own districts. He said he had a discussion with Sheriff Balaam and CM Thomas regarding approximately 37 parcels of land that were deeded to the County in the 1970s and then deeded back to the original landowner in the 1990s. He believed that many of the owners had passed away and that the property was deeded to their heirs, but some heirs may not have accepted the parcels. He requested a report on those parcels and an accurate history, as he felt the County should have institutional knowledge of them. He said the County should have recorded deeds and asked for the number of parcels involved and mentioned there might be more or fewer than 37.

Commissioner Clark indicated that he had been an advocate for the Washoe County Pilot Safe Parking Program and asked who was sleeping in the cars and who their guests were. He believed that if the County were to provide a safe place for individuals to sleep in their cars, the County should regulate the program by identifying who was in each vehicle, how many guests each car had, and they should manage a guest count per vehicle. He wished to know why a parcel that contained women and children was also allowing strangers to sleep in their cars in the parking lot. He noted that the County owned the WCSO and that there was ample overnight parking with ample security. He reported that the Director of Human Services, Ryan Gustafson, was in attendance and speculated that he could address the concerns later. He asserted that he wanted to know the reason behind choosing that parking lot for overnight camping in vehicles, given that vulnerable individuals were in the building.

Commissioner Clark noted that Jane Swartley provided a report regarding the Cold Springs area. He indicated that he was working with seniors throughout the County regardless of their district. He reported that he was not helping individuals in an attempt to buy votes and said he believed Jane Swartley had done an excellent job organizing operations for those in need of food. He speculated that many seniors faced food insecurity but lacked transportation to attend Food Bank events. He thought the County should emulate Jane Swartley's model because he felt her organized food distribution system was fantastic.

Commissioner Clark recalled that Jill O’Leary had repeatedly attended Board of County Commissioners’ (BCC) meetings and asked for an update on her concerns. Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large indicated that Jill O’Leary’s concerns were not agendized; however, he noted that in December, she had submitted a letter that was forwarded to Washoe 311. He said that the District Attorney’s (DAs) Office responded to her public records request (PRR) that sought documentation from the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) regarding several cases that she was involved in. He reported that the SJDC issued an order finding Jill O’Leary to be a vexatious litigant in one probate case. He explained that the Board did not have oversight of the SJDC and that any issues she had regarding ongoing litigation needed to be referred to the court. Commissioner Clark thanked CDDA Large for the update and hoped that Jill O’Leary heard and understood what she needed to do and that the Commissioners could not intercede on her behalf.

Commissioner Clark asserted that he was in support of Vice Chair Herman becoming the Chair. He explained that Vice Chair Herman had been on the Board longer than any other elected County official and was in office potentially longer than Reno City Mayor Hillary Schieve or City of Sparks Councilmember Charlene Bybee. He believed that Vice Chair Herman had seniority and institutional knowledge of the BCC. He noted that it was not only about Vice Chair Herman but about the district of roughly 100,000 residents that she represented, which had not had its Commissioner as Chair. He opined that not having Vice Chair Herman elected as Chair during her term was a failure to her district. He said that the Chair had personal knowledge and wished for certain things within their district, such as Chair Hill and her work with Incline Village. He felt that Chair Hill should focus on Incline Village, as it was her district and within her right as Chair; however, Vice Chair Herman also had concerns in her district that needed attention. He reported that Vice Chair Herman had one year left in her term as Commissioner, and he believed it was essential to end her term as Commissioner as the Chair. He recalled that his fellow Commissioners had stated that Vice Chair Herman lacked sufficient experience, but he pointed out that she had been elected longer than any other elected official in the County. He announced his support for Vice Chair Herman's election as Chair for the following year. He believed there were specific topics she had tried to get on the agenda for years that were continually denied by others. He thought that electing Vice Chair Herman as Chair was an opportunity to honor her and allow her to serve as Chair for her final year as Commissioner.

PRESENTATIONS

- 26-0005** **AGENDA ITEM 5.A.1** Update by Leslie Mix and students to discuss the life changing impact of Job Corps programs for students and the Washoe County community and why it is important to Nevada. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas thanked Vice Chair Herman for recommending Sierra Nevada Job Corps (SNJC) Business Relations Specialist Leslie Mix to come before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). CM Thomas explained that Ms. Mix was in attendance at the meeting with her students to discuss the impact and

importance of the Job Corps program for students, the Washoe County community, and to Nevada. She noted that the Commissioners were hoping to take a quick photograph with Ms. Mix and her students following the presentation.

Ms. Mix greeted the Board and stated that she was delighted to be presenting before the BCC again and to have the Board's support. She emphasized that it had been very important for her program to have had the support and understanding of elected officials across the State regarding the Job Corps program over the previous six months. She explained that during standard operations, SNJC could process 750 new workers who were certified and trained for Nevada's workforce in the trades and other career programs offered on the program's campus. She noted that she had brought two SNJC students to the BCC meeting to tell their personal stories: Mr. Samuel Taylor and Mr. Nicholas Duncan.

Ms. Mix described her intent to provide a brief update regarding the status of the Job Corps program in relation to the federal budget. She explained that the program had been ordered to close within a week, leaving many students without a place they could relocate to within that time frame or throughout the anticipated extended closure term. She described the loss of hope and opportunity those changes caused for the students. She elaborated that the State of Nevada had intervened and objected to the closure by initiating legal proceedings that indicated that the Job Corps program was being illegally paused. She noted that those proceedings were eventually resolved in court, and that the program had since been included in the federal budget again, despite initially receiving nothing. She stated that the Job Corps program had received nonpartisan support for the previous 61 years, which she believed was still true based on the most recent information she had heard. She reported that Congress had returned approximately 50 percent of the program's allocated budget to Job Corps. She acknowledged that changes and efficiencies could be implemented to improve the program. She described having four years of experience working for SNJC and opined that the Job Corps program should operate across the Country, as its productivity was proven by its typical certification and graduation rates of 82 to 93 percent for participants, which she stated far exceeded those of most government programs. She stated that the United States (US) Senate had reportedly proposed reallocating almost 100 percent of the Job Corps budget back to the program, though the final status of that action and the program's budget allocations were uncertain at that time.

Ms. Mix explained that approximately 20 students were enrolled in the program each week, with the majority coming from both rural counties and Clark County. She noted that Job Corps was the only residential program in the Country, which she opined was a primary reason for the program's success. She speculated that many people would know that the Job Corps dormitories were located in older facilities whose construction predated World War II, though she noted that participants and staff managed within those conditions due to the program's importance. She reported that SNJC employed many staff members who had been with the program for over 30 years, which she did not attribute to the high pay rate but rather to the fact that they saw the impacts their work made for students like Mr. Taylor and Mr. Duncan, and what they were able to achieve in the future with the time staff dedicated.

Mr. Taylor introduced himself as a 19-year-old student of SNJC, noting that he had recently completed his office administration training. He noted that he had been a participant in the program since October of the previous year and had begun with zero academic credits following his high school graduation. He recalled having engaged in leadership classes and joining the Student Government Association and was elected president of the program's campus since enrolling. He stated that he had participated in many engagements that would help the campus thrive and contribute to the community, as he was very thankful for what the program had done for him. He described having done everything he could to help save the Job Corps program over the previous six to eight months after hearing that it could be shut down. He reported having participated in interviews for news networks, sent e-mail correspondence and letters, and made telephone calls to various political leaders, including Nevada Senator Jacky Rosen. He said he wanted the Job Corps program to remain operational after his graduation, as he thought it was very beneficial and taught many children about responsibility, leadership, and connecting with others their age. Chair Hill congratulated Mr. Taylor and described his comments as beautiful.

Ms. Mix emphasized that Mr. Taylor had been an extraordinary student and reiterated that he had begun the program with no educational credits due to a somewhat complicated personal background. She explained that Mr. Taylor had completed his high school education, finished the training for his trade, and had begun working toward another trade within one year of his enrollment. She described Mr. Taylor's leadership efforts and reported that he was elected president of their Student Government Association, which represented students on his campus. She described her pride in Mr. Taylor and the progress he had made. She expressed certainty that Mr. Taylor would become an independent, high-performing, taxpaying citizen at some point. She emphasized how much Mr. Taylor had achieved.

Mr. Duncan introduced himself as a 25-year-old SNJC student who had participated in the program since May 2025. He stated that he had made substantial progress towards his education and career in the electrical trades. He explained that he was the first of his mother's children to graduate from high school, which was a major achievement for him. He noted that the electrical program had given him many opportunities he thought he might never have had, especially since he had not been able to graduate from high school previously. He stated that the Job Corps program offered him the chance to receive advanced electrical lineman training in New York after completing the program, which he had always dreamed of doing. He explained that students like Mr. Taylor had fostered a strong sense of community at SNJC, where participants encouraged one another's growth and accomplished a lot. He reiterated that Job Corps had given him many opportunities he thought he might never receive and emphasized the importance of the program remaining open so that future participants could experience the same. He thanked the Board for its support.

Ms. Mix explained that the Job Corps programs offered advanced training, which Mr. Duncan had been admitted into, enabling him to accelerate through his electrical trade training. She noted that Mr. Duncan and his family were not required to make any

payments or incur any debt for his participation in any SNJC program, as was the case for all students. She opined that such a factor was a reason the program was successful, as students were able to begin their careers without that burden. She suspected that Mr. Duncan would make substantial money in his career.

Chair Hill asked whether Mr. Duncan would consider working for NVEnergy in the future and asked what his dream was. Mr. Duncan responded that he would be interested in doing so if he could. Chair Hill stated that she could see Mr. Taylor serving as a County Commissioner in the future, given his leadership skills. She thanked Ms. Mix for persevering through the program's stressful changes. She noted that Ms. Mix's passion, leadership, and resilience were very inspirational to the Board. She thanked Ms. Mix for her dedication to the SNJC students and emphasized that the BCC would support her in whatever way it could, as the Commissioners appreciated her efforts to change people's lives.

11:02 a.m. **The Board recessed for a photo.**

11:04 a.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

26-0006 **AGENDA ITEM 5.A.2** Update by Kara Steeland with Truckee Meadows Water Authority on TMWA's 2025 - 2045 Water Resource Plan for the Truckee Meadows. (All Commission Districts.)

Danny Rotter, Assistant General Manager of the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) and Director of Systems Planning and Engineering, and Kara Steeland, TMWA's Senior Hydrologist and Watershed Coordinator, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: 2025-2045 Water Resource Plan; Overview; Comprehensive Planning; Plan Goals And Objectives; Customer Survey; Washoe County Population & TMWA Water Production; 20-Year Water Demand Projection; Sources of Supply; TMWA Water Rights; Truckee River Water Rights; Water Conservation; Residential Per Capita Water Demand; Future Conditions (2 slides); Future Water Resources; Protecting The Watershed And Environment; Key Takeaways; Questions.

Mr. Rotter introduced himself and explained that he would speak briefly before allowing Ms. Steeland to provide the remainder of the presentation, as she was an expert on the topic. He described his intent to discuss each of TMWA's jurisdictions, summarize the organization's Water Resource Plan (WRP), and examine its impact on the community and the Truckee Meadows region.

Mr. Rotter displayed the slide titled *Overview* and explained that the 2025 to 2045 WRP was the fifth version of the plan since TMWA's inception, with a new version created every five years. He noted that the current WRP was unique from those developed in previous years, as a summarized *Water Resource Plan: At a Glance* report of the plan was available via a quick response (QR) code and a website link he had included in the presentation. He opined that the summarized report was likely the best place to start finding

answers to any questions elected officials or members of the public might have about the WRP. He noted that those interested could then investigate further using the full report, including 100-page documents on climate change and river forecasting.

Mr. Rotter showed the *Comprehensive Planning* slide. He stated that the slide depicted an aspect of TMWA's daily operations and its continuous planning efforts. He explained that the image on the slide showed a comprehensive planning circle. He explained that part of the planning process included the WRP, which provided projections for the organization over the next 20 or more years. He reported that the WRP was updated every five years, which had just been completed, and that it would be discussed in further detail later in his presentation. He described the next step in TMWA's planning process as the Facility Plan, which addressed concerns about where the water needed to go and how it would be transported to areas such as the North Valleys, North Spanish Springs, and South Truckee Meadows. He noted that the Facility Plan was another 20-year projection that was updated by TMWA every 5 years. He stated that the final step of the planning process involved TMWA's Funding Plan, which was updated annually and included the guidance from a yearly strategic workshop conducted by TMWA's leadership to create a five-year projection. He noted that the Funding Plan's projections were associated with matters such as customer rates, facilities charges, and development efforts. He explained that Ms. Steeland would discuss the WRP in further detail.

Ms. Steeland greeted the Board and displayed the slide titled *Plan Goals And Objectives*. She explained that the slide provided a broad overview of TMWA's WRP and its goals and objectives. She stated that the primary goal of the WRP was to ensure that TMWA had adequate water resources to meet the community's needs throughout the next 20 or more years. She explained that TMWA staff evaluated and implemented innovative solutions to best manage water resources, with a key part of that process being maintaining community confidence in TMWA's planning procedures. She noted that those efforts were intended to ensure the public was aware of how TMWA would meet the community's needs over the following 20 years.

Ms. Steeland introduced the *Customer Survey* slide. She recalled that, beginning with the previous WRP created in 2020, TMWA had started to incorporate more customer feedback and concerns into the plan to ensure it addressed those matters. She explained that customer survey feedback was collected semiannually. She stated that some of the concerns voiced by TMWA's customers included maintaining the high quality of drinking water, keeping water affordable, having a sufficient water supply during droughts, and meeting the needs of a growing population. She noted that the WRP addressed most of the issues she had listed. She explained that the concern about keeping water costs affordable was addressed later in the planning process, when rates were determined.

Ms. Steeland showed the slide titled *Washoe County Population & TMWA Water Production*. She explained that the slide's bar chart depicted several key figures commonly considered when discussing water, including Washoe County's population and TMWA's water production. She noted that the blue line on the chart represented TMWA's water production, while the green line demonstrated the County's population. She

acknowledged that the Board would be aware that the local population had been steadily increasing, but she remarked that TMWA observed a somewhat drastic decrease in water use, similar to rates seen during the mid-2000s, which she attributed to water conservation programs and the integration of efficiency measures she would discuss later.

Ms. Steeland referred to the slide titled *20-Year Water Demand Projection*. She explained that the 20-year water demand projections were a critical part of the WRP. She described the process of creating future projections based on historical growth patterns and what TMWA expected the service area's needs to be over the next 20 years. She stated that TMWA's goal was to ensure sufficient resources to meet the area's needs. She noted that the current water use for the entire service territory was approximately 90,000 acre-feet, with expected growth to approximately 107,000 acre-feet in 20 years. She described that estimate as a conservative projection, noting that the actual total had often been significantly lower than the projections in the four previous WRPs. She noted that the slide's graph showed an annual growth rate in water use of approximately 1.8 percent.

Ms. Steeland displayed the *Sources of Supply* slide and noted that the chart showed the sources TMWA had historically used to meet demand, as well as how the organization would continue to do so in the future. She noted that TMWA's supply was primarily sourced from surface water, with approximately 80 to 85 percent of the water coming from the Truckee River and its tributaries. She explained that the remaining supply was comprised of groundwater, with TMWA operating about 90 production wells throughout the service area. She explained that the purple color on the chart appeared only in six of the years included, which coincided with years when the region experienced droughts. She noted that during those years, TMWA had utilized privately owned water supplies and credited water under the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA), which the organization stored in its headwaters and released during periods of low river flow. She noted that TMWA had been fortunate not to need to use that backup water supply for many years, but it was kept in place for drought conditions.

Ms. Steeland introduced the *TMWA Water Rights* slide, explaining that TMWA held a mix of surface water and groundwater rights across nine hydrographic basins and anticipated having sufficient water rights in the future as well. She displayed the slide titled *Truckee River Water Rights* and explained that, under the Orr Ditch Decree, no new water rights to the Truckee River could be created, so the total was fixed at 226,000 acre-feet of water rights associated with the river. She referred to the chart on the slide and explained that the presence of light blue and dark green indicated that TMWA had historically relied on agricultural water rights dedicated to the organization by developers, which were later converted to municipal and industrial water rights. She reported that there were approximately 40,000 acre-feet of remaining Truckee River water rights, so TMWA was relying on that remaining water being converted to municipal and industrial use as the region continued to develop.

Ms. Steeland displayed the *Water Conservation* slide. She referred to the graph on the slide titled *Washoe County Population & TMWA Water Production* and to her earlier mention that water use had not been increasing drastically. She attributed the

consistency of those statistics to TMWA's existing planning and water conservation efforts. She described TMWA's water-efficiency codes, which included assigned days for watering, as well as seasonal water-conservation consultants who patrolled the area to ensure people were following those rules. She noted that TMWA operated a tiered rate billing structure to incentivize lower water use. She stated that one of the primary reasons for the lack of an increase in water usage was that TMWA had metered all customers during the mid-2000s and had recently switched them to a more advanced meter infrastructure that allowed customers to access real-time water use data to identify leaks or other potential efficiencies. She noted that TMWA had a robust education and outreach program, as well as a water usage review program, which helped customers identify ways to be more efficient with their water use or to fix leaks.

Ms. Steeland showed the slide titled *Residential Per Capita Water Demand*. She noted that the lines on the chart showed total water use and consumptive water use, which accounted for the water returned to the river after passing through the water reclamation facilities. She explained that the water demand had decreased over time and eventually stabilized due to TMWA's conservation programs.

Ms. Steeland displayed the first *Future Conditions* slide and reported that TMWA conducted fairly robust climate modeling in the WRP to estimate potential future conditions using a range of scenarios. She noted that the slide's graph illustrated one such scenario, extending from the present to 2098. She reiterated that the WRP prioritized estimates for the next 20 years, though she emphasized that TMWA also wanted to ensure planning was conducted for future resources that would require decades of forethought. She stated that the graph indicated that TMWA would be able to meet the needs caused by the expected increase in demand through the end of the century. She acknowledged that there were a few anticipated shortages during more extreme scenarios in the later years of the projection, which is why she thought it was important for TMWA to consider what they could do to alleviate those issues if they were to occur in the future. She showed the second slide titled *Future Conditions* and explained that the graph depicted how TMWA might alleviate future shortages if the aquifer storage and recovery program were extended, which she described as the process of injecting treated surface water into groundwater aquifers. She reiterated that such action represented only one of TMWA's many future resource options, which the organization would consider taking to ensure that future generations had access to sufficient supplies.

Ms. Steeland introduced the *Future Water Resources* slide by discussing Chapter 5 of the WRP, which described TMWA's future resource projects and included tables comparing each project's potential benefits and challenges. She emphasized that while the WRP was not TMWA's infrastructure plan, it included theoretical, broad project ideas that would be implemented over time. She explained that some projects were more conceptual than others, while others were already underway, such as the Advanced Purified Water project at American Flat.

Ms. Steeland showed the slide titled *Protecting the Watershed and Environment*. She reported that TMWA had a robust program intended to protect the

watershed and environment, which included various partnerships listed on the slide. She described the goal of that program as ensuring that TMWA's water sources maintained the same high water quality they had always had. She noted that TMWA operated hydroelectric plants, providing the organization with a renewable energy source.

Ms. Steeland displayed the *Key Takeaways* slide and explained that it summarized the essential ideas from the WRP she had discussed during her presentation. She reiterated that TMWA had sufficient water rights to meet the region's growing water demand over the next 20 years, which she emphasized was the concern the WRP had been created to address and the plan's primary goal. She explained that such a goal was achieved through modeling, noting that TMWA had an extremely resilient and reliable water supply due to decades of prior planning, as demonstrated by the TROA. She reported that the WRP also included recommended strategies and actions to guide TMWA throughout the next five years. She reiterated that TMWA was consistently analyzing future options, as the WRP was a document that was always evolving and was updated by the organization every five years. She explained that TMWA regularly assessed how it could better meet the region's needs and identify any necessary changes. She showed the slide titled *Questions* and noted that she and Mr. Rotter would be glad to answer any questions from the Board. She stated that the full WRP and the *Water Resource Plan: At a Glance* report were available to read at tmwa.com/wrp2025.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Steeland and stated that it was always a pleasure to see her in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex. She acknowledged that Ms. Steeland had worked on the WRP for a long time, and Chair Hill expressed her desire to ensure the community understood the plan's details. She noted that Commissioner Andriola served as the chair of TMWA's Board of Directors and invited her to discuss the presentation first.

Commissioner Andriola stated that, as the chair of TMWA's Board of Directors, she had the pleasure of working with TMWA's staff and remarked on the quality of the development of TMWA since its inception 20 years prior. She stated that the benefits of the organization's regional approach were apparent. She recalled having shared at previous meetings, as concerns about a lack of water locally were frequently raised, that there was a balance between utilizing a conservative approach and maintaining very thorough planning. She noted that Ms. Steeland had done a good job of reassuring people that water was available in the region, and she stated that the continued good work on that effort needed to be acknowledged. She referenced the first *Future Conditions* slide, noting that it showed there would be available water in 2098, but she emphasized the importance of carefully choosing an approach in the future while remaining diligent. She explained that TMWA's internal operations reflected the external water issues that were being observed. She emphasized that TMWA aimed to be the best in all respects, whether that meant financial planning and being very mindful of the responsible use of taxpayer dollars, or other operational aspects internally. She stated that continuous process improvement in every area truly stood out in TMWA. She thanked Ms. Steeland for sharing information from her presentation and encouraged everyone to read the WRP, use the QR code in the presentation, and participate in TMWA's community outreach events. She stated that the

educational components of those actions were very helpful in understanding the facts, which she noted as important. She asked whether there was anything Washoe County, as a jurisdiction, could do to support TMWA's continued efforts to provide the best possible service to the community.

Mr. Rotter agreed that knowing the facts of a matter was important, which was why TMWA had created the *Water Resource Plan: At a Glance* report. He noted that the report was prepared so that solutions could be discussed based on TMWA's observations and projections when concerns or questions were raised. He stated that providing clarity about TMWA's projections, how the organization would meet them, and the actions being taken were among the most important goals.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Rotter and encouraged everyone to investigate the *Water Resource Plan: At a Glance* report. She noted that members of TMWA's Board of Directors had already seen the WRP, which she opined was very well put together. She acknowledged that Chair Hill and Commissioner Garcia served on the Western Regional Water Commission's (WRWC's) board.

Vice Chair Herman recalled that she had formerly served on TMWA's Board of Directors. She noted that many actions had been taken during her time on that board. She described having attended a Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) meeting where discussions about artificial intelligence (AI) had scared her. She asked what the outcome of those conversations was and how they were related to the water supply.

Mr. Rotter suspected that Vice Chair Herman had referred to the large water use associated with data centers and how regional planning agencies govern those matters. He noted that he had not seen the entire meeting Vice Chair Herman had described, but he reported having met with the TMRPA following its meeting on that topic. He explained that shortly after that meeting, TMWA continued to speak with the TMRPA's Director of Regional Planning, Jeremy Smith, regarding methods to address that concern regionally. He noted that the issue was addressed in the WRP as one of TMWA's strategies for the near future, which included collaborative efforts between the organization and the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), the Nevada Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED), the TMRPA, and all regional jurisdictions. He explained that those efforts were still ongoing. He suspected some of the initial questions on the matter were addressed in the WRP, particularly those regarding the regulations and governance. He opined that Mr. Smith had done a great job of addressing those questions through community conversations. He hoped his response had answered Vice Chair Herman's question. Vice Chair Herman thanked him and noted that it had helped.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Rotter and Ms. Steeland for attending the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting, and she noted that she had no questions. She expressed intent to add that the region had amazing drinking water. She stated that she could tell the difference in water quality when she traveled to different parts of the world or throughout the United States (US). She referred to the *Key Takeaways* slide

and remarked that she had liked that substantial work had been done 20 years prior to improve planning through initiatives like the TROA, which she disclosed she had not known about prior to serving on the WRWC's governing board. She remarked that the integration of the TROA was one of many key moments in the region's history that involved TMWA and individuals at the federal, State, and local levels. She thanked Mr. Rotter, Ms. Steeland, and TMWA for maintaining a perspective that considered the distant future, as it was ingrained in those who were born and raised in Nevada to conserve and care for water as a precious natural resource. She opined that the region was in a good position, and she thanked Mr. Rotter and Ms. Steeland for TMWA's education and outreach efforts. She recognized TMWA's long-term strategic planning and congratulated them.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. Rotter and Ms. Steeland for their informative report.

Chair Hill noted that Washoe County was partnered with many organizations, and she noted that Krishna Pagilla, Director of the Nevada Water Innovation Institute, was present at the BCC meeting for Agenda Item 10. She stated that she wanted to recognize his presence, as the County worked closely with him and TMWA. She thanked Mr. Rotter and Ms. Steeland for their leadership. She believed that the Board would continue to work regionally on all of the challenges they had identified. She noted that many issues would be addressed as the community continued to grow, such as data centers, modernizing the water system, and potentially integrating the region's water reclamation systems into a single comprehensive system. She opined that it was an exciting time to be involved in water-related matters. She thanked Mr. Rotter and Ms. Steeland and asked if there was anything else they had hoped to discuss with the Board.

Mr. Rotter thanked the Board. He acknowledged Ms. Steeland's hard work on the presentation, attributing the precise explanation of the information in the WRP to her efforts. Chair Hill thanked Mr. Rotter and noted that the Board would be in contact with him again.

PROCLAMATION

26-0007 **6.A.1** Proclamation for the month of January as National Radon Action Month in Nevada. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Andriola and Washoe County Extension Educator at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) Extension, Abbey Pike, read the proclamation.

Ms. Pike thanked the Commissioners for their support and efforts.

Chair Hill expressed her appreciation for Ms. Pike's efforts to educate the public about the issue.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6A1 be adopted.

DONATIONS

26-0008 **7.A.1** Recommendation to accept the donation of three (3) ModPod units totaling an estimated market value of [\$58,425] from LIT Workshop. These units will be installed at Safe Camp for use by program participants. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill stated that, according to County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas, the manufacturer made the donation because Washoe County had been a great partner. She mentioned that LIT Workshop was impressed with the Safe Camp and chose to offer support by providing additional resources. She felt the donation reflected the hard work of the Washoe County team and the success of the Safe Camp. She commended both the Washoe County team and the Karma Box team.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7A1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8K1, EXCLUDING PULLED AGENDA ITEM 8E4 AND AGENDA ITEM 8I1, WHICH WAS HEARD SEPARATELY

26-0009 **8.A.1** Recommendation to approve an Easement Deed between Washoe County (grantor) and Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) (grantee), to support the installation of a 10-inch water main to eliminate the existing dead-end distribution system and create a looped system per NAC 445A.6712 via a permanent Water Facilities Easement totaling ± 1,933 square feet on Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 083-024-06, part of Lazy 5 Regional Park; for no charge pursuant to NRS 277.053. The project will benefit Lazy 5 Regional Park by creating a looped water system for redundancy during maintenance or emergency work. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)

26-0010 **8.A.2** Recommendation to approve and accept a Grant of Trail Easement from Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), a Joint Powers Entity, to Washoe County for non-motorized public use, limited maintenance, and installation of signage on the existing access road located on approximately 11,994 square feet of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 038-182-09 at a cost of \$0.00; and approve a Consent to Use agreement between Sierra Pacific Power Company, d/b/a NV Energy, TMWA, a Joint Powers Entity, and Washoe County to allow TMWA to grant the trail easement on APN 038-182-09 to Washoe County for public use [Three signs will be installed in

the easement area as part of the Canepa Ranch Trailhead construction project for an estimated cost of \$1,500.00]. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

- 26-0011** **8.A.3** Recommendation to approve a Lease Agreement between the Gerlach General Improvement District (Lessor) and Washoe County (Lessee), pursuant to Nevada Revised statutes 277.050, for the continued occupancy of 420 Cottonwood Street, Gerlach, NV, consisting of approximately 6,000 square feet of warehouse space, less 299 square feet that creates a back office space used by Gerlach Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. under a separate lease, for a term commencing retroactive to July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2035, in support of fire and EMS services to Gerlach, NV, [at a cost of \$10.00 annually to Washoe County]. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)
- 26-0012** **8.A.4** Recommendation to: 1) accept the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada Truckee River Fund Grant #316 - Mayberry Park Watershed Protection and Public Restroom Project grant [in the amount of \$250,000.00 with a Washoe County cash/in-kind match in the amount of \$62,500.00]; and 2) approve a new capital project and Project Agreement with a grant period from January 1, 2026 through January 31, 2027; and 3) authorize the Assistant County Manager [Dave Solaro] to sign the Project Agreement and any subsequent documents related to the grant on behalf of the County; and 4) direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)
- 26-0013** **8.B.1** Washoe County Law Library Annual Report for fiscal year 2025, including the following elements of Law Library operations: funding, collection, and personnel. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0014** **8.B.2** Recommendation to appoint one attorney member and one non-attorney member to the Law Library Board of Trustees. It is recommended that Patricia Halstead serve as an attorney member and be reappointed for a two-year term expiring on January 31, 2028, and Cortney Young serve as a non-attorney member, reappointed for a two-year term expiring January 31, 2028. Candidates will satisfy the attorney position and non-attorney position required for the Law Library Board of Trustees. Patricia Halstead (incumbent) was the only applicant for the attorney position. Applicants for the non-attorney position include Jodi Michelle Bennett, Brian Erbis, Jennifer Salisbury, and Cortney Young (incumbent). District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0015** **8.C.1** Recommendation to approve the reclassification of an Office Assistant pay grade 10, to a Media and Communications Support Specialist, pay grade 12; the reclassification of the Executive Assistant to the County Manager, pay grade 16 to the new job classification title of Management

Services Officer, pay grade TBD pending evaluation by Korn Ferry (Office of the County Manager); reclassification of nineteen Homeless Services Case Manager positions, pay grade 15, to Human Services Case Worker III, pay grade 15; reclassification of two Homeless Services Case Manager positions upon vacancy to Human Services Case Worker III, pay grade 15 (Human Services Agency); reclassification of a Registered Nurse - Juvenile Services, pay grade 14, to Advanced Practice Registered Nurse, pay grade 18 (Juvenile Services); reclassification of a Deputy County Recorder, pay grade 11 to Imaging and Records Technician II, pay grade 11 (Recorder's Office); reclassification of an Administrative Assistant I, pay grade 13 to Administrative Assistant II, pay grade 14; reclassification of a Media Production Specialist, pay grade 12 to Public Information Officer, pay grade 15 (Registrar of Voters); reclassification of a Wastewater Plant Operator I, pay grade 12 to Wastewater Plant Operator II, pay grade 13, establishing a new flexibly staffed series (Community Services Department); reclassification of a Communications Center Manager, pay grade 18 to Assistant Division Manager, pay grade 16; (Sheriff's Office); reclassification of the HR Manager - Organizational Effectiveness, pay grade 19 to Senior Human Resources Business Partner, pay grade 17 (Human Resources) as reviewed and evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee and/or Korn Ferry; a change in the job classification title from Accounting Manager to Division Director - Accounting; a change in job classification title from Budget Manager to Division Director-Budget; a change in job classification title from Principal Fiscal Analyst to Budget Division Manager; a change in job classification title from Purchasing and Contracts Manager to Division Director - Purchasing (Finance); a change in job classification title from Director of Human Resources to Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO); a change in job classification title from HR Manager - Benefits to Human Resources Division Director - Benefits; a change in job classification title from HR Manager- Compensation & Recruitment to Human Resources Division Director - Talent Management; a change in job classification title from HR Manager - Labor Relations and Employee Services to Human Resources Division Director - Labor Relations and Employee Services; a change in job classification title from Human Resources Analyst Trainee to Human Resources Business Partner Trainee; a change in job classification title from Human Resources Analyst I to Human Resources Business Partner I; a change in job classification title from Human Resources Analyst II to Human Resources Business Partner II; a change in job classification title from Senior Human Resources Analyst to Senior Human Resources Business Partner; delimit the job classification title of HR Manager - Organizational Effectiveness (Human Resources); a change in job classification title from Detention Manager to Assistant Division Manager; a change in job classification title from Chief Deputy Sheriff to Assistant Sheriff, pending PERS approval (Sheriff's Office); delimit the 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant II position, position number 70008025 (Office of the County Manager); delimit the 1.0 FTE Registered

Nurse-Juvenile Services position, position number 70010178 (Juvenile Services); delimit the 1.0 FTE Office Assistant position, position number 70011823 (Registrar of Voters) and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes. Total fiscal impact [savings of \$160,286]. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0016** **8.D.1** Recommendation to accept an FFY26 Title XX subgrant award from the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in the amount of [\$165,951.00; no county match], including possible purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives, retroactive from October 1, 2025 to September 30, 2026 to promote reunification, safety, educational support, and normalcy for children in care; retroactively authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the grant award documents; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0017** **8.D.2** Recommendation to accept the year 4 subgrant award for the Infant Toddler Court Program from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services in the amount of [\$50,000.00; no county match], including the possible purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives, retroactive from October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2026 to support the Safe Babies Court Team program; authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the subaward agreement and related documents; and direct Finance to make necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0018** **8.D.3** Recommendation to accept a Child Abuse and Neglect (CANS) FY26 sub-grant from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services in the amount of [\$29,900.00; no county match required], including the possible purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives, retroactive from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026; authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the grant and related documents; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0019** **8.E.1** Recommendation to (1) accept a grant from the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, in the amount of [\$162,766, no match] from January - December 2026 to support the region's efforts to build out an improved behavioral health Crisis Response System and support other regional behavioral health initiatives, and (2) direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager's office. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0020** **8.E.2** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of

[\$5,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; District 5 Commissioner Jeanne Herman recommends a [\$5,000.00] grant to Reno Elks Charitable Fund - a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes - to support cooking classes for senior citizens focused on preparing meals on a budget; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager's Office. (Commission District 5.)

26-0021 **8.E.3** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$2,500.00] for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; District 3 Commissioner Mariluz Garcia recommends a [\$2,500.00] grant to Green Vibe World - a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes - to support community outreach and clean-ups along the Truckee River corridor; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager's Office. (Commission District 3.)

26-0022 **8.E.4** Discussion and possible action by the Board of County Commissioners on approval of a Special Improvement District (SID) policy. A SID is a defined geographical area within Unincorporated Washoe County in which a developer proposes to construct eligible infrastructure that otherwise would not be constructed or installed by Washoe County using tax-exempt bonds. While the bonds are not obligations of the County, the Board must approve their issuance. This proposed policy addresses the terms and conditions under which the Board of County Commissioners will consider a Special Improvement District. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0023 **8.E.5** Washoe County Federal Legislative Activity report for the first, second and third quarters of calendar year 2025 created in accordance with Washoe County Federal Legislative Principles and Lobbying Practices for the 119th United States Congress. This item provides a summary of federal legislative activities of county staff, contract lobbyists, and elected officials during the first, second and third quarters of 2025, including but not limited to contacts with the members and staff of Nevada's congressional delegation on matters such as updates on federal lands bills, impacts from cuts to key federal programs providing services and support to vulnerable populations, impacts from delayed receipt of grant funds, requests for support for legislative measures, tours of Washoe County facilities, and requests for appropriations for Federal Fiscal Year 2026. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0024 **8.F.1** Recommendation to approve an agreement between Washoe County and Nevada Donor Network for use of the Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office facility for postmortem tissue donation for a

period of one year, with revenues totaling [\$247,464], effective January 1, 2026; and if approved, authorize the Chief Medical Examiner & Coroner of the Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office to sign and execute the agreement. Regional Medical Examiner. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0025** **8.G.1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$48,996.55; \$12,500.00 county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Office of Traffic Safety Grant, retroactive to October 8, 2025, through September 30, 2026, for the Population Health Division (PHD) to support the Traffic Safety Education & Outreach Program, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0026** **8.G.2** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$21,737.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Preventive Health and Health Services (PHHS) Block Grant, retroactive to October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2026, for the Population Health Division (PHD) to support Preventive Health and Health Services Program, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0027** **8.G.3** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$135,267.38; no county match] in both revenue and expenditures to the FY26 HIV Prevention Program, retroactive to June 1, 2025 through May 31, 2026, for the Population Health Division (PHD) to support the HIV Prevention Program agreement and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0028** **8.H.1** Recommendation to retroactively accept a fiscal year 2026 Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) grant award [amount not to exceed \$22,155.25, no County match required] as administered from the FBI, NNSSTF File Number 281D-LV-C37135, for overtime and benefit costs for deputies assigned full-time to the FBI Northern Nevada Safe Streets Task Force (NNSSTF) for the grant period of October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0029** **8.H.2** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2026 Nell J. Redfield Foundation grant award [amount not to exceed \$25,000.00, \$10,000.00 County match required] as administered from the Nell J. Redfield Foundation, for costs associated with the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team's Clean Path Initiative Program for the retroactive grant period of September 4, 2025 through September 3, 2028;

authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0030** **8.H.3** Recommendation to accept a Fiscal Year 2026 United States Marshals Service (USMS) grant award [amount not to exceed \$17,000.00, no County match required] as administered from the USMS, Obligation Document Control #M-26-D48-O-000009, for overtime costs for the Joint Law Enforcement Operations (JLEO) Task Force for the retroactive grant period of November 3, 2025 through September 30, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0031** **8.H.4** Recommendation to accept a Federal Fiscal Year 2026 Northern Nevada Child Exploitation Task Force (NNCETF) grant award [\$44,310.50, no County match required] as administered from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), for reimbursement of overtime costs directly related to activities in conjunction with the FBI NNCETF for the retroactive grant period of October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0032** **8.H.5** Recommendation to acknowledge Receipt of Status Report of Commissary Fund set up per NRS 211.360 to be utilized for the welfare and benefit of the inmates for items such as counseling, chaplaincy services, vocational training, and certifications programs for inmates in the jail, submitted by the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Commissary Committee for the First Quarter of Fiscal Year 2026. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0033** **8.J.1** Recommendation to Acknowledge Receipt of the Report of Sale-January 21, 2026, Delinquent Special Assessment Sale [Sale Proceeds \$0.00] as the parcels paid prior to the sale for the following district: WCAD 32 – Spanish Springs Valley Ranches Rd, parcels: 076-361-08, 076-371-09, 076-391-21, 076-391-23, 076-900-04. (additional description of affected parcel contained in Exhibit “A” of attached Resolution.) Treasurer. (Commission District 4 and 5.)
- 26-0034** **8.K.1** Recommendation to approve an Interlocal Agreement between the County of Washoe and the City of Reno for election services provided by Washoe County for the 2026 Primary and General Elections. Reimbursement to the County will be \$0.15 for each active registered voter residing in the City of Reno and is estimated to be approximately \$50,000. Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill announced that Agenda Item 8E4 would not be heard until January 20, 2026.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Michael Large asked if Commissioners had any disclosures.

Commissioner Clark disclosed that he was a member of the Reno Elks Lodge and that an item in the Consent Agenda included funds donated to that organization. He stated that his involvement would not affect his role with the Reno Elks Lodge, nor his duties with the County.

On the call for public comment, Andrew Sauls, a representative of Green Vibe World, thanked Commissioner Garcia for the proposed \$2,500 donation and for the opportunity to speak. He stated that the donation would be meaningful for the communities his organization served. He explained that Green Vibe World was a community-focused organization dedicated to environmental stewardship, workforce development, and youth mentorship. He indicated that its programs were designed to create real-world opportunities for individuals, particularly at-risk youth, to contribute positively to the community while gaining practical skills, structure, job readiness, and a sense of purpose. He said that through initiatives such as the Green Vibe Guardians Program, the organization aligned with local agencies to engage young people and supervise community service projects such as environmental cleanups, environmental restoration and education, and, most recently, creating defensible space on municipal property to help protect homes from wildfires. He stated that those efforts not only improved public spaces but also promoted accountability, personal growth, long-term community reintegration, and helped reduce recidivism. He shared that the donation would directly support program materials, supervision, and expand service opportunities. He noted that Green Vibe World was committed to transparency, measurable impact, and being a responsible partner to the County. He thanked the Board for its consideration and continued investment in programs that strengthened the community.

Washoe County Law Library Manager Sarah Bates highlighted the Law Library's work and its role in supporting community access to justice. She explained that in 2025, the Law Library assisted a record 1,699 participants through the Lawyer in the Library Program and reduced the program's waitlist by 30 percent compared to 2024. She indicated that those numbers reflected both growing public demand for free legal assistance and meaningful improvements in program operation and efficiency. She mentioned that the Law Library worked closely with the court to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) digital accessibility deadlines by remediating court forms and packets to ensure they were accessible to all users. She added that staff continually reviewed and improved packet instructions to make court processes easier for self-represented litigants. She noted that beyond those efforts, the Law Library provided a vital public space where community members could conduct legal research, attend remote court hearings, electronically file documents with the court, and receive assistance navigating the justice system. She believed that those services continued to strengthen legal access for the community. She expressed appreciation for the ongoing support of the Second Judicial District Court bench,

the Law Library Board of Trustees, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), and Washoe County.

On motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8K1, with the exclusion of Items 8E4 and 8I1, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8K1, with the exclusion of Items 8E4 and 8I1, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

26-0035 **8.I.1** Recommendation to acknowledge and approve, effective February 1, 2026, for Sparks Justice Court, a waiver of the six-month cooling off period for Judge Kevin Higgins. [\$0 net impact]. Sparks Justice Court. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas noted that the item included a Supreme Court order recalling Judge Kevin Higgins to service as a senior justice of the peace. She clarified that the action before the Board was the waiver of the six-month cooling-off period. She explained that Judge Higgins would be eligible to serve temporarily in any justice or municipal court in Nevada, provided he had served at least two years in office, which she noted he had. She added that Chief Judge Chris Wilson, of the Sparks Justice Court, was present to answer any questions.

Commissioner Clark stated that the public might not fully understand the purpose of Agenda Item 8I1 and could mistakenly assume there were underlying issues if they had not reviewed the backup material. He summarized that Judge Higgins was retiring but would then return to work.

CM Thomas said that Judge Higgins would be available up to two days per week to assist fellow judges with their caseload needs, as other judges had previously done. She explained that having a judge with extensive service and institutional knowledge could benefit the courts while new judges were being indoctrinated. Commissioner Clark emphasized that, because someone was retiring, it could present an opportunity for the Board to fill that position. CM Thomas indicated that Judge Higgins had submitted his notice of retirement, effective at the end of January, and that the next step would be for the Board to either leave the seat vacant or appoint another judge. Commissioner Clark asked whether there was a vacancy and if the Board could fill it.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large said that, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 4, once a vacancy occurred within the office of the justice of the peace outside of an election period, as would be the case with Judge Higgins' retirement, the Board would have the discretion to either hold the seat open or appoint an interim replacement until the next election.

Commissioner Clark suggested that a second judge had retired in the previous couple of years and planned to run for an open seat. He thought that the public

had a right to understand why judges retired and then quickly returned to work. He believed that with retirement, there would be savings, but retired judges were being called back to work and were getting paid a salary and collecting their retirement. He emphasized the need for further discussion so the public would understand what had happened and could refer to the meeting if they had questions in the future.

Judge Wilson said that he was recently elected Chief Judge in Sparks by his peers. He shared that Judge Higgins would retire on January 31, 2026. He noted that Judge Higgins had 22 years of experience, was familiar with the caseload, and was well-versed in the court's procedures. He explained that if the Board chose to leave the position vacant until the next election cycle, the three remaining judges were willing to cover the caseload. He thought the County's savings would be substantial and that the workload was manageable, but that additional assistance from Judge Higgins would be beneficial. He indicated that the Supreme Court had already approved Judge Higgins as a senior judge, and his service would be needed throughout the State, but utilizing him locally for the next six months would be valuable. He mentioned that since Judge Higgins was familiar with procedures and policies, he could assist with the specialty court. He added that Judge Higgins knew people in the Specialty Court Programs, which would ensure a smooth transition and help alleviate potential court congestion.

Commissioner Clark questioned why Judge Higgins was retiring if he intended to return to work, noting his own proximity to retirement. He asked what had prompted Judge Higgins' decision to return. Judge Wilson said he had convinced the judge to stay because of the significant institutional knowledge he had. He clarified that Judge Higgins would not be available every day due to planned retirement trips, but would be available periodically. He explained that Judge Derek Dreiling had also retired and was now seeking election for a District Court seat, which was a higher court, rather than a municipal or justice court seat.

Commissioner Clark believed that, for most people, retirement meant leaving the workforce entirely and not preparing to run for a higher office. He said he was confused why someone would retire and then return to work. Judge Wilson mentioned that Judge Higgins had more he wanted to accomplish. Commissioner Clark stated that he understood that, for some individuals, retirement could be busier than expected, and those individuals may return to maintain a slower pace.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 811 be acknowledged and approved.

BLOCK VOTE – 10 THROUGH 11

26-0036 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve the Interlocal Research Agreement between Washoe County and the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), obo the University of Nevada, Reno, an institution of higher education of the State of Nevada, for a period of three years (February 1, 2026 through January 31, 2029) for research services on several of Washoe County’s water reclamation facilities to address items identified in the agreements scope of work [at a cost of \$777,169.00]. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia disclosed that she was an employee of the Nevada System of Higher Education at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). She shared that the interlocal research agreement would not affect her or her position, and that she had no pecuniary interest.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

26-0037 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to approve Amendment No. 1 to an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services between Washoe County and Stantec Consulting Services Inc. for the South Truckee Meadows Steamboat Lift Station and Force Main Project, to provide engineering services during construction, as described within Exhibit A [in the amount of \$295,567.92 for a total contract amount of \$1,036,241.92]. Amendment No. 1 is required due to construction delays caused by the Contractor, K.G. Walters Construction Co., Inc. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

26-0038 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation for discussion and possible action in regard to the appointment and/or reappointment of Commissioners to boards and commissions, alteration of terms of service on boards and commissions where legally permissible, and such other action as the board of commissioners may desire to take in regard to those administrative matters. Boards and commissions for which possible changes to appointments could be made under this item include all of the boards and commissions listed at the end of this agenda as the “various” boards and commissions that commissioners may be members of or liaisons to. Manager's office. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas reminded the public that each agenda listed the various boards at the end, in case anyone had questions about which boards Commissioners served on.

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson indicated that the item was an annual procedure, as some appointments expired every year or every 2 to 4 years. She shared that there had been questions about whether selecting a new Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) Chair would affect any board positions. She noted that only the Washoe County Investment Committee seat would change. She added that, under Washoe County Code (WCC), the BCC Chair served as the Investment Committee Chair and appointed the second primary member. She addressed questions about the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) alternate member and noted that Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large would conduct additional research to determine whether a lay member who served on the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) could also serve as the TRPA alternate. She mentioned that the issue would be on a future BCC meeting agenda.

Chair Hill said she had a few changes she wanted to make but wanted to hear from the other Board members first.

Vice Chair Herman indicated that she wanted her boards to remain the same.

Commissioner Garcia stated that she wished her boards to remain the same.

Commissioner Andriola noted she wanted her boards to remain the same and asked to be considered for the Reno Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA) board.

Commissioner Clark said he wanted to hear Chair Hill's comments before speaking.

Chair Hill noted that after speaking with CDDA Large regarding the TRPA, she wanted a layperson who also served on the APC and had consistently contributed to the Tahoe area to serve as her alternate. She emphasized the importance of having someone knowledgeable and actively involved if she was unable to attend the TRPA meetings. She suggested leaving the TRPA alternate vacant until the next BCC meeting.

CDDA Large stated that, if the BCC agreed, he recommended selecting the primary TRPA member and postponing the alternate selection. He mentioned that he had reached out to the TRPA Council to clarify whether someone could serve on both the APC and as an alternate on the regular board. He hoped to have that clarification by the following BCC meeting, so a layperson could be appointed to the position if the BCC chose to do so.

Chair Hill indicated that she preferred to remain the primary member and recommended that Commissioner Andriola be appointed to the RSCVA Board.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered to change the RSCVA representative from Chair Hill to Commissioner Andriola, and to keep the TRPA alternate position vacant.

26-0039 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Discussion and direction to staff for the possible use of more than four hours of staff time as requested by Commissioner Mariluz Garcia at the October 14, 2025 Board of County Commission meeting to determine if individual parcels of land, not owned by Washoe County, and not currently being assessed taxes can and or should be reviewed for ownership by Washoe County or adjacent property owners. The current issue is many of these parcels of land have no responsible or responsive owner to manage the properties, leading to illegal dumping, or illegal camping without ability for adequate enforcement. Manager's office. (All Commission Districts.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He indicated that some Commissioners or members of the public could be wondering why Agenda Item 12 was before the Board. He recalled that the Board had rules of procedure that governed the way the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) operated, and that Section 5.8.11 of the Rules of Procedure required the entire Board to discuss any item that required staff time of four hours or more. He indicated that those rules were highlighted in the assessment of the Office of the County Manager (OCM) because the organization had become lax with the procedure. He reported that when a Commissioner mentioned something on the dais, many staff members would process requests if needed. He said that the County's department heads ensured that employees performed the work to implement BCC policies and processed requests for information.

ACM Solaro mentioned that some requests took time and thanked Commissioner Garcia for her patience regarding the new process for Commissioner requests. He asserted that the County implemented the Board's policies and staff needed to ensure resources were available and allocated to the right locations, which he believed was why the Strategic Plan was important to follow. He indicated that staff were implementing a process that involved asking the Commissioners what their priorities were, so that staff could meaningfully focus on that. He reported that when staff requested a change to the Washoe County Code (WCC), the item was brought to the Board to initiate the Code change, and the information was reviewed prior to making the change. He explained that staff did not want to disrupt the process; however, the County's resources were overloaded. He speculated that staff's responsiveness to the Board was becoming more difficult; therefore, Agenda Item 12 was a helpful alternative that would allow many department heads to focus on prioritized work.

ACM Solaro explained that the County had abandoned properties with deceased homeowners, properties without probate, and properties where a section of the roadway that was parceled out was now separate from the County-owned parcel. He indicated that the parcels with no owners were transferred to the Treasurer, who served as

trustee. He recalled a toll road area in south Reno where someone needed an easement approved, but the County was listed as the trustee. He said that the County did not own the property and could not enforce property rights; therefore, the Treasurer had to return the deeds to the original owner, which could lead to illegal dumping or squatting on the property.

ACM Solaro noted that the County had not had a clear process in the past for properties that became roadways, nor had it specified who would maintain them. He mentioned that when someone bought a piece of property, they also bought the parcel with the access as is, whereas if the County owned it, the parcel would need to be brought up to standards similar to developer requirements. He pointed out that a property on Quartz Lane was subject to abatement proceedings and had gone through the nuisance process, which had taken about 5 or 6 years. He reported that the County had conducted cleanups on the Quartz Lane parcel three times. He said the property should go through probate proceedings because the owner was deceased and there were squatters on it. He explained that the County had no legal right to clean up the property. He recalled that Commissioner Garcia viewed the parcel as a public nuisance and a fire hazard, which posed safety concerns. He asserted that not all of the parcels were in Sun Valley and that some were in South Reno, Horizon Hills, and North Reno. He said that Agenda Item 12 was a proposal to allocate staff time from various departments to review properties on a case-by-case basis, since a list of parcels deemed problematic by the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team, the Community Services Department (CSD), and Code Enforcement was provided. He relayed that Agenda Item 12 was not a quick solution and could require additional items to be presented to the Board in the future; however, staff wanted the Board's perspective on whether to expend staff time on the matter. He explained that the Staff Report contained extensive information for the Board to review.

Commissioner Garcia thanked ACM Solaro, the OCM, the District Attorney's Office (DA), and staff for organizing Agenda Item 12 and working with her. She indicated that Agenda Item 12 was important to her because she felt the quality of life of the surrounding neighbors of the vacant lots was affected, including a nearby church and elementary school. She said that she was pleased that Commissioner Clark participated in a ride-along and witnessed the impact the vacant lot had created over the past three years. She recalled that when she was elected, she focused on illegal dumping, abandoned vehicles, and neighborhood blight. She said that with staff's work and the use of her discretionary funds, community cleanups were possible. She explained that she was happy to perform proactive work; however, systemic changes were needed. She reported that three cleanups were conducted in Sun Valley, resulting in the collection of over 4,000 tires, 12,000 pounds of electronic waste (e-waste), 23,000 pounds of household hazardous waste, 136 large appliances, and 75,000 pounds of general waste. She said there were many community members had waste; however, some might not have access to transportation to reach the cleanup site or take their waste to Waste Management (WM). She noted that she had recommended organizing private property cleanups with landowners who were willing to prioritize low-income seniors and others in need.

Commissioner Garcia referred to a Slope Drive roadway parcel and said that an 80-year-old resident who lived alone had to stare at the empty parcel every day. She felt it was disheartening for a resident who had worked her whole life to build a home, only to have her property sit next to a vacant lot with debris. She speculated that leaving the debris in place gave the impression that no one cared about the nearby property owners. She indicated that Code Enforcement and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) could not enforce consequences for the debris due to a loophole in the Code. She noted that a property on Fifth Avenue had become increasingly worse with debris and that the property behind it had 14 trailers and recreational vehicles (RVs) in the middle of the parcel. She recalled that the property owner had called the fire department on many occasions after fires were started in the trailers.

Commissioner Garcia indicated that the individuals living in the area were hopeful that the situation would improve because the concerns were being addressed. She urged her fellow Commissioners to support Agenda Item 12. She believed that situations occurring in her District may not be in others. She opined that Agenda Item 12 was a creative option and that there were different fiscal opportunities for affordable housing, land trusts, or land banks that she believed other communities have had success with. She said that Agenda Item 12 would require some staff time, but she speculated that it would be worth the effort to benefit taxpayers who end up cleaning the abatements when they become public nuisances. Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Garcia for her passion and dedication to her constituents.

Commissioner Andriola mentioned that she had participated in several ride-alongs with the HOPE Team and thanked Commissioner Garcia for bringing Agenda Item 12 forward, noting that she believed that it was a loophole that needed to be remedied. She recalled that after a recent Spanish Springs cleanup, she had wished for a more proactive solution that would allow different agencies to enforce and maintain the safety and cleanliness of properties. She indicated that driving by the impacted sites was eye-opening and disturbing. She said that during one of the ride-alongs, an individual asked the HOPE Team to look under the trailer, and excrement was found. She noted that squatters and others in the area who contributed to the condition of the parcels knew that law enforcement could not do anything. She asserted her support for Agenda Item 12 and thanked Commissioner Garcia for her work.

Commissioner Clark said that as the former Assessor, he thought he had seen every street in the County; however, during the ride-along, he learned that there were areas he had not seen. He asserted that he supported Commissioner Garcia and Agenda Item 12. He noted that he had expertise and that the County's work scope needed to be defined. He said that the County needed to learn who owned the properties and for how long. He felt that title insurance companies, the Recorder, the Assessor, the Clerk, the Treasurer, and over 3,000 realtors in town had the information the Board needed. He reported that the Assessor was tasked by the State with listing, discovering, and appraising everything of value in the County. He opined that the Washoe County Assessor's Office knew who owned the parcels, and the Treasurer knew where the tax bills were delivered. He indicated that it would not be difficult to determine who owned the parcels because

many County departments likely had that information. He said that once ownership was determined, the County would be able to determine whether taxes were paid. He reported that if the County took ownership of the parcel, they could sell it and know who bought it, allowing the parcel to be placed back on the tax rolls. He asked why the parcel's owner was not paying property tax (p-tax) and why they were not cleaning the land. He pointed out that the biggest problem was getting individuals to clean up their own mess, and if the land was simply vacant, the County would not be involved. He requested information regarding how many parcels there were, who owned them and for how long, and how the owner acquired the property.

ACM Solaro agreed with Commissioner Clark and said it was important to know who owned the properties. He reported that, around 90 percent of the time, when the owner was known, they were willing to work with the County to become compliant. He explained that the examples in Agenda Item 12 were cases in which the parcels were owned by someone else who stopped paying taxes and ended up on a sale list with no one interested in buying the parcel. He said there were policy implications and noted that taxpayers were paying for individuals' access rights who did not pay their fair share. He reiterated that finding the owner was the first step in the process. Commissioner Garcia explained that the parcels in Agenda Item 12 had deceased owners. Commissioner Clark asserted that if there were parcels with heirs who might not want the parcel, the County should foreclose on the property, auction it, or ask the adjoining neighbors if they wanted extra footage on their parcel. He said that not every situation would be handled the same way. Chair Hill noted that Agenda Item 12 was to allow staff to present options to the Board through staff time and research.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large indicated that the parcels were unique and that each of the 37 parcels involved many departments. He asserted that the Board's job was to decide whether departments' time would exceed four hours, since the situation would take a long time to remedy. He reported that he was running a chain of title on all 37 parcels, and each one had a different outcome with a different task force assigned. He noted that the County was working to make the parcels as clean as possible in the most expeditious and lawful manner. He said that parcels could not be taken without due process. Commissioner Clark said he wanted the public to understand what the County was doing. He reiterated his support for Agenda Item 12; however, he wanted it done in the most efficient way possible. Commissioner Garcia noted that the discussion had lasted longer than the item itself. Vice Chair Herman indicated that Agenda Item 12 would be based on the County's affordability.

On call for public comment, Heidi Soper stated that Agenda Item 12 was interesting. She asserted that she was sure the Board was aware of the illegal dumping and homeless camps occurring on Fifth Avenue, Slope Court, and Carnes Drive. She mentioned that Commissioner Garcia was working diligently with the DA's Office to increase enforcement of illegal dumping and camping on private property with deceased owners or inactive limited liability company (LLC) ownership. She urged the Board to approve Agenda Item 12 to allocate adequate staff time to address the encampments and fire risks while exploring legal options to remedy the issues. She said the properties were not taxed

and that possible ownership by the County or property managers should be reviewed. She recalled a major fire that destroyed an abandoned property, noting it had fortunately not damaged the adjoining parcels. She speculated that the properties needed to be sold to a responsible owner who would take care of them, thus avoiding concerns about dumping and camping. She pointed out that the current process lacked enforcement, which she opined had to be remedied promptly.

Katherine Yriarte stated that she fully supported Agenda Item 12 and wished to relay information from a friend who was a large-animal veterinarian. She indicated that her friend could not attend due to work. She noted her friend lived in District 2 near Pinion Drive. She explained that her friend owned a parcel near a road on a deceased owner's property that was not managed by a homeowner's association (HOA). She said the road was impassable during inclement weather. She noted that her friend needed to be able to leave her home quickly to provide emergency veterinary care; however, it was nearly impossible for a fire truck to reach the home in an emergency. She recalled that several elderly individuals lived on the street near her friend and had learned to deal with the roadway concerns; however, her friend was a new owner and wanted to do right by her neighbors. She reported that her friend's Assessor Parcel Number (APN) was 017-072-19, and that her friend had confirmed with the Assessor's Office that the previous owner was deceased, rendering the property abandoned. She believed that Agenda Item 12 would be great and affected every district in the County. CDDA Large asked Katherine Yriarte to repeat her friend's APN. Katherine Yriarte reiterated that the APN was 017-072-19. Chair Hill pointed out that if anyone had additional properties, they should inform staff via Washoe 311. She reported that she would inform staff about a parcel in Verdi that she was concerned about.

County Clerk Jan Galassini advised the Board that she received an emailed public comment, which was placed on file.

Veronica Cortes noted that she had attended various meetings. She indicated that she was a Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) Member, owned a pizza restaurant, was a mobile notary, and was a lunch lady in Lemmon Valley. She said she lived in District 5, and that Commissioner Garcia had worked with her in the past to clean up homeless camps. She recalled that the homeless camp clean-up in Sun Valley included a biohazard area, and she appreciated that Commissioner Garcia worked outside her district to assist with the project. She mentioned that she worked without payment and was available via text, email, and in person, so she was tired of hearing that the County did not have funds for safety concerns. She said she had paid taxes since she was 18, attended local schools, and graduated in Washoe County. She reported that she used to work at McDonald's for \$3.50 an hour when she was 16 so that she could go to school. She said that she attended band camp and visited London, England, for the Queen's Band, where she played the flute. She expressed that she loved Washoe County and was born at Saint (St.) Mary's Hospital. She wanted to know where the money to fix the roads was coming from and why the Washoe County School District (WCSD) lacked funding. She said that there were kindergartners who assaulted teachers, and she believed that the community needed to be improved. She asserted that she had attended many meetings because she was

running for County Commissioner, District 5. She said that, whether she had support or not, she hoped the Board understood she was trying to help the community. She opined that there was a homelessness issue in the County that needed to be addressed, and that many volunteers who loved where they lived would help the community. She said she loved Sun Valley, had lived there since 1977, and that her grandparents moved to the area in the 1950s. She felt that the residents in her district knew who she was because she participated in many community activities and cared for horses and children. She believed the community needed better representation across various boards and that many corrupt individuals were taking money from developers who did not care about the residents.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be directed.

Chair Hill believed that the approval of Agenda Item 12 was great for Commissioner Garcia and the County. She thanked Commissioner Garcia for her leadership.

* * * * *

Chair Hill indicated that the Board would recess until 1:00 p.m., then continue to the public hearings. CDDA Large noted that Agenda Items 13, 14, and 16 would allow for virtual public comment for those in Gerlach.

* * * * *

12:21 p.m. The Board recessed.

1:05 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

26-0040 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's approval of Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0018 (Iveson Ranch) for a high technology industrial use type for drone research and testing and for a private air strip use type; and appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to approve a hazardous materials special use permit for a general industrial - heavy use type to include explosives testing and use and storage of certain hazardous materials in the High Desert planning area, as required by NRS 278.147 and Washoe County Code section 110.810.42. The project site is located at 2001 State Route 34, Gerlach, Nevada 89412 (APN 066-030-05), is 320 acres and is surrounded by public land. The hazardous materials that are proposed to be on site have the following CAS numbers: 121-82-4 (RDX), 118-96-7 (TNT), 78-11-5 (PETN), 2691-41-0 (HMX), and 7790-98-9 (AP). The proposed special use

permit includes outdoor storage, and also includes modifications to standards relating to landscaping, parking, noise, and paving.

The appellant is the Burning Man Project and the applicant for the special use permit is BRDR Properties, LLC. The proposed project is in the High Desert Area Plan and has a master plan designation of Rural and is within the General Rural regulatory zone.

The Board of County Commissioners (Board) shall consider the appeal based on the record on appeal and testimony and materials submitted at the Board's public hearing. The Board may affirm, modify or reverse the Planning Commission's decision. Virtual Public Comment Eligible. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

* * * * *

Chair Hill opened the public hearings for Agenda Items 13 & 14 and stated that they would be heard together. For discussion on Agenda Item 14, please see Agenda Item 13, Minute Item Number 26-0040.

* * * * *

Chair Hill explained that Agenda Item 13 would begin with a brief staff presentation, followed by the applicant and the appellant, who would each be given 10 minutes for their presentations.

Senior Planner Chris Bronczyk introduced himself and noted that his presentation would discuss both the appeal for Agenda Item 13 and the hazardous materials (hazmat) special use permit (SUP) request for Agenda Item 14. Chair Hill asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large whether it would be preferable to open Agenda Item 14 as well to be heard simultaneously with Agenda Item 13, which he confirmed. Chair Hill opened the Public Hearing for Agenda Item 14. CDDA Large explained that the Planning Commission (PC) had already made a recommendation on Agenda Item 14, but the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had original jurisdiction to approve hazardous waste SUPs, so the item would need to be brought before the Board. He reiterated that the Board would hear both the appeal from Agenda Item 13 and the recommended approval of the SUP from Agenda Item 14. County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas noted that she would read the introduction for Agenda Item 14 into the record prior to the Board hearing the staff presentation, as requested by CDDA Large, and she proceeded to do so.

Mr. Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Special Use Permit WSUP25-0018; High Desert Planning Area with subject parcel highlighted; Vicinity Map; Appeal (2 slides); Modified Condition of Approval; New Condition of Approval; Approved Iveson Project; High Desert Modifiers; High Tech Industrial Use Type; Private Air Strip (2 slides); Outdoor Storage; Explosive

Testing / General Industrial – Heavy; Hazardous Materials; ATF Explosive Licensing; Safety Response on Site; Consultation; Neighborhood Meeting; Findings; Possible Motions; Hazmat SUP Motion; Thank You.

Mr. Bronczyk displayed the *Special Use Permit WSUP25-0018* slide. He stated that Agenda Item 13 concerned SUP Case Number WSUP25-0018, for the Iveson Ranch project. He introduced the slide titled *High Desert Planning Area with subject parcel highlighted* and explained that the slide's map provided an overview of the location in question within the High Desert Planning Area. He showed the *Vicinity Map* slide and explained that the map on the slide provided an extended view of the area. He explained that the location was 26 miles north of Gerlach, located off Nevada State Route (SR) 34, was 320 acres, and was zoned as general rural (gr).

Mr. Bronczyk introduced the first slide titled *Appeal*. He noted that Agenda Item 13 concerned an appeal brought to the BCC by the Burning Man Project (BMP) regarding the entire Iveson Ranch project. He reported that part of the appeal request included two primary conditions that were not approved by the PC and were intended to limit the frequency and intensity of explosives or energetics testing. He explained that the appellant had contended that the finding of the SUP's issuance not being detrimental could not be made without the inclusion of the two conditions they had requested. He displayed the second *Appeal* slide and recalled that the applicants and the appellant had multiple meetings together and had invited Washoe County staff to attend. He noted that an additional meeting was held afterward, during which County staff drafted a new condition and modified another condition in the SUP, both of which were agreeable to the applicant and appellant.

Mr. Bronczyk showed the *Modified Condition of Approval* slide. He explained that the modified condition clarified that airplane and drone flights should occur at the location's airstrip no more than five Sundays per year, with an additional exception for medical evacuation flights. He displayed the *New Condition of Approval* slide, describing the condition as substantial. He noted that the new condition limited energetic testing to no more than 12 pounds of explosive material per test, imposing numerical limits on detonators, charges, and solid rocket motors. He noted that the condition was drafted and agreed upon by the appellant and the applicant.

Mr. Bronczyk introduced the *Approved Iveson Project* slide by explaining that the current approved project was for a high technology industrial use type for drone research, a general industrial-heavy use type for explosives testing, and a private airstrip use type. He noted that the project was also approved for certain modifications and outdoor storage. He showed the slide titled *High Desert Modifiers*. He reported that the project was located in the High Desert Area, which he described as unique, as it included modifiers that allowed certain use types within the gr regulatory zone that were not normally afforded elsewhere in the County. He noted that the use types listed on the slide required an SUP under the modifiers, and the hazmat explosives associated with the general industrial-heavy use type necessitated an additional public hearing before the BCC. He displayed the *High Tech Industrial Use Type* slide and reported that the applicant had stated that the size of

the drones associated with the high technology industrial use type would be the size of dinner plates, and the drone operations would occur at the Iveson Ranch property and the adjacent Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land.

Mr. Bronczyk showed the first of the *Private Air Strip* slides. He explained that there was an existing airstrip on the property, located at its north end and spanning two parcels. He stated that the applicant reported that 75 percent of access to the proposed project would be by air. He displayed the second *Private Air Strip* slide and noted that the slide included a map of the airstrip in question. He explained that the portion of the airstrip highlighted in yellow was located on BLM land, while the blue area lay within the project's property. He noted that one of the conditions for approval of the project was that the applicant had to obtain written approval from BLM before using the airstrip. He referred to the slide titled *Outdoor Storage* and stated that the applicant indicated the project would include outdoor storage areas with no explosives stored within them. He explained that the storage areas would house materials used in their project's operations.

Mr. Bronczyk displayed the *Explosive Testing / General Industrial – Heavy* slide. He noted that the blue area depicted on the slide's map represented where the project's living area and ranch buildings were located, while the yellow portion of the map to the south showed where the explosive testing would occur. He added that no explosives would be dropped from drones and that testing would occur at a fixed location on a secure range. He showed the *Hazardous Materials* slide, noting that it contained details on the portion of the SUP associated with hazmat. He stated that State laws regulated the process and requirements for hazmat SUPs, and the slide listed the five regulated materials associated with the project that were subject to those requirements.

Mr. Bronczyk introduced the slide titled *ATF Explosive Licensing*. He reported that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) was heavily involved in the Iveson Ranch project, as the agency regulated the licensing, storage, and recordkeeping of explosives. He explained that the applicant would have to keep a record of any instances of explosive material removal or storage to stay in compliance with ATF regulations. He displayed the *Safety Response on Site* slide and noted that the applicants had fire safety measures located on site, as the project's property contained explosives and hazmat. He noted that the fire safety measures included two 4,000-gallon water trucks, three utility terrain vehicles (UTVs), and coordination efforts with the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD).

Mr. Bronczyk showed the *Consultation* slide. He explained that a substantial amount of consultation work was invested into the Iveson Ranch project, which was dictated by State law. He noted that every agency and contact listed on the slide was consulted as part of the project, including the Washoe County Director of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, the Nevada State Fire Marshal, and the Administrator of the Division of Environmental Protection of the Nevada State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. He displayed the slide titled *Neighborhood Meeting* and reported that the applicant held multiple neighborhood meetings, including one with the Gerlach/Empire Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) on November 13, 2025. He

explained that there were concerns about the project's hazmat and explosives, as well as its impacts on local wildlife. He referred to the *Findings* slide, noting that staff was able to make all the required findings associated with the SUP.

Mr. Bronczyk introduced the *Possible Motions* slide, noting that it listed the possible motions related to the appeal associated with Agenda Item 13. He stated that the BCC could either affirm the PC's decision with the amended conditions, reverse the decision, or affirm the approval as it was. He showed the *Hazmat SUP Motion* slide and explained that it included the recommended motion for Agenda Item 14, which pertained to the project's hazmat SUP. He displayed the slide titled *Thank you* and stated that he was available to answer questions from the Board.

Chair Hill asked whether the Board had any questions for Mr. Bronczyk and staff, and she determined that there were none. She invited the applicant to provide their presentation.

Iveson Ranch and BRDR Properties, Limited Liability Company (LLC), General Manager Mike Arth thanked the Commissioners and County staff for the time they had spent throughout the last several months on the project during the application review process. He described his role at BRDR Properties, LLC, and noted that he was a former United States (US) Air Force Special Operations Pilot. He reported that he had approximately ten years of experience operating drone systems and working in a national security environment to provide important technologies that would enable the Country to succeed in the future. He opined that the Iveson Ranch project was an example of that effort. He stated that it was important for the community to understand what the Board might support through the project's approval and how it could benefit the Nation, Washoe County, Nevada, and the Gerlach community.

Mr. Arth explained that drones, as systems, had been prominently seen in previous years, particularly in Ukraine. He noted that drones had been used by the US military, private law enforcement, private entities, and for road surveys and agricultural applications, resulting in significant economic benefits in the US and around the world. He stated that the vast majority of drone systems were manufactured in China, reporting that approximately 90 percent of drones sold worldwide were of Chinese origin. He explained that companies like BRDR Properties, LLC, intended to change that balance and wanted to begin those efforts in Nevada, if the BCC would allow them to do so. He opined that the Board had a unique opportunity for Washoe County, as its boundaries extended north into the Black Rock Desert, which he described as an important test asset for businesses like his. He acknowledged that the US military operated many test ranges. He explained that the vast expanses of BLM land, open airspace, and lack of electromagnetic frequency spectrum allocation in the northern portions of the Black Rock Desert represented a critical benefit to companies such as his, given the need for those metrics to successfully test their drone systems. He reported that testing conducted by his company was carried out in accordance with requirements from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the ATF.

Mr. Arth opined that the BCC granting operational permission to BRDR Properties, LLC, would be important, as it would signal that the County was receptive to collaborating with businesses that contributed to a growing technological field, which he believed would generate substantial economic benefits for the County and State. He reported that his company intended to bring 8 to 12 jobs to the Gerlach community, with average annual salaries of \$80,000 to \$100,000 and allocated benefits, representing approximately \$125,000 to \$130,000 in expenses to his business, per job. He listed the benefits his company offered, including health care and a 401 (k) matching plan, under Section 401(k) of the US Internal Revenue Code (IRC), and described himself as a concerned employer who treated employees well and integrated them into a growing business that offered opportunities such as equity compensation. He stated that employment of that kind was unusual in Gerlach, which he believed was a factor the Board should consider if they wanted to support attracting jobs of that nature to rural America. He noted that the jobs created by his company would function harmoniously with traditional industries in Gerlach, as his business would not conflict with the mines or with cattle grazing rights.

Mr. Arth believed that Washoe County could work with his company to demonstrate the blending of businesses associated with advanced technology and jobs or opportunities with a more historical precedent. He opined that there was an exciting chance to protect the environment, work with a well-intentioned, transparent, and ethical business like his, and provide new economic opportunities for the community.

Mr. Arth conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Iveson Ranch Special Use Permit; Special Use Permit; Site Location; Outdoor Storage; Runway / Airstrip; Energetics – Overview; Energetics – Location; Energetics – Detonators; Energetics – Solid Rocket Motor; Energetics – <12 pound charge; Government and Community Outreach; Questions; Back-Up Slides; Back-Up Energetics – Location; Back-Up Energetics – Safety (3 slides); Back-Up Energetics - Type Distribution (Projected); Back-Up Energetics – Noise; Back-Up Energetics – Noise Comparison; Back-Up Energetics - Frequency (Projected); Back-Up Energetics – Materials; Back-Up Energetics – Pollution (2 slides).

Mr. Arth displayed the slide titled *Special Use Permit*. He acknowledged that the Board already had an opportunity to review information on the matter and noted his willingness to answer any questions. He emphasized that the SUP was pertinent to the project. He stated that, despite the discussion often focusing on drones, the SUP was primarily associated with permission being for his company to develop the runway built by the previous landowner, which was divided by BLM land and their privately owned property. He noted that the SUP also allowed his company to unobtrusively store some of the equipment necessary for its operations, as well as provided permission to use energetics, which he suspected was the primary focus of the BCC and accounted for much of the public interest in the project. He noted that his company had also requested variance to the standards listed on the slide.

Mr. Arth showed the *Site Location* slide. He explained that the project was located approximately 26 miles north of Gerlach, about 2.5 miles away from the nearest inhabited neighbor, nearly 6 miles from the Fly Geyser and Fly Ranch project operated by Burning Man, 11 miles from the Black Rock Playa, and over 13 miles from the site where the Burning Man event occurred. He noted that the property was located a significant distance from Gerlach, comparing the distance between the two to the distance between Reno and Carson City.

Mr. Arth introduced the slide titled *Outdoor Storage*. He thought the outdoor storage portion of the SUP was not in question, but he believed it was an important aspect of the project in order for his company to operate legally. He noted that he had mentioned the topic because it represented one of the things a business like his could theoretically get away with doing without first seeking proper permission, given the project's location. He emphasized that his company intended to be fully transparent and compliant with the guidelines and responsibilities they had to the County and their neighbors. He asserted that his business would do that throughout the duration of the Iveson Ranch project and demonstrate a commitment to being an ethical operator.

Mr. Arth displayed the *Runway / Airstrip* slide. He acknowledged that the runway had already been mentioned and emphasized the importance of noting the size of the aircraft operating on it. He mentioned that the aircraft were very small, that the airstrip was about 3,500 feet long and made of gravel, and that improvements would be made once permission was granted. He explained that the aircraft utilizing that airstrip operated quietly, but he requested a noise variance to allow them to cross the line defining their property from the BLM's property. He elaborated that when aircraft crossed that boundary, it would produce more noise than normally allowed at a property line. He clarified that his company was not seeking a noise variance related to the munitions activity, which he described as a common concern from the public. He noted his intent to explain why his company believed those concerns were slightly overstated. He argued that the noise from munitions did not come close to violating County noise ordinances. He explained that the aircraft would make more noise during takeoff while crossing two-thirds of the airstrip on the project property than it would while on the last one-third of the runway located on BLM land. He noted that his company had requested the variance for that reason, as the BLM could bring forth a noise complaint against them under the Washoe County Code (WCC).

Mr. Arth showed the slide titled *Energetics – Overview*. He explained that his drone company made several different kinds of products, with the intention of offering a vast array that could support conservation, agricultural, law enforcement, and military efforts. He acknowledged that some of their existing customers used their drone products to fly munitions, which he attributed to the reason his company wanted a better understanding of the drones' electrical circuitry to demonstrate that a blast cap could be used, charged, and armed from the drones' electrical systems. He reported that his company had procured a magazine they wanted to use to store equipment for static testing of up to 10 pounds of energetic material. He recalled that the condition he and the appellant, BMP, had agreed upon was to increase the maximum amount of energetic material for that testing to 12 pounds, as his company wanted to prepare for what might be needed for future testing.

He explained that the majority of that testing activity was conducted with explosives called *blasting caps*, containing approximately one gram of explosive material, which was regulated by the ATF and required his company to appear before the BCC. He acknowledged that the blasting caps were still categorized as hazmat, which he emphasized he did not want to minimize. He compared the charge generated by the blasting caps his company used in testing to that of 0.22-caliber ammunition, noting that both produced approximately the same noise signature. He described the blasting caps as very small, trace amounts of explosive material. He emphasized that his company was testing solid rocket motors rather than liquid rocket motors, which he stated were involved in an incident associated with the company Rocketdyne.

Mr. Arth introduced the slide titled *Energetics – Location* and noted that his company was not anticipating flying munitions on drones at the project's testing site, recalling that the topic had already been discussed. He explained that the testing site was located in the southwest corner of the property, approximately half a mile from SR 34 and about 2.5 miles from the nearest inhabited neighbor. Mr. Arth displayed the *Energetics – Detonators* slide, noting his uncertainty about whether he could play the video included on it. He noted that the video depicted a blasting cap and apologized that it would not be exciting to watch. He explained that the explosion in the video accounted for approximately 75 percent of the activity his company was conducting during testing. He referred to the minimal size of the explosive activity in the video and apologized to the Board, noting that the ATF and State of Nevada required him to discuss it during the BCC meeting. Chair Hill asked how large the piece of material in the video was, and Mr. Arth responded that the application in the video showed what was primarily a fuse, with the length of the blasting cap material itself spanning approximately one inch.

Mr. Arth showed the *Energetics – Solid Rocket Motor* slide, noting that his company intended to conduct solid rocket motor testing. He reported that the test site for hobbyist rocket motor testing and rocket launches was located approximately 12 miles from the Iveson Ranch project. He explained that while it was perfectly legal for hobbyists to engage in those activities, a commercial business like his needed to appear before the BCC to do the same. He added that his company intended to fix a test stand to the ground to enable more scientific measurement methods than would be possible otherwise when the rocket was launched and moved rapidly away from Earth. He played the video included on the slide, which demonstrated a solid rocket motor test. He described testing of that kind as more exciting than the tests shown previously for the blasting caps. He explained that the sound generated by the solid rocket motor testing was approximately 80 decibels (dB) at a distance of about 300 yards. He explained that by the time the sound of the rocket motor test reached SR 34, based on the depression and the location of the test site's land within a bowl-shaped area surrounding the space, he believed very few people would ever hear it. He believed that the sound would not be audible from inside an automobile, to those standing next to a vehicle, or to people standing in the open terrain with the wind hitting their ears. He acknowledged that someone might hear the rocket motors if they stood on a neighbor's property on a calm and cool day. He reported that no more than approximately 40 tests of that kind would be conducted per year.

Mr. Arth displayed the *Energetics - <12 pound charge* slide. He explained that the slide included a video of a 12-pound charge, which was larger than anything his company intended to test, but was the most comparable video he could find to the testing they hoped to conduct. He opined that an individual a few hundred yards away would likely mistake the sound caused by detonating the charge for a 12-gauge shotgun being fired, which he noted was a firearm that many people discharged on BLM lands surrounding the Iverson Ranch project.

Mr. Arth introduced the *Government and Community Outreach* slide, noting that, before taking questions from the Board, he hoped to reinforce that his company had met with numerous individuals in the County over the previous six months. He stated that he was prepared to continue having those engagements. He stated that should the Board be kind enough to grant a vote in favor of the Iverson Ranch project, his business would be one that intended to be a member of the community for many years. He recognized that such engagement brought a responsibility to be involved in the community, to meet with concerned residents, and to continue working with them to understand the activities his company engaged in, what it was not doing, and the legitimate concerns that might persist. He expressed that his business wanted to be sensitive to those issues.

Mr. Arth recalled speaking with members of the Gerlach community about certain young employees of his company who had driven through town slightly faster than the 25-mile-per-hour speed limit. He emphasized that those behaviors would be addressed and that he would be proactive in doing so, reiterating his 18 years of service in the US military. He explained that his company had employees ranging in age from 19 to 75 years old, noting that they would all endeavor to reassure concerned community members. He reported that, over the year his company had owned the property, many of his employees had joined the Gerlach Volunteer Fire Department, became involved in some of the town's community service organizations, sought to engage with neighbors, and invited residents to the ranch and Christmas parties. He emphasized that such commitment would continue regardless of the outcome of the Board's voting on Agenda Items 13 and 14. He wanted everyone to understand that he and his employees wanted to be a part of the community for many years, intended to uphold their promises, and aimed to speak with anyone who had concerns.

Mr. Arth showed the *Questions* slide and thanked the Board for their time. He noted that his email address was listed on the slide and invited the Commissioners to contact him there at any time, noting that he would respond within 24 hours to address concerns. He welcomed questions from the Board and expressed excitement to discuss drones, munitions, the Iverson Ranch project, and the beautiful deserts of Nevada.

Chair Hill asked whether the Board had any questions for the applicant, and it was determined that there were none. She invited the appellant to present.

Marissa Fuhrman, a representative of the appellant, BMP, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Appeal Overview;

Burning Man Project; Untitled Map; Property Near the Iveson Ranch; NRS 278.147; Proposed Conditions; Burning Man Request.

Ms. Fuhrman introduced herself and displayed the *Burning Man Project* slide. She described BMP as a nonprofit organization that had held the Burning Man arts and culture event annually for many years, which attracted nearly 80,000 visitors to the Black Rock Desert. She showed the *Untitled Map* slide and reported that Burning Man owned several properties within the immediate vicinity of the Iveson Ranch project site. She explained that the slide showed BMP's three properties on the map, each depicted in different colors, with Fly Ranch highlighted in red. She displayed the slide titled *Property Near the Iveson Ranch*. She noted that the map on the slide provided additional context and showed the Iveson Ranch project in red, with Fly Geyser located approximately six miles southeast.

Ms. Fuhrman showed the *Proposed Conditions* slide. She stated that the protection and preservation of the subject area were at the forefront of Burning Man's involvement with the application in question, which had prompted several collaborative conversations with the applicant. She referred to earlier staff comments stating that certain conditions were jointly proposed at the November 20, 2025, PC meeting. She recalled that only two of the conditions were ultimately incorporated into the project's approval, which led BMP to quickly appeal the decision. She reported that collaborative conversations with the applicant and staff had continued following the appeal. She explained that two additional mutually agreed-upon conditions that had been discussed previously were identified during those conversations. She stated that BMP, the applicant, and staff were aligned on the two conditions provided in the staff-recommended modified conditions included in Attachment H of the appeal documents.

Ms. Fuhrman noted her desire to review both conditions for the record. She explained that the first condition was listed on the slide as *Proposed Condition (1y)* and applied to energetics. She recited that condition, which indicated that the applicant had proposed and consented to conditioning the hazmat SUP on the slide's listed limitations, which would also be reflected on the operation plan submitted to the TMFPD for any explosive permits. She described the second condition, listed as *Modified Condition (1v)*, which applied to the project's private airstrip. She read aloud the condition, which stated that airplane and drone flights on Sundays would not exceed five Sundays per year, at the applicant's discretion, except for medical evacuation flights, which were not included in that limitation. She noted that those conditions complied with Washoe County's statutory duty to appraise SUPs involving hazmat, which represented measures intended to protect the health and safety of County residents while further mitigating potential impacts from the proposed SUP. She believed that, based on the addition of the two previously mentioned conditions, all parties involved in the matter appeared comfortable proceeding with the SUP approval.

Ms. Fuhrman stated that, as a result of the mutual agreement, BMP respectfully requested that the BCC affirm the PC's approval of SUP Case Number WSUP25-0018 and recommended approval of the hazmat SUP with the modified

conditions of approval previously mentioned by staff and listed on the slide as *Modified Condition (1v)* and *Proposed Condition (1y)*. She expressed gratitude to the staff and the applicant, on behalf of Burning Man, for their very cooperative and collaborative efforts throughout the entire process, which enabled a suitable resolution. She concluded her presentation and noted her willingness to answer any questions.

Commissioner Andriola opined that the applicant and appellant were a model of working together. She disclosed, for full transparency, that she had met with both parties. She expressed her belief that it would be great if such collaboration between applicants and appellants occurred in every appeal case, noting that it would benefit all and serve as an example of working together.

Commissioner Clark stated that he had met with the applicant and his staff and opined that they had approached the matter properly. He noted that Mr. Arth's company would conduct very important research. He opined that they would be very good neighbors to the residents of the rural Gerlach community. He explained that the area needed fresh ideas, new residents, and additional jobs. He noted that the jobs Mr. Arth's company would create sounded more like careers, which he thought would be a good opportunity for Gerlach residents. He expressed his belief that the applicant and their staff would be involved with many local matters, such as firefighting and community service. He opined that supporting the applicant was a good opportunity for the BCC.

On the call for public comment, Katherine Yriarte stated that she had attended the Gerlach CAB meeting at which staff from the Iveson Ranch project had presented. She noted her agreement with Commissioner Andriola's earlier comments. She said it was great that the applicant and appellant reached an understanding. She stated that her intent to speak on the item was to advocate for the residents of Gerlach, noting that if they supported the approvals, then the Board elected to represent them should move forward with their wishes in mind, as the matter would directly impact those individuals throughout the year. She referred to earlier comments regarding the project's employment opportunities and said that it was a huge benefit for such a small town, noting that it demonstrated the County's responsibility to consider potential housing additions in the area. She stated that housing was a major challenge in that region and expressed hope that the project's development could be leveraged to encourage builders and contractors to consider constructing additional housing for residents.

Elisabeth Gambrell said she agreed with everything that had been said previously, noting that the process associated with Agenda Items 13 and 14 had been beautiful. She stated that Burning Man was very aware of how difficult it could be to operate in the Gerlach area and had a wonderful staff that looked into the matter. She said that many agreements in that area were sealed with handshakes, and she noted that such had occurred between Burning Man, the Iveson Ranch project, and the community, as the applicant had agreed to all conditions needed for residents to feel comfortable and had worked with BMP. She expressed belief that affirming the approval with the appellants proposals would be great for everyone in her community. She thanked staff for their hard work.

County Clerk Jan Galassini stated that emailed public comment was received and placed on file.

Commissioner Andriola noted that she would be happy to make the motion for Agenda Item 13 based on the Staff Report. She asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large whether she should make a large, combined motion for both Agenda Items 13 and 14. CDDA Large recommended that two separate motions be made, one for Agenda Item 13's approval and another for Agenda Item 14's hazmat SUP, so a vote could be taken for both motions.

Commissioner Andriola moved to affirm the decision of the PC approving WSUP25-0018, Iveson Ranch, and recommending approval to the BCC of the hazmat SUP. Commissioner Garcia seconded that motion.

Mr. Bronczyk explained that the slide titled *Possible Motions* from his earlier presentation included three motions, one of which was to affirm the PC's original approval of Case Number WSUP25-0018 as it stood, without any modifications. Commissioner Andriola requested that her previous motion be rescinded so she could include the amended conditions, and Commissioner Garcia noted that she would revoke her second on that motion.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was moved to affirm the decision of the Planning Commission approving WSUP25-0018 (Iveson Ranch) with the modifications set forth in the Conditions of Approval, adding a new condition 1y, and amending the language of condition 1v, based upon the ability to make all five of the special use permit findings required by Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30 and 110.810.42(d) based on the record and evidence presented.

26-0041 **AGENDA ITEM 14** To consider a hazardous materials special use permit for general industrial-heavy use type, to include explosives testing and use and storage of certain hazardous materials in the High Desert planning area, as required by NRS 278.147 and Washoe County Code section 110.810.42. The project site is a 320-acre parcel (APN 066-030-05) located at 2001 State Route 34. The applicant is BRDR Properties, LLC. The hazardous materials that are proposed to be on site have the following CAS numbers: 121-82-4 (RDX), 118-96-7 (TNT), 78-11-5 (PETN), 2691-41-0 (HMX), and 7790-98-9 (AP). (WSUP25-0018 Iveson Ranch). Virtual Public Comment Eligible. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

* * * * *

For additional discussion on this matter, please see Agenda Item 13, Minute Item Number 26-0040.

* * * * *

Chair Hill asked whether there was public comment on Agenda Item 14. County Clerk Jan Galassini explained that Elisabeth Gambrell had signed up to speak on the item, though she had already provided a comment on Agenda Item 13, which was heard simultaneously with Agenda Item 14.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was moved to approve a hazardous materials special use permit for BRDR Properties, Limited Liability Company (LLC) for Iveson Ranch to allow a general industrial-heavy use type, to include explosives testing and use and storage of certain hazardous materials on Assessor's Parcel Number 066-030-05, as required by Nevada Revised Statutes 278.147 and Washoe County Code Section 110.810.42, with the hazardous materials conditions of approval included in Exhibit E, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.42(d). The hazardous materials that are permitted to be on site have the following Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) numbers: 121-82-4 (RDX), 118-96-7 (TNT), 78-11-5 (PETN), 2691-41-0 (HMX), and 7790-98-9 (AP).

Chair Hill congratulated General Manager of Iveson Ranch and BRDR Properties, LLC, Mike Arth, for his collaborative work with the appellant on Agenda Item 13 and for his military service. She stated that it was an exciting day for Washoe County, and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was excited to be a part of his company's patriotic project.

26-0042 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0005 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0006 (Sun Valley 48 LLC).

Consideration of:

(1) The Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt amendments to the Washoe County Master Plan, Sun Valley Master Plan Land Use Map, (WMPA25-0005) to change the master plan land use designation on a ±17.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-52) and a ±1.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-53) from Suburban Residential (SR) to Urban Residential (UR) on ±14 acres and Open Space (OS) on ±4.4 acres; and if adopted, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect; and

(2) The Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt an amendment to the Sun Valley Regulatory Zone Map, to change the regulatory zoning on a ±17.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-52) and a ±1.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-53) from Medium Density Suburban (MDS-3 du/acre single family detached; or 5 du/acre single family attached & middle housing) to Low Density Urban (LDU -10 du/acre single family detached; or 14 du/acre for single family attached, multi-family, middle housing; or 12 du/acre mobile home park) on ±14 acres and Open Space (OS) on ±4.4 acres, subject to final approval of the associated master plan amendment and a

finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by regional planning authorities, and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect; and

(3) Subject to a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authorities, to adopt a resolution sponsoring an amendment to the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan to change the land designation of the subject parcel from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

The applicant is Sun Valley 48, LLC. The subject two parcels are located between 1st Avenue and 2nd Avenue at their western terminus and total 18.4 acres.

Following the public hearing, the Board of County Commissioners may adopt the proposed amendments; may modify the proposed amendments, however, modification of a master plan amendment must be referred back to the Planning Commission for its report in accordance with NRS 278.220(4); or may deny the proposed amendments. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Garcia said she appreciated the staff's time and wanted to hear input from the other Commissioners. She thanked Manhard Consulting Region and Entitlement Manager Chris Baker for his presentation to the Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) and noted that she had listened to the presentation, including the questions and concerns raised. She observed that Mr. Baker mentioned several times that the process involved changes to map colors and land-use information. She acknowledged the importance of balancing growth with infrastructure, noting that the project covered 10 square miles and affected over 20,000 people. She emphasized that she did not take the decision lightly, as it was her district and she lived just a few blocks away from the proposed project. She added that her daily experiences in the area made her more critical of the project.

Commissioner Andriola believed that the time spent preparing for meetings was important and reflected a dedication to thoroughly understanding as much information as possible. She shared that she watched the Sun Valley CAB meeting in its entirety and rewatched several portions of the discussion. She explained that balancing increased traffic and growth was challenging and was likely experienced across all districts. She mentioned that the Board often acted in a quasi-judicial role and emphasized the importance of everyone following the law. She clarified that the item presented was not for a current project, but rather a request to adopt a Master Plan Amendment (MPA) for Sun Valley. She stated that there needed to be awareness of future plans and their impact on the traffic

flow. She shared that she was involved in the approval process for the Highland Ranch, 5 Ridges project, where she observed how traffic flow was managed until a better traffic corridor could be established. She indicated that the density figure gave her pause and prompted further analysis. She believed that anyone who reviewed the information would recognize the substantial potential increase in traffic. She noted that although the item could continue through the process, she struggled to make all the required findings. She said she looked forward to hearing from others who had done extensive work on the 18 acres, some of which were designated as open space. She explained that after reviewing issues related to density, current development zoning, and the elementary school, she felt additional work was needed to ensure a balance between increased housing and the limitations of the dedicated space. She said that she struggled with the item.

Chair Hill stated that she understood the rest of the Board might not feel the same way, but she agreed with staff and the Planning Commission (PC) and could make the required findings. She felt that achieving improved public transit often required denser communities. She acknowledged that it could be difficult when infrastructure followed development. She shared that she faced a similar challenge in her district, balancing the need for adequate housing within a difficult tax system. She indicated that because she could meet the findings, she supported the PC's recommendation.

Commissioner Andriola asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large to clarify whether part of the procedural process for a change amendment included a regional planning review. CDDA Large explained that, as outlined in the Staff Report, the third part of Agenda Item 15 was subject to regional planning's conformance review.

Community Services Department (CSD) Planner Julee Olander confirmed that if Agenda Item 15 were approved by the Board, it would proceed to regional planning for review of conformance with the Master Plan. Commissioner Andriola mentioned that she served on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency Governing Board. She shared that she struggled with the item but understood the legal steps involved. She indicated that, depending on the circumstances and findings, projects could be halted to a certain extent. She emphasized her desire to ensure that the item would proceed through regional planning for conformance review first.

CDDA Large stated that the PC's recommendation to adopt the MPAs would go to regional planning for conformance review. He added that the second part of the item, reviewing the PC's recommendation to adopt the regulatory zone map, was a decision for the Board. He reiterated that the Board was deciding, as a matter of policy, whether to change the Master Plan. He stated that, depending on the Board's decision, the item would then proceed to regional planning for conformance review. Commissioner Andriola questioned why the item would not go through regional planning before going to the Board for the regulatory zone portion.

CDDA Large explained that, under the law, regional planning dealt with the Master Plan and overall issues. He added that regulatory zones fell exclusively under the

Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) authority, allowing the Board to set its own planning parameters. Commissioner Andriola emphasized the importance of the Board understanding the distinction between the two steps. She asked whether the item would proceed to regional planning to ensure conformance with the regional Master Plan. She acknowledged the second component regarding the regulatory zone amendment findings but questioned whether both steps would occur concurrently.

CSD Planning & Building Division Director Kelly Mullin noted that, in accordance with standard practice, when applications were received for both a Master Plan change and a zone change, the zone change was made subject to regional planning approval. She noted that if the Board chose not to authorize the MPA, the zone change would not proceed. Commissioner Andriola pointed out that if the item moved forward, regional planning would complete its legal process, and if they found it did not conform, action on the regulatory side would be moot. Ms. Mullin confirmed that Commissioner Andriola was correct.

Chair Hill believed both the County and Country were undergoing significant changes and that the Board was working to evolve as a community. She indicated that the BCC had discussed the housing crisis and recognized that more action was needed. She felt that considerable work had already been done regarding zoning changes. She thought there had been frustration on the Board, specifically regarding Agenda Item 15, which she saw as an opportunity to increase densities. She said that she could make the required findings and agreed with staff and the PC.

Commissioner Garcia stated that she did not believe the findings could be made but appreciated the efforts of staff and the applicant. She believed that, within the MPA, only two findings could be met. She explained that the area was currently labeled suburban, but the Master Plan clearly allowed mixed residential densities in Sun Valley. She added that facilities were available based on the General Improvement District's (GID) commitment to water and sewer. She said she struggled with the finding related to compatible land use. She explained that most of Sun Valley was suburban residential and that the surface streets were already struggling under the existing zoning. She identified several issues, including narrow roads, ditches, culverts, and limited lighting. She expressed concern that increased density in the area would adversely affect safety and welfare. In response to a point made by Chair Hill regarding affordable housing, she stated that she believed Sun Valley had already provided that or had proposed solutions. She explained that The Ridge at Sun Valley on First Avenue added 195 units and was adjacent to the proposed property. She noted that the project on Chocolate Drive was proposing 240 units in the same area. She described the location of the proposal and observed that the open space and a nearby mountain contributed to a high density. She shared that the City of Reno had recently approved more than 400 units on Dandini Boulevard with no maximum density. She noted that overarching conditions, including construction on United States (US) Highway 395 and Pyramid Highway, were impacting Sun Valley. She explained that people were bypassing heavy traffic by going through Sun Valley, which she felt was never-ending. She described the increased congestion on Sun Valley Boulevard as tremendous. She added that, while serving on the Regional Transportation

Commission (RTC) Board, she had advocated, at the federal level, funding to make infrastructure improvements along Sun Valley Boulevard. She shared that a potential grant was being submitted for an \$88 million infrastructure project. She stated that the 5 Ridges project, located in Sparks' jurisdiction, had a significant impact on the Highland Ranch area and contributed to congestion extending into Spanish Springs. She noted the uncertainty surrounding Scottsdale Road and potential future projects adjacent to the open land. She opined that the finding related to the desired pattern of growth could not be made, and the existing suburban residential zoning was appropriate for the area. She explained that the highly concentrated area added pressure to existing County roads, and the proposed area, backing up to the mountains, did not allow traffic to be dispersed across large parcels. She indicated that increased traffic congestion would create safety concerns due to the lack of sidewalks and streetlights. She shared that the principal at Lois Allen Elementary School was concerned that students would walk to school through ditches and culverts. She said that she was not opposed to increased density, as she loved living in the urban residential area. She concluded that, based on the current information, she could not make the findings for the MPA but was open to further discussion if misinformation was presented.

Mr. Baker suggested that infrastructure and land-use changes were the Board's primary concerns. He explained that the lengthy process included a voluntary neighborhood meeting and the Sun Valley CAB meeting, which Commissioner Garcia attended virtually. He indicated that he had received substantial public comments and believed that reviewing the presentation would help the Board understand the big picture and the thought process.

Chris Baker from Manhard Consulting conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: APN085-010-52 & 085-010-53; Location; Land Use Designations; Existing Approval, Requests; Land Use Designations; Area Changes; Meets All Findings; and Q&A.

Mr. Baker reviewed the slide titled *APN 085-010-52 & 085-010-53* and said the Board should be familiar with the location adjacent to Lois Allen Elementary School. He pointed out the locations of First and Second Avenues on the slide. He reviewed the slide titled *Land Use Designations* and explained that the existing land use designations were suburban residential and medium-density suburban (MDS).

Mr. Baker reviewed the slide titled *Existing Approval* and said that approval was issued in 2022 for 48 residential single-family lots. He noted that much had changed since then and that the land use reflected a minimum of a 10-year plan. He reminded the Board that the Master Plan was frequently updated and emphasized that many of the current findings pertained to future plans rather than existing conditions. He noted that the current Master Plan might not align with regional planning's projections for future growth and stressed that failing to keep up could jeopardize future project funding. He shared the importance of considering the findings and future plans when making decisions, rather than focusing solely on current conditions. He agreed that no project was presently in place and thought that might be the case until adequate infrastructure was available, reinforcing the need to stay ahead of changes for future projects.

Mr. Baker reviewed the slide titled *Area Changes* and said the picture on the left reflected information from 2022, showing 48 residential single-family detached lots. He shared that Chocolate Drive had undergone a MPA and zoning map amendment, which the BCC approved. He mentioned that the dwelling units per acre increased from three to a minimum of 21. He indicated that the property east of the elementary school changed from a public facility zone to 21 dwelling units per acre. He said that the City of Reno property to the south had uncapped density, with approximately 400 residential units currently in progress. He stated that adjustments had been made and the proposal would need to be modified. He indicated that the Board had made zoning changes around the proposed project, which would make it difficult to progress if the zoning could not be amended. He said there had been many meetings with the RTC and that, prior to the conceptual alignment for the extension, US Highway 395 originally went directly through the property. He recalled that, at that time, no one realized the plans crossed both private and public property immediately to the west. He shared that the transportation plan was modified as recently as September because the increased density was seen as an allowance to provide access points. He stated that without sufficient density, future funding would not be available.

Mr. Baker reviewed the slide titled *Meets All Findings* and said that the PC staff agreed that the report supported meeting all findings. He noted that, regarding infrastructure, Commissioner Garcia had no issue with the GIDs. He explained that the proposed area was in a US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-designated area, one of the last undeveloped parcels eligible for federal subsidies. He recognized that the Board's goal was to provide affordable housing but noted that being unable to approve an increase in density in a government-designated area could be problematic. He shared that the Board had previously approved projects in surrounding properties and emphasized that achieving some of the Board's goals would be difficult without aligning with staff and the PC's findings. He emphasized the importance of focusing on future plans and noted that all supporting plans for the item were already in place.

Chair Hill recalled when the Chocolate Drive project came before the Board when only she and Vice Chair Herman were on the BCC. She indicated that the decision was controversial, as the Cities of Reno and Sparks reportedly opposed the increased density, and approval required extensive negotiations. She believed that planning needed to be approached differently and observed that many in the County had differing opinions regarding increased density. She agreed with Commissioner Garcia that County roads were a concern and that having children in high-traffic areas posed a safety risk. She indicated that there had been extensive discussions with the RTC regarding those issues and emphasized that the Board needed to consider how to address them. She added that, without property tax (p-tax) revenue, addressing the concerns would be difficult and that insufficient density could hinder securing federal funding for public transportation. She acknowledged that the discussion did not directly relate to her district and that she did not want to oppose Commissioner Garcia's wishes. She said that when commenting on bringing additional housing to the area, she wanted to ensure her actions aligned with her

statements and felt it was important to share the reasoning behind her decision to support the item.

Commissioner Andriola said that she concurred with most of Chair Hill's remarks. She expressed disappointment that an item regarding special improvement districts (SIDs) and strategies to prioritize infrastructure had been pulled from the meeting, noting that she and staff had worked on it for over a year. She believed that attainable housing was a priority, not only for Washoe County, but also nationally. She said that she did not recall hearing during the Sun Valley CAB meeting that HUD had designated the proposed parcel for federal subsidies, which she considered an important point. She recognized Mr. Baker's earlier statement that circumstances had changed, even though 48 potential units existed and were being expanded. She mentioned that she prided herself on consistently following the law and process, recognizing that the Board was acting in a quasi-judicial role. She felt reassured that the regulatory zone issue would become moot if regional planning determined that the project did not conform to their master plan. She expressed her appreciation for the regional planning team, describing them as highly capable and well-equipped to analyze the project for accuracy. She noted that she would support the item.

Mr. Baker explained that the MPA would proceed to regional planning. He indicated that any future project would require a SUP. He noted that in that instance, the requirements for the findings would differ and include an analysis of actual trips taken. He informed that the matter would need to return to the PC for approval at that time. He stated that such findings would assess whether the roads were compatible with existing uses and whether the infrastructure was in place, rather than planned for the future. He clarified that water and sewer were currently available, but traffic had not been analyzed. He stated that, from a project-specific standpoint, analyzing traffic was not required. He said that because traffic was a recognized concern, an initiative was taken to analyze the traffic on Second Avenue. He referenced that the Board had previously approved an increase in trips taken via Chocolate Drive on Second Avenue. He explained that traffic would need to be analyzed regionally for any future project-specific approvals. He felt that the Board struggled with the item due to the lack of a traffic study, but noted it was not a finding that needed to be met for Agenda Item 15.

County Clerk Jan Galassini advised the Board that she received an emailed public comment, which was placed on file.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Commissioner Garcia voting no, it was moved to: (1) Adopt Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0005, to adopt an amendment to the Sun Valley Master Plan Land Use Map, which is a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, to change the master plan land use designation on ± 17.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-52) and on a ± 1.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-53) from Suburban Residential (SR) to Urban Residential (UR) on a ± 14 acres and to Open Space (OS) on ± 4.4 acres; and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment A to the staff report to that effect. In making the motion, the Board is able to make the findings, as outlined in the staff report,

for the master plan amendment as required by Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d);

(2) Adopt, subject to final approval of the associated Master Plan Amendment and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0006, which, amends the Sun Valley Regulatory Zone Map, to change the regulatory zoning on a ±17.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-52) and on a ±1.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-53) from Medium Density Suburban (MDS-3 du/acre single family detached or 5 du/acre single family attached or middle housing) to Low Density Urban (LDU -10 du/acre single family detached; or 14 du/acre for single family attached, multi-family, and middle housing; or 12 du/acre manufactured home park) on ±14 acres and to Open Space (OS) on ±4.4 acres; and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment B to the staff report to that effect. In making the motion, the Board is able to make the findings, as outlined in the staff report, for the regulatory zone amendment as required by Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d);

(3) Adopt and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained as Attachment C to the staff report to initiate an amendment to the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan to change the designation of the subject parcels (APNs: 085- 010-52 & 53) from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

Chair Hill thanked CDDA Large for his help in reading the third part of the motion. She said the next step would be with regional planning, and the Board would continue to work on similar issues.

26-0043 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Two- Area Plan Regulations to establish standards for permanent employee housing in the High Desert Planning Area; to allow permanent employee housing on parcels zoned General Rural (GR) within the High Desert Planning Area at a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres as an allowed use; and to allow permanent employee housing on such parcels at a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres with the approval of a special use permit; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

In making its determination, the Board shall either affirm, modify, or reject the findings of fact included in the Planning Commission's recommendation. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1752, Bill No. 1944.

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

On the call for public comment, Elizabeth Gambrel thanked the Board for their efforts on items affecting Gerlach, noting significant progress had been made. She

suggested that changes to the High Desert Planning Areas would benefit not only Iveson Ranch but also ranchers, farmers, and entrepreneurs by making housing more accessible. She highlighted the long-standing housing shortage in Gerlach and noted the challenges with planning and special use permits (SUPs), making it difficult to build a home or move a trailer in. She indicated that it could take up to two years to build a new abode. She expressed her support for Agenda Item 16 and emphasized that the changes were critical to help the community provide housing for workers and move toward a better future.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1752, Bill No. 1944, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

26-0044 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three- Regulation of Uses, Division Four- Development Standards, and Division Nine- General Provisions. These amendments include adding various sections to: establish small lot residential development standards and establish infill residential and commercial development standards. These amendments also include amending various sections to: include an example of the multi-family, minor residential use type and allow cottage courts on multiple parcels; modify the maximum size of attached and detached accessory dwelling units from 50% to 80% of the size of the main dwelling; modify the maximum floor area from 1,000 square feet to 1,200 square feet for cottage court developments; specify that only one community accessory structure is allowed for every four (4) cottages in a cottage court development; clarify the calculation of setbacks for cottage court developments; modify lot and yard standards for common open space developments; add various definitions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

In making its determination, the Board shall either affirm, modify or reject the findings of fact included in the Planning Commission's recommendation. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1753, Bill No. 1943.

Chair Hill asked whether the Board desired a presentation, and it was determined that none was needed.

On the call for public comment, Pat Davison, a resident of District 5, stated that she approved of Agenda Item 17. Chair Hill shared her appreciation that Ms. Davison approved of the item.

Dave Snelgrove said that he supported Agenda Item 17. He noted his involvement with the Development Code Amendments (DCAs) for the Iveson Ranch

projects and referenced the extensive discussions regarding housing. He believed that Agenda Item 17 would help create affordable housing in appropriate locations and encouraged the Board to support the item. Chair Hill thanked Mr. Snelgrove for his service on the Planning Commission (PC).

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1753, Bill No. 1943, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

26-0045 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Election of Chair of the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners. (All Commission Districts.)

* * * * * * * * * *

Chair Hill announced that Agenda Items 18 and 19 would be heard together. For discussion on Agenda Item 19, please see Agenda Item 18, Minute Item Number 25-0045.

* * * * * * * * * *

Chair Hill reminded that Agenda Items 18 and 19 would be heard together. She thanked the Board for allowing her to serve as Chair. Vice Chair Herman noted that there were challenging events at the beginning of Chair Hill's term as the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) Chair; however, she had never seen a Chair learn quicker or make more positive changes than Chair Hill. She felt that Chair Hill had done a great job and thanked her for her work.

Commissioner Garcia explained that the first six months after her swearing-in as a Commissioner were difficult for the County; however, Chair Hill demonstrated calm professionalism that kept the BCC on schedule. She believed that Chair Hill was kindhearted and highly dedicated to the County. She speculated that the BCC did not always work harmoniously; however, under Chair Hill's leadership, the County progressed. She opined that Chair Hill had challenging days, but even on days when her integrity was questioned, she upheld decorum and a high standard for the Board to conduct business. She commended Chair Hill for her strength, positivity, and assistance.

Commissioner Andriola echoed Vice Chair Herman's and Commissioner Garcia's comments and added that she believed it took a real leader to pivot and make changes. She said that the Commissioners equally cared about the community and asserted that she had witnessed Chair Hill grow as a Commissioner. She speculated that the Board could learn much from Chair Hill regarding her ability to handle difficult situations while treating everyone equally. She commended Chair Hill's parents for raising her to be a good and caring person. She explained that everyone's voice counted, even when opinions differed. Chair Hill indicated that it had been a joy to serve as the BCC Chair and thanked the Board for the opportunity.

Commissioner Clark reported that the Board had significantly improved since June, and said he appreciated the changes that had occurred. He recalled that he had not been interrupted on the dais in months. Chair Hill believed that the Board was cordial because they were there to serve the community. She expressed excitement about the County's future and new leadership. She recommended that Commissioner Andriola be elected Chair and Commissioner Garcia be elected Vice Chair.

Commissioner Garcia thanked and recognized Vice Chair Herman. She expressed that it had been an honor to sit next to and work with Vice Chair Herman over the years. She believed that Vice Chair Herman had a wealth of knowledge and was generous in serving the community. She expressed appreciation for Vice Chair Herman and her leadership. She recalled the enjoyment of working with Vice Chair Herman at the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and said she witnessed Vice Chair Herman's energy while networking. She commented that she respected Vice Chair Herman tremendously and thanked her for her years of service. Chair Hill said that she loved working with Vice Chair Herman.

Commissioner Clark requested the history and rationale for extending the Chair's term from one to two years. He believed that the Board should revert to a one-year term because if the Chair served for two years, there was little likelihood that other Commissioners would be able to serve as Chair during their elected cycle. He asserted that it was not about who the Chair was but the district they represented. He recommended that the BCC reanalyze the decision to extend the Chair's term to two years, as part of new leadership and in the spirit of cooperation. He said that the elected Chair could be reelected after one year and serve two terms. He noted that he did not have an issue with the same person being reelected repeatedly as Chair because it was part of the election process; however, he did not agree with a two-year term. He asked that the term discussion occur at a future meeting and, if passed, retroactively change the elected Chair's term to one year.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas indicated that, according to the BCC's Rules of Procedure, Section 5.3.1, the two-year term was changed in January of 2021. She explained that the Chair and Vice Chair term procedure could be changed or modified under the Rules of Procedure, as a procedural change. Commissioner Clark asked which meeting the change occurred at and requested copies of the minutes for his own review. CDDA Large reiterated that the change occurred at the January 13, 2021, BCC meeting. He believed that a change in the Rules of Procedure was decided to coincide with legislative sessions. He reiterated that the Board could modify the Rules of Procedure at a future meeting to change the Chair term to one year or to create automatic ascension from Vice Chair to Chair.

Commissioner Andriola noted that Vice Chair Herman demonstrated exceptional commitment and provided unwavering care for her district. She believed that Vice Chair Herman should be honored for the work she performed and that she was a great listener and fair. Chair Hill said that it did not matter whether someone was a Chair or Vice Chair, but rather how they led their district.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Commissioner Andriola be elected as the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners and Commissioner Garcia be elected as the Vice Chair of the Board of County Commissioners.

Chair Hill asked if Commissioner Andriola would lead the Board into Agenda Item 20 as Chair. CM Thomas indicated that the Board could do so if they wished; however, the seating change was planned to take effect at the following meeting. Chair Hill noted that she would sign the documents for the current meeting as Chair. CM Thomas indicated that Chair Hill concluding the meeting as Chair would be the most efficient.

26-0046 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Election of Vice-Chair of the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners. (All Commissions Districts.)

* * * * * * * * * *

For discussion on Agenda Item 19, please see Agenda Item 18, Minute Item Number 25-0045.

* * * * * * * * * *

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Commissioner Garcia be elected as Vice Chair of the Board of County Commissioners.

26-0047 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

26-0048 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Garcia thanked her fellow Commissioners for a productive meeting during which they discussed many complex topics. She shared her gratitude for the strong leadership of Chair Hill and Vice Chair Herman. She requested to remain at her current seating arrangement at the dais, next to Vice Chair Herman.

Chair Hill said that she would sit in Commissioner Andriola's spot at the dais next to Commissioner Clark.

Commissioner Andriola echoed Commissioner Garcia's sentiments and thanked her fellow Commissioners for the unanimous vote, which she said was meaningful. She stated that she looked forward to working with Commissioner Garcia and hoped to

work with Chair Hill and Vice Chair Herman to gain insight during her transition into the Chair role.

Commissioner Clark requested additional information regarding the pilot Safe Parking Program, including how many individuals used the six parking spaces, the length of their stays, the number of individuals per vehicle, how secondary passengers were identified, and why Our Place was selected as the pilot location. He congratulated the new Chair and Vice Chair of the Board and said that he looked forward to working with them. He added that he looked forward to sitting next to Chair Hill.

Chair Hill said 2026 would be a great year.

* * * * *

2:38 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
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk*