

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

NOVEMBER 18, 2025

PRESENT:

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

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

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

**25-0794      AGENDA ITEM 3 Invocation.**

Mr. Jason Guinasso provided the invocation.

**25-0795      AGENDA ITEM 4A1 General Update from Truckee Meadows Fire & Rescue, Chief Richard J. Edwards may be available to provide the Board of County Commissioners a verbal report on fuel management and emergency planning, and any other updates as requested monthly to the board, to update to the community related to fire activities. (All Commission Districts.)**

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards greeted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and described his intent to provide an update on the TMFPD's fuel mitigation and fire prevention efforts during the previous few weeks. He reported that during the fall, the TMFPD initiated the commencement of the organization's green waste recycling program, which resulted in the disposal of a total of 894 loads of green waste. He explained that over 700 of the 894 total loads came from the Washoe Valley and Silver Lake areas. He opined that the program results contributed hugely to the TMFPD's efforts for fuels reduction and increasing community safety. He noted that the 894 loads of green waste equated to over 4,200 cubic yards of material. He expressed the TMFPD's gratitude for the organization's partners at Waste Management (WM), who had donated 16 large dumpsters to help personnel offload a substantial amount of material. He explained that the TMFPD was looking forward to conducting another green waste program in three months, during the spring, for those who had not been able to participate in the previous opportunity to engage with the program.

Chief Edwards reported that the TMFPD had also initiated a curbside chipping program in the fall, where the organization serviced 100 properties. He noted that the curbside chipping program was for those who were elderly or disabled and could not physically attend the recycling events. He explained that the TMFPD would come to a person's location to chip their excess green waste material instead. He opined that the curbside chipping program was a great service to the community, which bolstered citizens' fire prevention efforts and fuel mitigation plans. He reported that the TMFPD had also expanded the open burning season, which had previously only spanned two months. He noted that the open burning season began on November 3, 2025, and would last until April 30, 2026. He explained that the TMFPD encouraged those who were able, provided they had an approved permit on a permissible burn day, to burn so that the mitigation efforts could be completed in a controlled environment during favorable conditions. He explained that good conditions for open burns were on rainy days with low fire risk. He noted that those seeking more information on open burns could visit the TMFPD's website, where additional details on the open burning process would be listed on the homepage.

Chief Edwards stated that his final update for the Board was that the TMFPD was partnering with the Truckee Meadows Firefighter Foundation on neighborhood Santa Claus parades and a toy drive. He explained that the goal was to collect toys for those who were less fortunate and for those at the Ronald McDonald House. He reported that the parades would take place nightly for five consecutive nights, from December 11, 2025, to December 15, 2025, beginning at 6:00 p.m. each day at a different neighborhood firehouse. He explained that additional information regarding those events was available on the TMFPD's website. He stated that the TMFPD would love everyone to get to know their local firefighters by attending the parades and sharing in the holiday festivities. He noted that the organization would be collecting toys at each of the TMFPD firehouses until December 15, 2025. He encouraged anyone who wanted to drop off unwrapped toys to do so at those firehouse collection locations.

Chair Hill stated that Chief Edwards' updates were great, and she expressed her love for the parade idea and the efforts to ensure the community could learn about their different fire stations while supporting children in need. She thanked Chief Edwards for his leadership in those events.

Commissioner Clark thanked Chief Edwards for his very informative report. He referred to Chief Edwards' mention that WM had collaborated with the TMFPD by donating dumpsters, and he recalled that he had mentioned during a previous BCC meeting that he had brought a load of waste to one of the TMFPD's green waste recycling events, and the workers had done a great job unloading the trailer. He stated that those events were all about fire prevention and that Chief Edwards was doing a good job in that regard. He opined that the extended open burn season was another excellent idea that would aid in fire prevention. He noted that those efforts would ensure that the green waste surrounding people's properties and outbuildings could be removed, which would also clean the area by eliminating dead brush, bushes, and branches to be chipped and recycled elsewhere. He inquired if he was correct in presuming that the TMFPD was recycling and

finding other ways to utilize some of the large piles of chipped green waste materials he had seen.

Chief Edwards confirmed that portions of green waste that did not contain a large quantity of soil or other materials had been chipped and subsequently used for mulch or decorative landscaping. Commissioner Clark thanked Chief Edwards for repurposing the green waste. He commended Chief Edwards' work on community outreach and involvement, noting that he had seen him regularly at various events. He thought it was important for the community to have someone who represented the TMFPD's leadership, and he thanked Chief Edwards for attending all of the organization's events.

Chair Hill thanked Vice Chair Herman for requesting that updates from Chief Edwards be regularly provided during BCC meetings.

**25-0796      AGENDA ITEM 5 Public Comment.**

Mr. Fred Hinnners introduced himself as the unpaid Executive Director of the Family Counseling Service of Northern Nevada (FCSNN), which he shared had served the County for 66 years. He said people might be aware of the FCSNN from their Aly's Prom Closet program, which provided dresses, tuxedos, and accessories for high school students who might not be able to afford them. He added that the FCSNN operated the Summer of Healing sexual abuse treatment program for 25 years. He explained that the Summer of Healing program took sexually abused children to a camp at Eagle Lake for therapy. He advised that it was a transformative and extraordinarily helpful experience for the children. He reported that in 2025, the FCSNN worked with veterans' groups to do a complete makeover of the home of a disabled veteran who had been abused by family members. Mr. Hinnners said the FCSNN organized intensive cleaning, structural repairs, new appliances, and a live-in caregiver to assist the veteran. Mr. Hinnners revealed that the FCSNN assisted thousands of middle-class County residents with low-cost credit counseling and bankruptcy preparation for decades. He disclosed that their focus had more recently shifted to assisting individuals in poverty. He described the representative payee program operated by the FCSNN and noted that the scope of their assistance went much further than that program. He disclosed that, as much as they were able, they provided snacks, clothing, and hygiene products. He added that the FCSNN provided intensive case management as needed, and he shared that a grant from the State allowed them to take on truly difficult cases in the County. He summarized that the FCSNN had the training, experience, and extensive knowledge of resources to make positive differences in people's lives. He expressed his surprise that the Human Services Agency (HSA) canceled the \$70,000 annual grant that made the representative payee program possible. He commented that the FCSNN was meticulous in its record-keeping and extremely responsive to requests for information. He was not aware of any complaints from the FCSNN clients, and he said a recently conducted audit did not contain any negative findings. He shared that the FCSNN began the first representative payee program in the area more than 25 years ago and had served challenged individuals ever since. He observed that a few other programs had come and gone over the years, and he advised that the reimbursement rates of Social Security and Veterans Affairs (VA) made such programs almost unsustainable. He stated that the

FCSNN currently had 150 payee clients and did not want to lose their ability to help those individuals. He reasoned that the \$70,000 the FCSNN received was a tiny fraction of the County's budget, and mentioned that keeping their program intact would save many lives.

Mr. Terry Brooks shared an original poem on the topic of gender discrimination in the workplace. He recounted experiences from his employment history, the majority of which exemplified unequal treatment of men and women.

Ms. Amy Pulver informed the Board of her intention to address Agenda Item 12, which she observed was specified on the Agenda as being for discussion only. She explained the item as a request from the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 base budget to be equal to the combined current FY 2026 budget, adjusted appropriately to account for future contractual obligations. She noted that the FY 2027 Washoe County Library System (WCLS) budget would be fully within the County General Fund in FY 2027. She said that she had attended all regular and special meetings of the LBT since November 2024. She viewed many of the meetings as chaotic and ill-managed, and she opined that they breached rules of civility. She recalled a meeting in which three library staff members left in tears at different times in reaction to statements made by LBT members. She described that she had worked in the public sector for decades and had been through many contentious and heated public meetings, but she was shocked at the lack of professionalism exhibited by some LBT members. She discerned that improvements began when Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro added oversight of the WCLS to his other duties. Ms. Pulver said that she had seen ACM Solaro work with library staff, board members, and the public over several months. She felt that he treated everyone with kindness, courtesy, respect, and patience, and his work was thorough and transparent. She advised that ACM Solaro explained budget scenarios numerous times and answered multiple questions, sometimes many times. She recounted that he listened to hundreds of comments from the public and helped the LBT reach consensus on a base budget for the WCLS. She shared that ACM Solaro and his staff prepared cogent presentations with multiple scenarios and different assumptions to arrive at the recommendation that was now supported by the LBT. She expressed her support for the budget recommendation and urged the Commissioners to accept the recommendation at the appropriate time. She believed that the recommendation faithfully reflected community sentiment about the WCLS, acknowledged the reality of the County's tight financial situation, and would provide a good starting point for the new library director once they were in place.

Ms. Kaniz Tasmim of Coral Academy spoke about the prevalence of corruption in governments worldwide. She listed the top ten most corrupt countries as reported by *U.S. News & World Report*, and specified that the rankings were derived from the Corruption Perceptions Index devised by Transparency International. She provided examples from Bangladesh of what could happen when people stopped tolerating corruption in their country. She described how dissent in Bangladesh began as peaceful protests but escalated to raids, and the actions of dissidents were met with retaliation from the government in the form of violence and turning off cell towers to prevent the spread of information. Ms. Tasmim opined that although it might not be possible to control the rise

in corruption, people should try. She clarified that her comments were not directed towards any Commissioners.

Ms. Daniela Marquez of Coral Academy advised that she would be talking about the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). She asked the Board to imagine a chessboard where every piece represented a life, a family, and a dream. She said ICE agents were tasked with enforcing immigration law amidst that game, but with real human lives and families rather than chess pieces. She acknowledged that the job of ICE agents was to detain individuals without proper documentation, but she countered that behind every arrest was a mother, a father, or a child who was separated from their family. She argued that those residents, although sometimes without proper documentation, helped the community and the Country develop. She stated that America was built by immigrants. She shared that, according to the Pew Research Center, 51.9 million immigrants lived in the United States (US) as of June 2025, making up 15.4 percent of the Nation's population. She said immigrants, including undocumented immigrants, were not criminals and were, in fact, less likely to commit crimes than US-born residents. She described that immigrants were people with dreams and goals, and some were hard workers who tried to achieve a better future through building houses, schools, apartments, and other structures that were needed in communities. She commented that some immigrants were students who were forced to abandon their education. She felt that what she mentioned was not just stories; it showed what the US had become. She said families were being torn apart and people were living in fear. She encouraged people to remember that the US Constitution protected every person in the US regardless of their documentation status, which she concluded proved that ICE was breaking the law. She believed that without ICE, people could work together to help one another. She spoke about the protections enshrined in the Bill of Rights, particularly the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments. She summarized that all people had equal rights, regardless of their past.

Ms. Genesis Fajardo of Coral Academy wondered how it felt to be the singer Bad Bunny at that time. She supposed that some people might say that it was the best month of his life because he was just named the headliner for the Super Bowl, but others might say it was his worst month because of the controversy surrounding the decision. Ms. Fajardo questioned whether Bad Bunny should be able to perform at the Super Bowl, and she determined that he should be able to because he was an American citizen, 600 million people in the world spoke Spanish, and his music had broad appeal. She hoped to convince anyone who doubted whether he deserved to perform at the Super Bowl. She understood that many people who opposed his upcoming Super Bowl performance claimed that he was not a US citizen and should therefore not be able to perform. She viewed those people as being very mistaken because his home country of Puerto Rico was part of the US, and all residents of Puerto Rico, including Bad Bunny, were US citizens. Additionally, she observed that many past Super Bowl performers, including Shakira, The Weeknd, Rihanna, and Coldplay, were not US citizens. She felt that everyone should be allowed to perform regardless of their citizenship. She advocated for supporting non-US citizens and helping everyone feel welcome. She said that some people were upset because all of Bad Bunny's lyrics were in Spanish, and they thought Super Bowl performers should only sing in English. Ms. Fajardo argued in support of choosing a

Spanish-language headliner because the National Football League (NFL) was trying to reach a bigger audience, and what was once known as an American sport was becoming a worldwide sport. She invited the Commissioners to imagine how many people the NFL would be able to reach on the day of Bad Bunny's Super Bowl halftime performance. She theorized that there might be more opportunities in the future to welcome other performers who spoke different languages and attracted increasingly diverse NFL audiences. She recommended embracing other cultures. She claimed that everyone danced to Bad Bunny's music, even if they did not know what they were dancing to. She concluded that people should let loose and enjoy the entertaining free concert and the diversity the NFL was choosing to support. She hoped Bad Bunny would pave the way for more artists to perform, regardless of the language in which they performed.

Ms. Eliza Rouse of Coral Academy said that the US was a melting pot of many different races and cultures. She believed the presidency should reflect the best of the Country, but she questioned whether it did. She opined that citizens should represent diversity by choosing presidents from different backgrounds. She observed that after almost 250 years, 98 percent of US presidents were white males, and most shared the same ancestor, King John of England. She specified that she did not object to the leadership of white males, but she felt the Country also needed people with different experiences and ideas to be president. She shared that when a child read a book or watched a movie that reflected them, they felt inspired to do great things. She did not think that kind of representation was common enough. She said a study from Cable News Network (CNN) showed that 84 percent of people in Generation Z and Generation Alpha felt discouraged about pursuing a career in politics. Ms. Rouse argued that electing more diverse presidents would help create a more confident, trusting, and diverse generation. She hoped that US citizens would do their part in future elections to elect a diversity of presidents. She defined diversity as differences in age, gender, abilities, religions, and backgrounds. She remarked that the US was supposed to be one of the most diverse countries, but she encouraged people to think about what was happening in the Country and how diversity was being destroyed. She reasoned that by electing diverse presidents, the problem could be fixed for the next generation, which would enable the children and grandchildren of everyone in attendance at the meeting to feel empowered to pursue their dreams instead of fearful.

Chair Hill commended Coral Academy for having its students attend and provide public comment at the BCC meeting. She said it helped them participate in representative democracy. She congratulated the students and invited them to come back.

Mr. Adam Schifferdecker thanked Ms. Marquez for her public comment about ICE. He said he was in attendance to speak about the proposed grant that would remodel the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) to create space for ICE. He wanted people to consider what it meant to make room for an agency like ICE in the County. He believed decisions like that did not just reshape buildings; they reshaped communities. He predicted that building space for ICE within local law enforcement would further blur a line that many families already feared crossing, and that people who were already vulnerable would retreat. He stated that victims of violence would think twice before reporting, and witnesses who could solve crimes would choose silence instead. He

expected that workers who experienced harm would not speak up because they could not know what the response from law enforcement would be. He identified that the problem was not mistrust of law enforcement itself, but fear that local officers would be tied to agents who took people away for reasons unrelated to public safety. He outlined that the remodel might seem small on paper, but it would have consequences that reached far beyond a renovated room. He recalled stories from other cities of unmarked cars, masked agents, and questionable detainments. He reasoned that those practices built fear, not safety, and damaged the trust law enforcement depended on to do its job effectively. He summarized that safety without trust was not real safety, and justice that people were too afraid to access was not justice. He thought that if residents could not seek help without calculating the risk, the community was moving in the wrong direction. He asked the Commissioners to consider not just the monetary cost of the grant, but the human cost. He urged them to reject the grant and instead support efforts to strengthen trust, dignity, and real safety for everyone who called Washoe County home.

Ms. Jessica Ruano introduced herself as a 41-year-old single mother of four. She reported that she had been a driver with the Keolis transportation company for seven years. She disclosed that she was also from the CrossRoads program and divulged that approximately ten years ago, she got in trouble for having some drugs in her pockets. She informed that Officer Wickman became her probation officer, and she described ongoing harassment from Officer Wickman and his wife since that time. She stated her willingness to undergo a polygraph test to prove the truth of her reports. She expressed her frustration with the ongoing problems and with people not listening to her.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Ruano for her comments and asked for a member of staff to follow up with her.

Mr. Nicholas St. Jon displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He expressed frustration because the timer for his three-minute speaking allowance had begun before his documents had been distributed to the Board. He indicated that his document reflected the cast-vote records (CVR) from the 2020 general election and represented the actual results of votes that were cast. He alleged that the election had been described as the most free, fair, and secure election to date, and that he would prove otherwise. He stated that he provided the Board with a limited number of pages, specifically the first, second, third, and last pages of his document. He explained that the page without a date at the top, and the following page with the date CVR export 20201117, were part of the document created in March 2020. He indicated that another document, which included a header, was from 2021 and had been created in March 2025. He noted that the sequential numbers on the left of the document represented the numbers assigned as votes were cast and counted. He pointed out various inconsistencies that he had discovered. He suggested that more than 98 percent of all CVR numbers had changed since that election. He directed the Board to review the last page of his packet, where he believed the numbers showed discrepancies, including an additional 1,682 records. He expressed concern that no one was troubled by the information he presented.

Ms. Tara de Quiroz displayed documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that the data she presented came from the most recent survey conducted by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), which she noted was the federal agency that oversaw museums and libraries. She noted that the first graph showed funding levels for the WCLS, in comparison to other libraries serving populations of 400,000 to 600,000 people. She indicated that her list was comprehensive and ranked the total budget per person for similarly sized libraries from the highest to the lowest. She reported that funding for Washoe County libraries was approximately \$34 per person, while the national average was about \$53 per person. She mentioned that her graph reported the number of books per person in each library system, and added that Washoe County ranked near the bottom, with 0.60 books per person, which was less than half the national average. She displayed a graph that showed electronic books (e-books) per person across libraries and indicated that Washoe County fell below that mark. She explained that Washoe County libraries had 0.07 e-books per person, whereas the national average was more than ten times higher at 0.80 books per person. She examined how Washoe County libraries compared to other libraries within Nevada. She stated that the two graphs she presented in her document included all Nevada libraries that reported data to the IMLS, where Washoe County was again ranked relatively low. She indicated that the budget was \$34.19 per person, while the Statewide average was \$85.68 per person. She noted that the document that showed the number of books per person for Nevada libraries indicated that Washoe County was near the bottom. She said that the State average was more than eight times the number of books per person in Washoe County. Regarding the last graph she displayed, she stated that it showed the number of e-books per person for Nevada libraries, with Washoe County near the bottom at 0.08 books per person, while the Statewide average was 2.05 books per person. She explained that maintaining a flat budget provided only the bare minimum. She added that libraries were not businesses, and that the return on investment for funding libraries in Washoe County needed to compare favorably with other departments. She felt that libraries were a great investment.

Ms. Elizabeth Estes said that she was the business manager for the FCSNN and had been with the agency for nearly 20 years. She indicated that a previous speaker, Mr. Hinnners, had outlined various programs the organization provided to the community over the years. She mentioned that the organization's representative payee program had operated under a \$70,000-per-year contract for more than 20 years. She noted that the organization had never requested an increase in funding and instead operated on a minimal budget to remain within its allocated funds while providing services. She said that the reduction in federal funding had a significant impact on the agency. She explained that Mr. Hinnners was currently serving as an unpaid executive director, and in order to maintain the payee program without the \$70,000-per-year, she would also waive her wages beginning in January. She said she was hopeful that those measures would help keep the agency open for the underserved population. She stated that when she reviewed the County's budget, she saw that \$17 million was allocated for the libraries. She added that budgets had been increased for home care and aging and disability services, and the FCSNN had assisted many of those clients and continued to receive referrals from Washoe County. She encouraged the BCC to reconsider the existing contract, which she felt was a small amount within the overall County budget. She shared that her organization relied on County



funding to provide services to the unhoused. She added that many unhoused clients whom the organization assisted with money management and intensive case management had either become housed or remained housed because of those services. She said that some individuals had refused housing for many years, and once they were housed, the FCSNN helped them become sober and find employment. She believed losing the ongoing contract would be devastating.

Mr. Oscar Williams displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He questioned why there had not been a discussion and vote on automated signature verification (ASV), which he felt was a critical component of election infrastructure responsible for processing signatures and ensuring that valid voters' ballots were counted. He believed that the State had not approved the ASV. He indicated that more than three months earlier, he had requested approval letters from both the State and the County but had not received a response. He thought that the Board had the option to vote on the matter and approve it at a later time, which he viewed as a preemptive measure. He said the Board should secure approval before committing to automated technology. He suggested that the ASV and Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) were not an option, but should be. He speculated that during the first week of November, the Deputy Secretary of State (SOS) for Elections, Mark Wlaschin, held hearings on revisions to the Election Procedures Manual. He indicated that the manual stated a person must not harass or intimidate election officials, which included the Registrar of Voters (ROV), and city and county clerks, but did not include the commissioners. He suggested that those individuals were protected under the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 293.710, which addressed harassment. He assumed that if the SOS wanted to take legal action against the BCC, there would be no restrictions, because the Commissioners were not listed in the Election Procedures Manual. He felt that, as an elected official, that was an oversight that the Board should address. He mentioned that following his discussion with Mr. Wlaschin, he sent a memorandum regarding personally identifiable information. He believed that the public had a right to privacy, particularly regarding the protection of handwritten signatures, especially when combined with names and addresses on a ballot return envelope. He alleged that the current ballot return envelopes were illegal and warned that if the Board pursued the matter, it would be aiding and abetting potential identity theft and forgery. He asserted that ballots were transported across State lines to Sacramento, where signatures were scanned. He added that every piece of mail was scanned, and he was uncertain what occurred after the signature scanning process in Sacramento. He expressed concern about Agenda Item 10 and urged the Board not to enter into the State's ballot agreement.

Ms. Eileen Ecklund, a resident of Sparks, thanked ACM Solaro and the LBT for their efforts in developing a workable solution for the library's budget challenges. She believed that it was clear a great deal of work had gone into preparing the budget proposal. She expressed her gratitude that library staff were consulted and that their input was incorporated into the final budget. She believed that the dedicated Washoe County library staff were frontline experts in assessing neighborhood needs and delivering the many library services and programs to the community. She acknowledged that the Board would not vote on the FY 2027 budget but urged them to proceed with the proposal presented by ACM Solaro. She suggested that although the proposal did not meet all the libraries' needs,

she felt it was a reasonable compromise given Washoe County's current financial situation. She indicated that the budget proposal was both fiscally responsible and responsive to the community's fundamental needs. She believed that the budget proposal would ensure that libraries could continue to provide the essential materials, services, and programs that County residents relied on and enriched their lives. She noted that reaching the compromise was a long and often challenging process and acknowledged ACM Solaro's hard work. She explained that the past several years had been difficult for libraries, but expressed gratitude for the community's support. She said that she hoped the Board would continue supporting the libraries by approving the budget proposal.

Mr. Ryan Vortisch self-identified as a paid lobbyist for Silver State Voices (SSV) and noted that the organization had urged the Board to approve Agenda Item 11. He explained that the new technology would print a physical paper ballot of a voter's selection at the voting machine, enhancing transparency and trust in the election processes by allowing voters to tangibly verify their ballot's accuracy before placing it into the tabulator. He noted that digital BMDs continued to support accessibility and privacy by allowing voters to tailor their voting experience with accommodating features such as adjustable text size and ballot language selection in English or Spanish. He believed that combining the security and accuracy of digital voting and tabulation machines with the tangibility of paper ballots would support a transition in voting technology that increased voter confidence and trust in elections, while avoiding the persistent errors and high costs associated with administering an entirely paper-based and hand-counted election. He requested the Board's support to ensure that Washoe County aligned with neighboring counties that already used the devices.

Ms. Kate Barnicki said that she recently started an online class and felt that libraries provided a place where she could take her class without being distracted. She noted that if she went to a coffee shop, she would likely be distracted by the people around her. She explained the importance of interlibrary loans, which allowed her to reserve the books she needed. She said if she required a due date extension, she would call her library to request one. She added that if she overlooked an item that she requested, the library staff would notify her. She said that she appreciated the human interaction involved in obtaining the books she needed, since she could not afford to purchase them all. She shared that she found it difficult to trust a single news source, so she valued the library's access to *The New York Times*, which she would not have been able to afford otherwise. She mentioned that *The New York Times*, along with other news sources, was available for free through the library, which provided opportunities for general learning and mental expansion. She explained that as a child, she did not travel much, but her library's subscription to *National Geographic* allowed her to explore many locations, and she likely read every issue from 1987 to 1999. She indicated that through those magazines, she was able to study maps up close and learn about cultures and languages, which were experiences she would not have had otherwise. She shared an example of how a memorable childhood encounter with an article about Cambodia later inspired her to travel there as an adult. She thought that some children may not want to go home after school for various reasons, and it was beneficial for them to have the library as a safe place to visit, use resources, and stay off the streets. She noted that she recently learned that library rooms could be reserved for small group

meetings. She felt it was essential to have a space free from distractions and urged the Board to continue funding the libraries.

Ms. Sandee Tibbett read from a document, no copy was submitted for the public record. She explained that she wanted to discuss the code of conduct and the process by which a member of the public could file a complaint against a Commissioner. She mentioned that on September 2, 2025, she made public comment at a BCC meeting regarding the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and while she believed her comments were truthful, she acknowledged that they may have upset a Commissioner. She indicated that following her remarks, the Commissioner allegedly confronted, intimidated, and attempted to bully her in the hallway. She suggested that Item 7 of the Washoe County Code of Conduct stated that employees and other representatives of Washoe County must behave professionally with one another and the public by demonstrating County values and adhering to the Code of Conduct in all interactions. She stated that she had filed a complaint against the Commissioner. She added that interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas responded by explaining that the Washoe County Code of Conduct was an internal policy intended solely for officials and employees and was not designed for use by members of the public to report complaints about interactions with employees or elected officials. She indicated that she was surprised by that response and felt that if her complaint had been against Commissioner Clark, the outcome would have been different. She suggested that the Board protected the Commissioner with whom she had the confrontation. She said that she was told to file an ethics report, which did not make sense to her because the encounter was not unethical. She added that because her interaction was not unethical, her report was dismissed, as the BCC did not have jurisdiction over how a public officer conducted their official duties unless the facts independently implicated ethics law. She mentioned that she contacted the Governor's Office, and they responded that her concern needed to be routed through Washoe County. She stated that she then filed a Title VI Civil Rights complaint because she wanted a resolution to the confrontation that had occurred. She felt that she should be able to make public comments without being bullied or intimidated through body language, posturing, or finger-pointing in her face, which she believed was unsettling and unacceptable behavior. She thought that the Commissioner should have walked away, and she felt that a public apology was owed to the three individuals who witnessed the interaction.

Ms. Janet Butcher displayed documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She reminded the public that President Donald Trump was the son of a legal immigrant and that he was married to a legal immigrant. She mentioned affordable housing and the challenges that made it unattainable. She stated that rents for apartment buildings being built across Washoe County had increased substantially. She alleged that the cost of one-bedroom apartments had risen from \$800 to \$1,400 per month since 2022. She added that many of those apartment complexes were not new structures, but were old, dilapidated, and poorly maintained. She thought that approximately 30 percent of housing was owned by corporations, some from outside the Country. She stated that many apartment complexes were owned by Limited Liability Companies (LLCs), which made tracking ownership difficult. She alleged that foreclosed homes had been sold in bulk, for \$10 to \$50 million. She mentioned that foreign hedge funds had purchased properties at a

low price and then increased rents, keeping Americans in debt. She stated that other factors contributing to increasing rents included pass-throughs, shell companies, and the increasing cost of energy and regulations. She believed that the government's assessment of fair market value, rental pricing, and the suggestion that homes were one of a kind also contributed to the housing crisis. She observed that the area had experienced an influx of low-wage workers and unemployed individuals. She clarified that she was not opposed to immigration and cited that a family member had migrated prior to the Revolutionary War. She alleged that the Biden administration's policy had allowed people from 200 countries to cross the border, which may have contributed to the housing crisis.

Mr. Alan Munson indicated that there was a legal process for those wishing to enter the Country, and while he cared about those who were entering the Country due to stressful reasons, he did not care for criminals. He noted that the process was in place to determine what kind of person the immigrant was. He said that he was sympathetic to those who needed to come to the US. He believed that ballots should be printed in Washoe County to ensure a better process was in place, rather than allowing the SOS to use a California company to print the ballots. He recalled that Mr. Drew Ribar was left off the election ballot. He said that he was unsure whether ICM Thomas should receive a raise immediately and wondered if a raise would be more reasonable in a few years. He asserted that he had heard ICM Thomas was a good person; however, there was a \$25 million deficit the previous year. He thought that all County employees' salaries should be limited. He thanked the Board for their work.

Mr. Cliff Nellis said that he was a 50-year resident of Washoe County. He asserted that it was important for elections to be honest and transparent. He believed that what happened in the computer room during the elections was a mystery, and the only way to verify election results was through a hand count. He recalled that he had asked for a hand count during the 2024 Primary Election; however, it was denied, which he speculated proved that the election results were manipulated. He said that President Trump would require hand counts for federal elections. He opined that hand counts would save the County money and that if the County still wanted to use the machines, they could keep the old ones because he thought they were better than the new ones. He urged the Board to verify the election results through a hand count, which he believed would be performed at no cost. He recalled that the increased funding for the library was denied because it was run by a cult. He said that the library did not represent the community and that they wanted funding to maintain a cult. He recommended privatizing the library system so that staff members with whom he disagreed with could be fired. He felt that the library was exposing children to obscenity through its books. He expressed that he did not have a problem with the books but wanted them removed from the children's section. He said that if the books were removed from the children's section at the public library, they also needed to be removed from school libraries. He said that teachers were assigning obscene books to students, which was seducing children with sexual immorality. He asserted that he supported the WCSO funding because he thought that ICE needed room to do its job. He recommended that the Cares Campus be turned into an expansion of the jail. He said that vagabonds had broken the law and should be put to work. He did not support ICM

Thomas's raise and believed that County employees could have their wages cut in half and would still work.

Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She disagreed with the Block including Agenda Items 10 through 18. She stated that under the First Amendment, people had the right to redress the government and could not be denied the right to address Agenda Items 10 through 18. She indicated that the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) Tulsi Gabbard said that there was evidence of electronic voting machines being vulnerable to hackers and exploitation to manipulate the results of elections, which she believed would further drive the mandate for paper ballots in the US. She said that it made sense why Dominion Voting Systems had recently been sold and rebranded as Liberty Vote. She believed there were problems with Liberty Vote and listed her questions regarding the sale of Dominion Voting Systems on the first page of her document. She said that the primary election was six months away and urged the Board to visit Liberty Vote's website because she thought it was concerning. She asked the Board to have legal due diligence performed on Liberty Vote and requested that Agenda Item 11 be tabled.

Ms. Tracey Thomas provided a document, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She read from the Item 5 – Public Comment document, regarding her concerns about County corruption, the budget, retaliation practices, ICM Thomas's salary, and the County's hiring process. She recalled that during the last appointment of the BCC's Chair, it was expressed that attending agenda review meetings was mandatory; however, she speculated that the next Chair would not have participated in any of those meetings.

Mr. Charles Elliott noted that he was born in Washoe County and said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil was for good men to do nothing. He stated that he had provided public comment many times and would not stop. He said that ICM Thomas's salary was 1 percent lower than that of former County Manager Eric Brown and was higher than that of Clark County's manager and the Governor. He reported that Clark County had five times the population of Washoe County. He said that residents were struggling and that there was a budget deficit. He hoped that the Board would make fair and just decisions for everyone. He mentioned that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Board had obscene salaries. He said that the voting machines were corrupt and controlled by Venezuela and Serbia. He felt that it was wrong to purchase new machines and relayed that the Venezuelan government paid Smartmatic for software that could be used to rig elections.

Mr. Todd Bailey self-identified as a paid lobbyist for Nevada Accountability and indicated that there would be a new Commissioner the following year and that the Board had made the claim that nobody was paying enough taxes, whether they were in a new or old home. He asserted that tax abatements and the Board were the problem. He speculated that the BCC had allocated more funds than any other Board in Washoe County's history. He believed that the County had created a road to bankruptcy while demanding that taxpayers rectify the Board's poor financial decisions. He felt that the only way to change the situation was to appoint Commissioner Clark as Chair because

he believed Commissioner Clark was a responsible adult who would lead the County out of its financial mess.

Ms. Jill Oleary displayed a document image, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She noted that she was a property owner in Washoe County who had an unlawful judgment lien that clouded her property's title. She requested a certified electronic audit log for the lien transaction and speculated that the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO) was not required to comply with mandatory requirements regarding a clerk's endorsement, specifically the inclusion of the clerk's name when recording documents. She explained that her formal request for the certified copy of the complete electronic audit log metadata was in the letter she had distributed. She thanked the Board for its attention to the matter.

Ms. Cynthia Cooper explained that she did not want to attend the meeting because it was cold and wet outside; however, she did not want to make any more excuses. She believed that the Board had heard her speak on several occasions about ICE activities and how she thought immigrant influences in the community were wonderful. She recalled discussions regarding the Basque, Irish, Chinese, and present-day Hispanic communities and hoped that her words had persuaded the BCC to understand that ICE was racist and bad for business. She mentioned that she had emailed the Board a list of concerns pertaining to detainees and their ability to vote during the election season. She speculated that there were other members of the community who were more eloquent, articulate, persuasive, and had made significant contributions to the community, but could have a darker complexion or speak with an accent, even though they were naturalized citizens or in the US legally with a work permit. She pointed out that American financier Jeffrey Epstein's files had been in the news a lot lately and that there may have been bankers or top executives who had questioned Mr. Epstein's character but continued to do business with him. She thought that the situation was a hit to women who may have been sexually assaulted as teenagers. She concluded by saying that taking money associated with ICE was a similar blow.

Ms. Trista Gomez believed that when she attended Board meetings, she listened to the people who spoke and felt that there was longing, hope, and desire in their words that reflected the community's needs. She felt that there was so much contention, which led to residents not feeling heard. She recalled having witnessed individuals crying over decisions made by the Board. She said that Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman acknowledged the residents and their concerns, but she felt that the rest of the Board placated residents with words of sympathy while continuing to vote in favor of developers. She urged the BCC to listen to the residents and stop voting against them. She relayed that the Korn Ferry study had been performed, which resulted in salary raises. She said that the budget was 40 percent higher than in 2019; however, the County was in a deficit. She said she did not believe that there was a conversation regarding how the salary raise or the Cares Campus would be sustained. She opined that salaries similar to those of county employees did not exist in the private sector and that the raises were at the expense of residents.

Ms. Kit Waite asked that the Board table Agenda Item 11. She said that she was not necessarily against the item; however, she felt clarification was needed before a

vote was made that would impact the County and the election. She asserted that the US was a land of opportunity and that everyone believed in some form of the American dream. She felt that to keep that way of thinking, America needed to come first. She noted that if an individual entered the US without proper documentation, they did not respect the US's rules and had to face the consequences. She said that ICE needed to be held accountable and deserved adequate support from the County to enforce the law. She mentioned that the Founding Fathers created checks and balances, as well as limitations on government power, to prevent its overreach, while also instilling civic responsibilities and virtues in individuals to foster a self-governing Nation. She opined that both Founding Fathers' plans were being degraded and that the County needed to unify as a community.

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

**25-0797      AGENDA ITEM 6 Announcements/Reports.**

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas announced that the Emergency Medical Services Advisory Board (EMSAB) had an opening for a four-year Hospital Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Representative term beginning December 18, 2025, through December 17, 2029. She noted that after the first term, the Hospital CQI Representative would be eligible for reappointment for up to two additional terms. She explained that the application deadline for the opening was Friday, November 20, 2025.

ICM Thomas mentioned that the Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) would be discussed during Agenda Item 11 and that the devices would be available in the lobby for anyone interested in seeing them. She reminded the Board that Washoe County was the last County in Nevada to purchase BMDs. She encouraged those with questions to investigate the equipment in the lobby. She relayed that information regarding family counseling services would be organized in a formal memorandum for the Board.

Vice Chair Herman provided documents from Ms. Val White, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She read Ms. White's email regarding her opposition to future involvement with Liberty Vote. Vice Chair Herman relayed that Ms. White's documents detailed security issues with Dominion Voting System and provided critical whistleblower information, which led to Ms. White demanding that Washoe County cease using Liberty Vote.

Commissioner Garcia highlighted that November was National Adoption Awareness Month and that the County had a terrific Foster, Adopt, and Mentor (FAM) program. She noted that if fostering or adopting was not of interest to a person, then mentorship might be. She recalled that she walked into the courthouse to finalize the adoption of her two children nine years ago. She believed it was essential to reflect on a time when many people were paving the way for, supporting, and encouraging adoptive families. She said that it was not easy going from zero to two children overnight, and she recalled being scared about finding childcare, seeing the increased price of groceries for a

family, and having to organize appointments and therapies to help her children heal. She encouraged anyone interested to research the FAM program. She reported that there was a huge waitlist for children in need of homes. She asserted that housing was critical and needed to be a focus of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) because it affected foster and adoption families, those who were seeking substance abuse treatment, those going through the court system, and individuals exiting the jail. She pointed out that childcare, healthcare, and behavioral health were all subjects of concern that needed to be addressed. Chair Hill hoped that Commissioner Garcia's reflections on her family would inspire the community.

Commissioner Andriola expressed gratitude towards the planning committee that organized the first annual observance for veterans on November 7, 2025. She recalled that the observance was created by a constituent who was an Air Force veteran who served in the Vietnam War. She reported that 150 people attended the event at the Sparks Senior Center, and she said it was one of the most memorable ways the community came together to recognize veterans. She recognized and thanked everyone who attended, including Commissioners Garcia and Clark, Washoe County School District (WCSD) Trustee Colleen Westlake, City of Sparks Mayor Ed Lawson, City of Sparks Councilman Donald Abbott, the Spanish Springs Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC), and the Nevada Department of Veteran Services (NDVS). She mentioned that many individuals organized the event, including Human Services Division Director Cara Paoli and Director of Human Services Ryan Gustafson. She said that she would provide updates regarding how the veteran service organizations (VSOs) would continue.

Commissioner Andriola recognized the Hidden Valley residents and the hard work of former Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Chief Charles Moore, who she thought had a great vision regarding the expansion of Fire Station 37. She noted that the TMFPD continued to provide uninterrupted service throughout the expansion. She expressed gratitude towards the Truckee River Flood Management Authority (TRFMA) for unanimously approving the Vista Narrows final design, which would prevent flooding, preserve the Truckee River, and prepare for a 100 to 150-year flood. She reported that construction would begin in late 2027 or early 2028 and was estimated to last one to two years.

Commissioner Clark thanked the public commenters in attendance and noted that many valuable points were made. He relayed that an Our Town Reno article reported that the Safe Camp Director was one of the highest-paid, tax-funded nonprofit directors in the community. He wished to be informed whether that statement was true and what was happening at Safe Camp. He referred to Ms. Kate Barnicki's comments regarding the library and her experience in Cambodia, and he thought that the way the library positively affected her life was great. He said that the library was supposed to be a neutral space where the mind could wander. He appreciated Mr. Todd Bailey's informative comments. He explained that Ms. Trista Gomez provided great comments, and he looked forward to hearing more regarding the budget and pay raises. He recalled that his predecessor spearheaded many pay raises, which he opposed because he believed it had



created financial problems. He said that the public should pay attention to what the County was doing and how mistakes could follow people.

Chair Hill expressed appreciation for the opening of Fire Station 37 and looked forward to its progress, as well as that of other stations, such as the Apple Station and the South Meadows Station. She recalled that it was wonderful to walk in the Veterans Day parade with County staff and elected officials. She commended the team that organized the parade and thanked the veterans.

**25-0798**      **AGENDA ITEM 7A1** Maurice Page, executive director of the Nevada Housing Coalition, to discuss the Nevada Housing Coalitions objective and review data regarding the housing crisis in Nevada. (All Commission Districts.).

Executive Director of the Nevada Housing Coalition (NHC) Maurice Page conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Nevada Housing Coalition Washoe County Presentation; About Us; FY 2022 Rankings; The Need For Affordable Housing; Nevada State Data Overview; Housing Affordability – Washoe County; Policy Wins for Affordable Housing; Turning Data into Policy Impact; 2025 Legislative Session: Housing Bill Outcomes (two slides); 2025 Nevada Legislative Session Wins; Thank You.

Mr. Page reviewed his *About Us* slide and established that the NHC acted as the voice of affordable housing throughout the State. He recalled a presentation he gave to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) earlier in 2025, during which he outlined the housing pressures the County was going through and the policy priorities of the NHC going into the 2025 Legislative Session. He said he was back to speak about some of the successes and continued barriers the County and State faced. He expressed his appreciation to the BCC for allowing him time to talk about the ongoing lack of housing throughout the State.

Mr. Page showed his *FY 2022 Rankings* slide and described that it represented a study conducted by the Nevada GrantLab in conjunction with the NHC. He said it showed that Nevada consistently received among the lowest levels of federal grant funding in the Nation, despite having some of the highest needs. He shared that in Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2022, Nevada received \$800 less per person than the National average, and the gap significantly limited the ability to fund housing, services, and infrastructure throughout the State. He added that Nevada ranked in the bottom 20 percent in five of the ten largest federal funding programs, resulting in fewer dollars for cities, Counties, tribes, and nonprofits in the State and contributing to the underfunding of programs that supported homelessness, seniors, and veterans. He reported that the NHC was recently made aware that the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program, administered through the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), was shifting away from permanent supportive housing projects. Mr. Page predicted that change would have a national impact, placing about 170,000 individuals and families at risk of homelessness. He informed that the County could lose

\$1.9 million, which would result in about 88 households losing rental assistance and support services. He added that the individuals in those households were previously homeless and would likely return to homelessness if no alternative funding was provided. He described that after receiving the notice late on Thursday of the prior week, the NHC sent notifications to their coalition members and aimed to meet with each CoC representative throughout the State to create a plan.

Mr. Page reviewed his *Nevada State Data Overview* slide and emphasized the ongoing need for affordable housing throughout the State. He advised that the figures shown were from April 2025. He noted that individuals who made less than \$30,000 per year were severely rent-burdened, and there was a shortage of approximately 16,000 affordable units for renters in that category in Northern Nevada. He recounted that nearly 48.1 percent of Nevada renters were excessively cost-burdened, which was the second-worst rate in the Country. He reported that 58 percent of renters statewide struggled with affordability. He disclosed that 53 percent of Nevada voters listed housing as one of their top two issues in a poll taken earlier in 2025. He added that more than 70 percent of Black and Hispanic renters were cost-burdened, which typified deep inequities overall.

Mr. Page showed his *Housing Affordability – Washoe County* slide and directed people to look at the blue lines, which represented annual fair market rents for different unit types. He highlighted the discrepancy between rent and salaries across multiple industries, including hospitality, home health, manufacturing, retail, and construction. He noted that the prices of a studio and a one-bedroom unit were roughly the same at approximately \$39,000 per year. He pointed out that the annual salary for the majority of industries was just below the annual rent for studios and one-bedroom units, which led many people to struggle with providing housing for themselves or their families. Even at that level, people were severely cost-burdened, and the burden persisted across all unit types. He summarized that two things were known about housing: the costs of rent and home ownership had risen significantly over the past few years, while wages had increased by only 2.5 percent statewide during the same time period. He said that was a burden the NHC was monitoring, and they advocated for minimum wage increases and partnerships with major industries to give back to communities and enable Nevada residents to afford housing.

Mr. Page presented his *Turning Data into Policy Impact* slide and acknowledged that he had presented a lot of bad news about housing affordability in the first few slides. He established that housing policy was a priority during the 2025 Legislative Session. He described that legislators brought ideas and solutions, and he praised the emergence of bipartisan support. He revealed that all participants in the 2025 Legislative Session agreed on the importance of addressing housing. He reviewed the first of his *2025 Legislative Session: Housing Bill Outcomes* slides and recognized that the Commissioners might already be familiar with the information. He expressed his intention to offer perspective for those watching or tuning in to the meeting. He stated that 63 housing bills were introduced in 2025, compared to 3 in 2015, 7 in 2017, and 9 in 2019. He pointed out that 2019 was a period of success as Nevada instituted state tax credits for affordable housing during that timeframe. He observed that between 2019 and 2025, the

number of housing bills that were presented increased from 9 to 63. He surmised the increase demonstrated that housing was a major issue at the top of everybody's mind. He informed that he included the number of bills that were vetoed to provide a broader perspective. He supposed that people might be surprised that 87 bills were vetoed in Nevada, but he advised that the number of vetoes was average from a National perspective. Mr. Page identified the impact of population growth in the State in recent years. He disclosed that he had been a Nevada resident for over 22 years and recalled that when he first moved to the State, the population was approximately 800,000. He remarked that the population had increased to 3.3 million people, and that growth came with more bills and more ideas. He suggested that people needed to understand that not every bill would get passed. Mr. Page displayed the second of his *2025 Legislative Session: Housing Bill Outcomes* slides and noted that nine bills were passed on affordable housing and financing, which he viewed as a success.

Mr. Page showed his *2025 Nevada Legislative Session Wins* slide and described the four bills shown as the major housing wins from the recent session. He explained that the NHC became aware of Assembly Bill (AB) 366 in 2023. At that time, it was labeled as AB310 and marked the initiation of supportive housing with a one-time appropriation of \$32.2 million. He congratulated the County on being a major recipient of AB310 funding and immediately putting it to use on support services. He recalled that 14 applications were submitted statewide, and Washoe County and Northern Nevada were awarded 10 of those grants. He conveyed that AB366 was presented with the assistance of Assemblymember Danielle Monroe-Moreno. It proposed a permanent funding source for housing support, and he shared that a minimum of \$20 million would now go towards housing support services annually. He elaborated that the Nevada Housing Division was working with the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) to design a framework for how the money would be utilized moving forward. He spoke about AB62, which addressed transferable tax credits for affordable housing. He restated that 2019 was the first year State tax credits were approved. He disclosed that there was mixed success with that program, but the NHC advocated for its expansion. He revealed that the expansion was not ultimately awarded, but some of the things the NHC was able to advance included processing final applications and avenues to expedite projects. He viewed improvements to the technical language in that bill as a significant win. Mr. Page warned that the remaining State tax credits would only help fund development through the next year and a half and would be fully expended by 2027. He cautioned that projects currently under development or review might come to a halt if the State tax credits program was not expanded in 2027. Mr. Page reviewed the Eviction Diversion Program outlined in AB475. He said AB475 was combined with rental assistance, and the NHC was able to secure \$21 million, with \$5.25 million allocated to Northern Nevada and \$750,000 allocated to rural communities. He reminded the Board that the funds would need to be spread over two years, but he saw it as a good start. He thought it would help some families maintain their housing and prevent them from being pushed to the streets. Lastly, he spoke about AB540, the Nevada Attainable Housing Act, which he viewed as the most significant housing win for the community from the 2025 Legislative Session. He said the Nevada Attainable Housing Act committed \$133 million towards what he called the *missing middle*. He described that the money would go towards housing support for households earning up to 150 percent of the

area median income (AMI), which would help working-class citizens who were otherwise unable to acquire home ownership. He predicted that AB540 would help 5,000 to 7,000 Nevadans step into homeownership over the next few years and start building generational wealth for their families, which he viewed as a win for the State. He explained that the bill would create more homes at an accessible price point and would include additional home styles, such as townhomes, condos, and duplexes. He recounted that the starting price for a single-family home in the area was roughly \$450,000 to \$460,000, depending on the month and time that it was captured. He recounted that the goal for attainable home prices outlined in AB540 was closer to \$300,000, which he theorized would expand the accessibility of home ownership.

Mr. Page showed his *Thank You* slide and acknowledged that his presentation was quick, but he was mindful of staying within his allotted time. He said he aimed to provide an overview to help the Commissioners understand that the NHC would continue to explore additional development opportunities statewide as they progressed in their priorities. He advised that they would explore additional policy solutions for the 2027 Legislative Session and consider additional revenue sources to help support builders and preserve affordable housing support that would come to term over the next couple of years. He stated that the partnership with the County and all jurisdictions would be paramount for the NHC as it moved toward its goal of decreasing the number of units needed for people to maintain housing throughout the State. He thanked the Commissioners and offered to answer any questions.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Page for his advocacy during the 2025 Legislative Session. She remarked on the numerous successes the NHC achieved, and she expressed her appreciation for his hard work. She observed that his presentation indicated the amount of work that remained for everyone.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Mr. Page for his work and for the information he provided. She acknowledged that housing was a major issue in the region.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Page for his update. She noted that his updates were never great news, but she appreciated them, nevertheless. She commented that housing was a big pain point for the children, adults, and seniors the County served, and she revealed that it was at the forefront of concerns expressed in almost every phone call she received from constituents. She remarked that housing was a foundational, basic need and deserved to be a priority. She invited Mr. Page to return to the BCC for future presentations as the work to address the problem evolved. She expressed her excitement about the *missing middle* initiatives included in AB540. She thought it was essential to keep pushing for that, and she theorized that many families would prefer a townhouse, condo, or other alternative to a single-family home. She advocated for making it easier for counties and cities to provide housing variability. She spoke about efforts in the County to remove barriers promoting accessory dwelling units (ADUs). She reasoned that removing those barriers was a good area in which to focus efforts to increase housing stock diversification. She shared that she was deeply concerned about the announcement from HUD regarding funding cuts to permanent supportive housing. She expressed her

agreement with a quote on one of Mr. Page's slides about affordable housing being an investment, not a threat. She pointed out that permanent supportive housing was geared towards addressing the needs of chronically ill individuals in the community, including people who were mentally ill, physically disabled, or both. She identified that the population served was predominantly senior citizens, including many veterans. She predicted that affordable housing support was less expensive than housing people in hospitals, jails, or homeless shelters. She advocated for a paradigm shift in the way affordable housing was viewed. Rather than seeing it as negative, she suggested that people reframe their concept of affordable housing support to include different housing types, such as smaller and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible options for seniors. She opined that not everyone needed to live in a 3,000-square-foot home, which she recognized as part of NHC's mission. She thanked Mr. Page and encouraged him to continue doing good work.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Page and the NHC board for their work. She noted that the NHC board was bipartisan, and she thought Mr. Page's statement on that was impactful. She highlighted the importance of AB540 and thanked Mr. Page for his extensive work with the Governor's Office on addressing issues throughout the State, including rural areas. She emphasized the importance of tenancy support as a key factor in the success of efforts to reduce homelessness. She recalled being informed that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team achieved over 90 percent success in their efforts to help individuals transition out of homelessness and into stable, sustainable housing without any ongoing government assistance. She acknowledged that homelessness was complex, but she asked Mr. Page if he knew how that success rate compared to tenancy support efforts in Clark County or other areas. She voiced that rural areas also sought ways to address increased mental illness, drug addictions, and other behavioral issues. She observed that those issues did not adhere to County or State borders.

Mr. Page agreed with Commissioner Andriola about the growth of the homeless population, particularly in Clark County. He advised that he was still waiting to receive data from the rural communities, but he understood that their homeless population had also grown over the last couple of years. He shared that the Clark County estimate was close to 8,900, but he noted that their new point-in-time (PIT) count would not be released until January. He advised that Clark County had a success rate of roughly 67 percent, but he cautioned that the population increase had to be taken into consideration. He explained that the number of homeless individuals had risen significantly over the last two years, before which the homeless population was approximately 3,000. He stated that interventions had a success rate of approximately 80 percent. He summarized that the growth of over 60 percent in the homeless population reduced the success rate in providing rapid rehousing services and permanent supportive housing.

Commissioner Andriola expressed her thanks to Mr. Page for everything that he did, including his work with Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich. She observed that Mr. Page worked closely with the County in many areas, especially housing.

She stated that housing was an important issue statewide, and she thought it would be interesting to see what approach the NHC took for the 2027 Legislative Session.

Commissioner Clark remarked that Lifestyle Homes co-owner Mr. Peter Lissner, whom he identified as a hero of his, had just left the meeting. He described Mr. Lissner as specializing in entry-level homes and asked Mr. Page if they were acquainted. Mr. Page said they were not, and Commissioner Clark advised that Mr. Lissner was out in the lobby. He informed that Mr. Lissner had built approximately 4,000 entry-level homes in Sun Valley and Cold Springs and was a specialist in that market niche. Commissioner Clark clarified that he was not criticizing any other builders, but he thought that someone might want to speak with Mr. Lissner about the affordable style of homes he specialized in. Commissioner Clark contrasted Lifestyle Homes with Toll Brothers and other prominent national names that built high-end properties nationwide. He stated that homes like that were not affordable for most County citizens and the local workforce. He advocated for Commissioners to encourage legislation to simplify things for entry-level builders, particularly in permitting and inspection processes. He gave the example of a builder who planned to build 30 homes of the same kind with the same floor plan and blueprint. Commissioner Clark suggested that it might be possible to inspect one of those homes thoroughly and then conduct a quick inspection of the others to ensure they followed the same guidelines. He thought County Commissioners could figure out ways to reduce those costs and make things easier for builders. He believed that would help the public obtain entry-level housing, which would lead to equity and pride of ownership. He stated his support for the work of the NHC and thanked Mr. Page for his report.

Mr. Page hoped that Mr. Lissner was aware of the pre-application for AB540, which was available to all developers, including both non-profit and for-profit organizations. He believed the pre-application closed on November 5, but he disclosed that a second round of applications would be accepted early in 2026. He said he would endeavor to find Mr. Lissner and make sure that he was informed of those opportunities. Commissioner Clark revealed that Mr. Lissner was signed in for public comment on an item later on the agenda.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Page again for his advocacy. She recalled that the NHC did not have any items on the special legislative session agenda, but she noted the potential effect of tax credits being applied to the film industry instead of housing. She indicated her continued support for Mr. Page's efforts. She asked him to inform the BCC if there was anything the Commissioners were missing on a local level. She wanted to ensure the County was at the forefront and did what they could. She expressed her appreciation for the support Mr. Page provided to the County and stated her intention to continue to move forward with the available resources. She said there were amazing people in the community who deserved a roof over their heads.

## **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8I2**

- 25-0799**      **8A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of October 14, 2025, and October 21, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0800**      **8B1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$132,941.98; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Tobacco Prevention & Control Program Notice of Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026, for the Population Health Division (PHD) to support the Nevada Clinical Services (NCS) Tobacco Prevention & Control Program agreement and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0801**      **8C1** Recommendation to continue authorizing the Human Services Agency (HSA) contractors, contracted staff, volunteers and hired temporary service employees to drive Washoe County vehicles to conduct Washoe County Human Services Agency business activities. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0802**      **8D1** Recommendation to accept an FY26 subgrant amendment from the State of Nevada, Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) to support the position and activities of the Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator, whose mission is to coordinate regional mental health services for underserved populations, in the amount of [\$7,250.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2024 through September 30, 2025; retroactively authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0803**      **8D2** Recommendation to: (1) accept an Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County Human Services Agency and City of Reno in the amount of [\$77,840.00; no county match] retroactively for the period of September 10, 2025 to December 31, 2026 in support of the CrossRoads Programming and Peer Support Specialist Academy, and retroactively authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement; (2) approve an increase to the CrossRoads Operator contract with The Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE) in the amount of [\$47,840] to support the CrossRoads Peer Support Specialist Academy; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0804**      **8D3** Recommendation to accept a Supportive Housing Development Fund award amendment #1 from the State of Nevada Housing Division for the

period of June 17, 2025 through June 30, 2031 to provide clinical services, support services, operations, training and administration activities at the Nevada Cares Campus, Permanent Supportive Housing building; authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute grant award amendment documents. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0805**      **8D4** Recommendation in accordance with NRS 244.1505 to approve a donation in the amount of [\$250] to Our Savior Lutheran Church, a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes; approve Resolution R25-0000120 for the same; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget appropriation disbursements. Our Savior Lutheran Church allowed Sparks Senior Center participants to use their space for senior programs while the senior center flooring was being upgraded over the summer. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0806**      **8D5** Recommendation to approve a net-zero cross-fund budget appropriation transfer from Human Services Agency Homelessness Fund (F223) to Human Services Agency Indigent Fund (F221) in the amount of [\$34,442; including the purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives]. This amount represents a monetary donation from the Estate of Victor G. Bucher, which was incorrectly approved for deposit into F223. If approved, direct Finance to make the necessary cross-fund transfer. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0807**      **8D6** Recommendation to deobligate a previously approved allocation of Affordable Housing Trust Fund funds in the amount of [\$1,000,000] awarded to American Covenant Housing Foundation Inc. (ACHF) for the Sutro Senior Sanctuary Supportive Housing project. ACHF has stated that they are unable to complete the project and has subsequently rejected the funding. This deobligation will allow for the funding to be reallocated to other projects. The annual Affordable Housing Trust Fund report to the Board is also submitted with this staff report. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0808**      **8E1** Recommendation to approve a Federal 2024 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Continuing Education Grant-In-Aid Award scholarship in the amount of [\$4,508.00; 10% County match recommended] for the travel and training of four Washoe County Library employees who attended the Association of Rural and Small Libraries (ARSL) Conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for a retroactive term of September 17 to September 21, 2025, awarded to Washoe County Library by the Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records through the Institute of Museum and Library Services; if approved, to direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Library. (All Commission Districts.)



- 25-0809**      **8E2** Recommendation to approve 2024 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Digital Collection Development Grant Award funds in the amount of [\$25,000.00; 10% County match required] for digital materials, awarded to Washoe County Library by the Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records through the Institute of Museum and Library Services for the retroactive grant period of July 1, 2024 to November 30, 2025; if approved, to direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Library. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0810**      **8F1** 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 Born 2 Ball Basketball Academy - a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes – to support bringing affordable competitive basketball opportunities to youth athletes in Reno and Sparks; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager. (Commission District 3.)
- 25-0811**      **8G1** Recommendation to adopt the Washoe County Sheriff's Office – Forensic Science Division (WCSO-FSD) fee schedule to include services related to crime scene response, DNA, controlled substances, firearms, latent print processing and comparison, and toxicology, and to approve the method used to calculate fees for Fiscal Years 2027-2029. If approved, the fee schedule will be retroactive to July 1, 2025 for the Reno and Sparks Police Departments and effective July 1, 2026 for all other customer agencies. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0812**      **8G2** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2026 Office of Traffic Safety grant award [amount not to exceed \$10,000.00, \$2,500.00 County match required] as administered from the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety Office of Traffic Safety, project number TS-2026-WCSO-1068, for overtime personnel costs associated with instructing the Drive Responsibly Includes Vehicle Education (DRIVE Program) for the grant period of effective date of authorization through September 30, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0813**      **8G3** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2025 High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Northern Nevada Drug Task Force grant award [amount not to exceed \$10,000.00, no County match required] as administered from the Las Vegas Metro Police Department, Federal project number HID1825G0495-00, for overtime and investigative expenses from HIDTA for the retroactive grant period of January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award

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

- 25-0814**      **8G4** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2025 High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Northern Nevada Interdiction Task Force grant award amount not to exceed [\$60,000.00, no County match required] as administered from the Las Vegas Metro Police Department, Federal project number HID1825G0495-00, for overtime, investigative, and travel expenses from HIDTA for the retroactive grant period of January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0815**      **8G5** Recommendation to retroactively approve the interlocal contract between Washoe County Sheriff's Office and Reno/Sparks Indian Colony to provide dispatch services for the amount of [\$161,661.52] beginning July 1, 2025 for FY 25/26] and if approved authorize the Chair to execute the interlocal contract and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute contract renewal. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0816**      **8G6** Recommendation to retroactively approve the interlocal contract between Washoe County Sheriff's Office and Pyramid Lake Tribal Police Department to provide dispatch services for the amount of [\$161,661.52] beginning July 1, 2025 for FY 25/26 and if approved authorize the Chair to execute the interlocal contract and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute contract renewal. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0817**      **8G7** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Law Enforcement Funding Agreement between the Burning Man Project (BMP) and Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office to provide extra staffing needed in the Gerlach/Empire area [Estimated \$129,582.00 annual costs reimbursed] during the Burning Man Festivals 2025 - 2028, Including one week prior and one week following the last day of the 2028 festival with the annual payment amount to be revised each year to adjust for increased costs. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0818**      **8G8** Recommendation to approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Washoe County and the Washoe County Sheriff's Supervisory Deputies Association (WCSSDA), modifying provisions related to Article 22 (Special "Assigned" Pay Differentials) of the WCSSDA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), to add the position of Sergeant assigned to the Northern Nevada Regional Intelligence Center (NNRIC) to the list of assignments that are eligible for a 5% special assigned pay differential, and to explain when the NNRIC Sergeant will receive the special assigned pay differential; and to approve modifications to the CBA consistent with the terms set forth in the MOU. The

modification to the CBA applies for the four (4) year period of July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2028. This change could increase General Fund expenditures by up to \$23,790.00 over the next three fiscal years if the Incline Captain position remains filled. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts)

- 25-0819**      **8H1** Recommendation to approve and sign the Second Amendment to the License Agreement dated January 3, 2001, by and between ATC Operating Inc. and Washoe County to extend the term of the License Agreement for a total period of five (5) years, starting January 19, 2026, with option to renew for four additional periods of five years; a fee increase of [\$1,309.92] for the first year of the license extension, and a fee increase of five percent (5%) annually thereafter, beginning January 19, 2027; and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0820**      **8I1** Recommendation to approve and execute Resolution directing County Treasurer to give notice, pursuant to NRS 271.545 of the sale of properties subject to the lien of a delinquent special assessment in 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.) No fiscal Impact to the General Fund. Treasurer. (Commission District 4 and 5).
- 25-0821**      **8I2** Recommendation to Acknowledge Receipt of the Report of Sale- July 22, 2025, 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: 076-310-81, 076-372-03, 076-381-02, 076-381-12, 076-900-04, WCAD 39 - Lightning W Water System Supply Imp, parcel: 055-382-15 (No Fiscal Impact to the General Fund) Treasurer. (Commission District 2, 4 and 5.)

Chair Hill indicated that she wanted the Consent Agenda Items to be heard first, followed by the Block vote, and then Agenda Item 9. Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas requested that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) first hear the Consent Agenda Items, then Agenda Item 9, and finally the Block vote. Chair Hill agreed to the order proposed by ICM Thomas and explained that, following those items, the Board would hear the remaining items in chronological order. She inquired if any members of the BCC wanted to pull items from the Consent Agenda, and it was determined that they did not.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Tolini Vega greeted the Board and thanked them for allowing her to speak about her nonprofit organization. She introduced herself as the President of the Born2Ball Basketball Academy. She noted that Joe Vega, Head Director and Coach of the Born2Ball Basketball Academy, was also in attendance at the BCC meeting. She explained that Born2Ball Basketball Academy was a nonprofit

organization dedicated to assisting the underserved boys and girls in the Reno and Sparks communities. She stated that the organization's mission was to provide youth athletes with elite basketball training, meaningful opportunities, mentorship, and a path towards continued education beyond high school. She noted that Northern Nevada basketball programs currently offer few opportunities for youth athletes to comprehensively learn to play competitive basketball or compete at a high level. She explained that Born2Ball Basketball Academy addressed those regional lapses in opportunities by offering genuine development, competition, and pathways forward while remaining affordable for the community. She explained that the organization removed the idea of selection from the sport and provided opportunities to any athlete willing to work towards improvement. She stated that the organization was very proud to have welcomed over 200 athletes during the organization's first basketball season in March, as it represented 200 children working hard, learning discipline, gaining confidence, staying active, and avoiding risk-prone environments. She explained that the organization's priority to create a safe and supportive environment where every child felt recognized, valued, and inspired to reach their full potential had remained the same as it continued to grow with each basketball season. She stated that Born2Ball Basketball Academy was more than just a program for many children who participated, as they felt the program was a lifeline, a family, and a place where they discovered who they could be. She explained that the organization was extremely proud that Born2Ball Basketball Academy was entirely operated by community volunteers. She explained that every training session, basketball game, and the time invested into helping the youth came from those who volunteered their time due to their passion and commitment to the community. She expressed hope that the organization would continue to grow, allowing staff to be compensated for their hard work and dedication. She explained that the desire to expand was why the organization invited others to join their nonprofit's community. She opined that when someone supported the organization, their donation was an investment in meaningful change. She stated that she had high goals for the future, which included launching a scholarship program, establishing a safe and open space gym for students to use after school, and continuing to expand the organization's reach to serve more youths in need. She noted that her dreams were substantial, genuine, and possible with community support. She stated that she was deeply grateful for Commissioner Garcia's generous support, as her contribution was not only financial, but also acted as a message to the young athletes in the program that made them feel as though their dreams mattered and their futures were worth investing in. She thanked Commissioner Garcia for believing in the organization's mission, making a notable impact on the future of the participants, and for being part of Born2Ball Basketball Academy.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8I2 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8I2 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**25-0822**      **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to execute a non-binding letter of intent from the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada for the purposes of

assisting Washoe County to assure the appropriate use and positioning of surplus land for the overall benefit of the community by developing the land to the highest and best use. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro indicated that the Board had wished to discuss how Washoe County-owned property was put to the highest and best use. He stated that the County's strategic objective was to develop initiatives focused on subjects such as attainable housing, County facilities, or other infrastructure. He noted that the County did not have an economic development reach and that, in collaboration with the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), a nonprofit third party was established to serve as the County's convener for all matters related to economic development. He said that the nonprofit third party would bring assessed needs through development work that could benefit citizens on County-owned properties. He pointed out that Agenda Item 9 was the letter of intent to allow County staff and EDAWN to collaborate on determining parcel projects for County-owned land.

ACM Solaro noted that the County owned 12 acres of land in the North Valleys that he felt was ripe for attainable housing; however, the County had been unsuccessful in utilizing the land because it lacked the necessary staff expertise. He indicated that the County needed someone to help determine the highest and best use of the property. He recalled that Commissioner Clark had mentioned on several occasions the need to add specific properties to the tax rolls to generate revenue for the County. ACM Solaro explained that for years, the County struggled to develop the right approach to put the Court Street property to good community use. He believed that the courthouse needed to be updated and that the Board's direction was to make the courthouse updates one of the top infrastructure projects. He stated that the County owned multiple properties downtown and that the County needed assistance in determining the best approach for developing the properties to benefit the community. He expressed his excitement about moving forward with EDAWN.

EDAWN Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Taylor Adams congratulated interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas on the Board's appointment of her as County Manager (CM). He explained that EDAWN advocated for free markets, the private sector, public-private partnerships (P3s), and the highest and best use of real estate. He believed that EDAWN had valuable tools for the County and would offer broader conversations with the private sector regarding how the parcels could be leveraged to deliver the County's best vision. He opined that EDAWN could provide fast performance and offer great opportunities to explore options, allowing the private sector to mitigate some of the risks that the County could encounter. He recognized a fellow member of EDAWN, Mr. Eric Rowen, who he said had helped him greatly in structuring the discussion.

Chair Hill recalled that the Board had participated in previous discussions during the strategic planning retreat regarding the potential move forward with the EDAWN agreement. She stated that the Board would serve as the final authority on any project and would make the ultimate decision; however, EDAWN would support the County on specific projects to better assist the community.

Commissioner Garcia indicated that she was a member of EDAWN but had no pecuniary interest in the matter. She said that she would vote in favor of Agenda Item 9 and was proud to serve with EDAWN. She expressed excitement towards revitalizing underutilized properties that the County owned and thought it was beneficial to partner with subject matter experts. She asked how many parcels the Board was presented with. ACM Solaro reported that there were hundreds of properties; however, many of them had deed restrictions associated with donations to the County. He stated that a disposal list, located in the backup materials for the item and labeled as Exhibit A-EDAWN/WC Letter of Intent, outlined the parcels deemed as surplus with no specific use. He explained that properties that were easier to process would be included in the first target grouping, which would comprise approximately 8 to 10 parcels. Commissioner Garcia thanked ACM Solaro for pointing out the attachments. She asked if most of the parcels were infill projects, excluding the North Valleys and Lemmon Valley. ACM Solaro noted that there was one parcel in Lemmon Valley that was questionable, with the rest of the parcels being infill projects. Commissioner Garcia asked if the remaining parcels had existing infrastructure and services. ACM Solaro responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Andriola believed that EDAWN deserved applause. She thought the alignment of the private marketplace and the market-driven approach, as exemplified by EDAWN, had been successful worldwide. She thanked EDAWN for attending an inaugural opportunity that she hoped would be put to good use. She felt that Agenda Item 9 was a market-driven funding opportunity. She thanked Mr. Adams and Commissioner Garcia for their leadership. She opined that EDAWN utilized several experiences and maximized the community's benefits. Mr. Adams indicated that EDAWN had been in the area for two years. Commissioner Andriola speculated that future presentations would be beneficial as projects were identified, as it was a new venture that could have barriers that needed discussion. She mentioned that she had worked on other resources over the past two years, which she hoped would be presented to the Board to add additional market-driven opportunities. She noted that some of the parcels appeared to have infrastructure in place and reminded the Board that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) offered disposal land maps for \$100 per acre. She thought that Southern Nevada had done a good job at utilizing some of the BLM resources. She asserted that Agenda Item 9 was a great opportunity that would benefit everyone. She thanked ACM Solaro and Mr. Adams for their vision and work in organizing the matter.

Commissioner Clark recalled that he had previously served as the County Assessor and did not think that the County should be in the property management business, as he stated that there was no County staff member with a real estate broker's license or understanding of property management. He asserted that the surplus parcels needed to be off the tax rolls. He noted that sagebrush did not pay property tax or house anyone other than rodents and rabbits. He said that if there were development, the County would be creating jobs and housing that would be on the tax rolls. He opined that Agenda Item 9 was the most illogical step. He relayed that he had been a real estate broker for 50 years and that the County needed to find quality real estate brokers to research how to put the parcels on the open market to receive the highest and best use dollar amount. He felt that Agenda Item 9 was like holding an auction but only allowing one person to bid. He thought that the

parcels needed to be listed and looked at by foreign, local, and national companies to get the top dollar. He said that EDAWN was another agency that the County had to pay for.

Commissioner Clark expressed opposition to Agenda Item 9 and indicated that brokers could organize proposals for the County to understand the value of the parcels and negotiate costs, thereby enabling the highest and best use of the properties. He said that the taxpayers owned the parcels, not the County, and he believed that selling them was the best fiduciary responsibility to the constituents. He pointed out that his position was different than the rest of the Board, other than Vice Chair Herman, who he mentioned was also a real estate broker. He thought that Mr. Adams was a great guy who probably did a good job; however, Agenda Item 9 would add another person who would receive funds from the parcels. He believed that all the revenue should be returned to the County's accounts for the highest and best use.

Mr. Adams thanked Commissioner Clark for his comments and said that he would be remiss if he did not disclose that the process Commissioner Clark indicated might occur. He relayed that he was not a commercial real estate broker; however, every commercial real estate broker and developer in the region invested in EDAWN. He explained that EDAWN intended to ensure that the process was open and fair, as defined by the County, for the Board's consideration. He opined that the highest and best use of the parcel was possible and critical with input from the private sector.

Commissioner Clark surmised that he wanted to be on a County committee that found the best deal for the taxpayers and stated that he was a subject matter expert with decades of experience as a real estate broker, mortgage broker, and property manager. He explained that he knew what he was talking about and how to secure the best deals. He recalled that he recently assisted the County with a lease that concluded on favorable terms. He said that the property needed to be liquidated without an extra layer of personnel in the process.

Mr. Rowen explained that the goal of the arrangement was not only to determine the highest and best use of the parcels but also to achieve the highest return for the County. He reported that it was essential to achieve the County's goals. He recalled that the previous two hours of the meeting had included complaints about a lack of housing and workforce affordability. He believed that with the help of EDAWN, the County could have an answer to those issues by utilizing a profit-driven developer to use the property to produce a product that the community needed. He believed Mr. Adams did excellent work and brought in higher-paying and more sustainable jobs, which allowed individuals to afford a place to live. He asserted that the goal was to produce community needs while generating revenue from the properties. He said that the Board wanted to receive taxes from a large parcel, which would be done with real marketplace developers who produced better services for those around the parcel. He explained that different ancillary facilities and properties were needed to support the County's parcels while generating additional tax revenues. He said that a 501(c)(6) would ultimately own or be responsible for the property. He stated that the County would have the final word regarding what happened to the parcels. He mentioned that Commissioner Clark may not need to divest the property but

instead could ground lease the parcel for 50 or 60 years, which would support financing to build the project. He asserted that many options did not require liquidation. He said that liquidating vacant, underused, or dilapidated land would not necessarily bring in as much funding as a property with already completed development. He supported the project and relayed that EDAWN and ACM Solaro performed excellent work on the proposal.

Commissioner Clark appreciated Mr. Rowen's comments but clarified that Mr. Rowen was a salesperson, and he did not believe that Mr. Rowen had listened to his previous comments. He asserted that he did not want a middleman and did not want to have more people in a project unless necessary. He recalled that there had been speculation that EDAWN had shown favoritism with certain realtors in the past, which he did not want the County to be involved in. He wished for the parcels to be placed on the open market. He stated that he wanted the land sold to receive a cash infusion, not leased. He explained that there were constituents in the audience who wished to obtain more funding for the library, and that the money received from the sold parcels could be allocated towards the library or other struggling departments, rather than EDAWN. He urged the Board to research subject matter experts who could bid on a contract that would allow for all the parcels to be placed on the open market. He said that EDAWN did a good job; however, he did not think they were a good fit for the County. He explained that a hired real estate broker would receive the same treatment from him because he wanted the highest paid and best use for the parcels. He opined that the County had other contracts for various things, and it seemed that the County only ever bid to one contractor, instead of negotiating or exploring other options. Mr. Adams thanked Commissioner Clark for his feedback.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Todd Bailey explained that he reviewed the backup material related to Agenda Item 9 and did not see a cost associated with the County partnering with EDAWN. He wondered if there would be financial transactions from EDAWN to the taxpayers related to the parcels. He noted that EDAWN would receive a surplus of taxpayer property at no cost, with complete discretion to use the parcel as they wished. He asked the Board or EDAWN to correct him if he was mistaken. He expressed opposition to Agenda Item 9 if the County did not receive revenue from the sales. Chair Hill stated that Mr. Bailey's statements were inaccurate and that the County would retain the property.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-2 vote, with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be authorized.

\* \* \* \* \*

Vice Chair Herman suggested that Agenda Item 10 not be added to the Block vote, as its content was similar in nature to the topic of Agenda Item 11, to which Chair Hill agreed.

\* \* \* \* \*



**BLOCK VOTE – 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, AND 18**

- 25-0823**      **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to Acknowledge the Publication of Notice of Intent to Augment Budgets and approval of the attached resolution to augment the Fiscal Year 2026 Other Restricted Fund budget, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 354.410, in the amount of [\$1,375,000.00] to appropriate previously unbudgeted sources consisting of non-pooled interest revenue, to support the remittance of Washoe County's Local Assistance and Tribal Consistency Fund (LATCF) monies, including the principal and interest earned, to the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada (CFNN) (to be approved at a future Board of County Commissioners meeting). The augmentation will increase revenue and expenditure budget authority for the purpose of remittance to CFNN, to support the creation of the Washoe Behavioral Health Endowment Fund, which in turn, will support operations and maintenance of the Washoe Behavioral Health Center; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments (no General Fund impact). Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be acknowledged, approved, and directed. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Agenda Item 13 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

- 25-0824**      **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to approve an Employment Agreement for Kate Thomas to serve as the Washoe County Manager, starting December 1, 2025 until November 30, 2027, including provisions for an annual salary of \$338,998.40, which reflects a 10% increase compared to Ms. Thomas' current Assistant County Manager base salary and reflects a salary approximately 1% less than the prior Washoe County Manager, and employment agreement benefits in the annual amount of \$14,900 and other provisions common to executive employment contracts including those of previous County Managers. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Ms. Trista Gomez displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She wished that everyone in attendance at the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting earlier in the day had stayed longer. She stated that the printed chart in the document she submitted was the information she had started with, and the written portion was the notes she had added. She opined that it was interesting that during the presentation for Agenda Item 7A1, Maurice Page, the Executive Director of the Nevada Housing Coalition (NHC), had shown the incomes of the private sector. She stated that many of the workers in the private sector resided in District 3. She opined that the inequities were massive between the salaries listed in Mr. Page's

presentation and those shown in the document she submitted. She thought that she could easily work as an office manager in the private sector; however, she would not be paid as much as an administrative secretary with Washoe County. She stated that 78 percent of the County's budget was dedicated to salaries. She believed that law enforcement had been funded last, and she opined that they should have been given priority because public safety should be the primary concern. She acknowledged that while she could be wrong, she thought that law enforcement had received a raise after all the budgets and salaries were approved. She explained that there had been an increase of approximately 40 percent in the budget since 2019, and she recalled that the County had received a substantial amount of money from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). She stated that when the County received the ARPA funds, it was aware, due to the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan (Master Plan), that there would be a need for development and housing. She said that instead of using those funds for housing, development, infrastructure, or necessities that would benefit 98 percent of the County's residents by enabling them to live comfortably in the area, the money was invested elsewhere, including much of it in the Nevada Cares Campus. She opined that the utilization of ARPA funds had only benefited a very small percentage of people, despite the County being aware of local infrastructure issues. She believed that the salary raises prevented investment in libraries, which she recalled had been discussed due to their lack of funds. She stated that the pay raises also prevented infrastructure, maintenance, and other matters that would benefit a large majority of residents. She acknowledged that although County personnel gained from the salary raises, most residents did not have access to or benefit from those wages, Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) packages, or County employee benefits, which she thought was hurting people. She stated that interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas had been lovely to her and had provided her with substantial opportunities. She opined that the salaries were unsustainable and would cause further harm to other programs that served the rest of the population.

Mr. Todd Bailey self-identified as a paid lobbyist for Nevada Accountability and stated that transparency was the new goal of the BCC. He asked if the kind of transparency sought by the Board was total and complete transparency. He said that the employment agreement for the County Manager (CM) was full of unknowns to taxpayers, as there was no way to predict or financially forecast the obligations outlined in the contract. He stated that the unknown variables included annual cost of living adjustments (COLAs), longevity and holiday pay, PERS, healthcare, life insurance, and a provision for unlimited bonus and merit pay increases. He said that although he fully approved of ICM Thomas' employment agreement, it was not unreasonable that he needed to understand every detail of its cost, as the contract was how people were funding their own management and was being used as a guide. He believed that ICM Thomas was the right person to have been chosen for the role of CM out of all of the candidates who had applied for the position. He thanked ICM Thomas and recalled appreciating the personal way in which she had approached him during a previous public meeting, noting that they had a good conversation. He said that he looked forward to working with her in the future. He stated that the BCC had access to more spendable tax money than any of the former Boards throughout Washoe County's over 150 years of history, which was why ICM Thomas could be offered such a generous contract. He said that the County needed adults

to work for it to accomplish what the BCC required, which was an expensive endeavor. He stated that he wanted to know with total transparency exactly how much that cost was each month. He explained that he would submit a public records request (PRR) every month so the County could provide the unknown information, which he did not think was unreasonable, as he only wanted to know the actual cost of those expenses. He congratulated ICM Thomas and reiterated that she was the right candidate for the job. He wished her good luck as the following 12 months would be very challenging.

Ms. Penny Brock introduced herself and recalled that ICM Thomas had taken the position of ICM in July and had received a substantial raise of \$333,000 at that time. Ms. Brock stated that she did not understand why ICM Thomas was receiving an additional pay raise. She recalled that there had been complaints about that compensation when it was previously presented. She noted that those comments were followed by a response that ICM Thomas's salary was still below what former CM Eric Brown had received while in the role. She stated that former CM Brown did not start with a salary over \$300,000 five years prior and had instead worked toward that compensation over time, which meant that he had gained experience and knowledge to merit the raises. She reiterated that ICM Thomas had only served in the position of ICM since July, and she asked what merited ICM Thomas receiving a substantial raise. She opined that the taxpayers could not afford that raise. She stated the County had a budget of \$1 billion to \$1.2 billion, yet the previous fiscal year (FY) had ended with a \$25 million deficit. She referred to Agenda Item 18 and believed that it indicated that the County was approaching another deficit for FY 2026. She stated that Clark County had 2.3 million residents and 43 million tourists visiting annually. She noted that Washoe County had 500,000 residents, though she did not have the information regarding Washoe County's annual tourist count. She reported that Kevin Schiller, the Clark County CM, received a salary of \$297,000. She explained that before Mr. Schiller's employment with Clark County, he had worked as an Assistant County Manager (ACM) for Washoe County. She opined that Mr. Schiller had substantial experience to merit his \$297,000 salary. She asked why ICM Thomas wanted another raise when she did not have the experience in the position, and the County did not have the population to justify it. She opined that the salary should be based on a comparative scale with Clark County. She stated that she did not think it was excessive for taxpayers to ask for staff to receive comparable salaries based on a location's population and a candidate's experience. She asked that the Board vote against ICM Thomas receiving another raise.

Ms. Darla Lee stated that she wanted to echo the concerns of the previous three speakers, noting that she agreed with their statements. She thought that enough information had been given to support why Agenda Item 14 should not be voted into effect. She believed Agenda Item 14 somewhat compared to what had occurred within the school systems throughout the United States (US). She thought the comparison was particularly valid for the Washoe County School District (WCSD), as the administration received the bulk of the funds allocated to the school budgets rather than the teachers. She opined that there was something wrong that needed to be addressed if the same issue of administrators receiving excessive salaries were to occur with Washoe County staff. She urged the Board to vote against Agenda Item 14.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved.

**25-0825**      **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to approve a Recycled Water Infrastructure Oversizing Agreement between Washoe County and DiLoreto Construction and Development, Inc. for the costs associated with Washoe County's request to oversize a section of proposed recycled water line to a distribution main, located on Assessor Parcel Number 140-010-55, allowing for the expansion of recycled water distribution within the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility service area [in the amount \$399,094.32]. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be approved.

**25-0826**      **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation to accept a FY26 Homemaker subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) in the amount of [\$326,690.20; \$49,004.00 county match] retroactive from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 to provide Homemaker services to seniors aged 60 or older in Washoe County; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

**25-0827**      **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to approve the reimbursement of costs incurred by the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, and Washoe County for expenses related to and in support of the Enhanced 911 Emergency Response System and portable event recording devices as recommended by the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee on July 17, 2025, and September 18, 2025, in an amount not to exceed [\$1,047,166.19] as specified within the adopted Enhanced 911 Fund's operating budget. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be approved.

**25-0828**      **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Interim Financial Report for Washoe County Governmental Funds for the Three Months Ended September 30, 2025 recognizing a total funds balance increase of \$35 million year-to-date and \$17 million year over year. This unaudited interim financial report is provided quarterly, in addition to the audited annual comprehensive financial report, to provide information on Washoe County's primary operating fund and accounts and identify significant variances between the years. - Unaudited. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be acknowledged.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Hill stated that Agenda Item 10, Minute Item Number 25-0829, and Agenda Item 11, Minute Item Number 25-0830, would be opened simultaneously, as they shared similar content.

\* \* \* \* \*

**25-0829**      **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to elect to use ballots, including mail ballots and return envelopes, purchased by the State, as authorized by NRS 293.2694, for the 2026 Primary and General election cycle. The State contract was awarded to ProVote Solutions as the statewide vendor. If the County elects to use the ballots obtained by the State, the State vendor will provide Washoe County with all ballots, including, without limitation, mail ballots, return envelopes, secrecy sleeves, I Vote Stickers, and voter instruction materials. If approved authorize the Registrar of Voters to provide written notice to the Secretary of State of Washoe County's intent to use ballots purchased by the State, as required by NRS 293.2694(2). Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas stated that Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald was present and could answer any questions the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) might have. ICM Thomas inquired whether the Board would prefer if she read the language of Agenda Item 11 first, as it had been opened alongside Agenda Item 10. Chair Hill agreed as it would allow the Board to discuss both items simultaneously. ICM Thomas noted that Agenda Item 11 was not strictly connected to Agenda Item 10, but she clarified that both were associated with the ROV's Office.

Chair Hill inquired if the Board had any questions before opening the item to public comment, and it was determined that they did not. County Clerk Jan Galassini

stated that she would begin the public comment for Agenda Item 10. She noted that several speakers had signed up for public comment on both Agenda Item 10 and Agenda Item 11, and she asked Chair Hill whether those individuals would have two opportunities to speak. Chair Hill thought that there would be just one opportunity provided to comment on the items being heard simultaneously.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock introduced herself and displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She stated that she assumed she would have three minutes to speak for Agenda Item 10 and another three minutes for Agenda Item 11, as those items were not included in the block vote. She noted that Agenda Item 10 was associated with the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) requesting the County to use ProVote Solutions as the vendor to print local election materials. She stated that ProVote Solutions was based in California and recalled that an agenda item had been presented to the BCC in 2023 seeking approval for ProVote Solutions to print the County's election materials. She stated that Vice Chair Herman and Commissioners Andriola and Clark had voted against that approval because they had expressed a desire for the printing to be done in Washoe County or by a vendor based in Nevada, which resulted in ProVote Solutions' services not being utilized at that time. She asked that the BCC not to approve using ProVote Solutions as the vendor, as she believed the decision regarding who would print the materials should be made locally rather than by the SOS. She stated that the SOS wanted control over everything related to elections. She opined that residents did not want the State of Nevada to control the County's elections, as local control of the government and elections was supported by the United States (US) Constitution. She stated that another issue with Agenda Item 10 was that the SOS had claimed that utilizing ProVote Solutions would be a cheaper option. She stated that she did not feel as though the SOS's claim was a valid reason to support this plan, as Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 293.200 outlined that the State provided reimbursements for certain election materials. She acknowledged that she was uncertain about that information, as she had not had a chance to compare the details. She opined that the County could spend the money needed to print election materials locally or in Nevada if it could invest \$88 million to support 1,800 homeless individuals. She suggested that the Nevada State Printing Office in Carson City could print the materials. She opined that another issue with Agenda Item 10 was the lack of information regarding who would serve as the mailing house for the election materials, which she described as another concern for voters. She stated that the approval of using the materials from ProVote Solutions meant that voters' personal information would be transported to California. She reported that the SOS was under investigation by the Department of Justice (DOJ), and stated that the SOS did not want the County's voting information to be sent to the DOJ. She inquired why the SOS wanted that information to be sent to ProVote Solutions in California, which she considered illogical. She asked the Board to vote against approving Agenda Item 10 and to reconsider the item at a later time. She noted that the NRS required contracts to be put out for bid.

Ms. Maureen Cunha was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Janet Butcher said she concurred with Ms. Brock's earlier comment. She indicated that although she appreciated the availability of an example that could be

referenced, she believed the situation was similar to a statement from former House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who said that people would have to vote for the Affordable Care Act (ACA) before they could learn about its contents. She opined that Agenda Item 10 should have been made public earlier. She inquired why the item had not been included in the agenda for the previous BCC meeting, which had concluded at 12:00 p.m. on October 28, 2025. She asked why Agenda Item 10 had not been tabled until the following BCC meeting, so that individuals could have an opportunity to investigate it. She thought people had been unaware of the item. She expressed concerns about the voting machines. She recalled having previously mentioned that she was a programmer and knew how a machine could be programmed to hide code or destroy its own code. She reiterated that she was entirely against the use of any voting machines. She opined that hand counting should be used during elections and that it could be done, as it had been proven to be possible the previous year during the caucus.

Ms. Darla Lee echoed the comments of the two previous speakers. She stated that she did not understand why things could not be done locally to provide people in Nevada with opportunities. She asked why residents would want to have all of the election materials printed in California, as people did not wish Nevada to be like California. She said what was really needed was decentralization rather than increased government control. She reported that she had been a poll worker for several years since moving to the area, and she stated that the different ways the elections had been run were a significant concern to her. She said she had not had the chance to review the information regarding the new provisions for the elections, and she noted that she would have also liked more time to learn about the matter before the BCC held a vote on it.

Mr. Alan Munson thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He wanted to reiterate what the previous speakers had said. He noted that he did not have a lot of new information, but he concurred with the comments made by those individuals. He expressed feelings of concern because residents needed to be able to have their voting matters decided locally. He opined that there had been a lot of issues associated with how the votes were counted. He hoped the Board heard what the citizens had mentioned, noting that he was just one of the people who had urged the BCC to keep election services based in Washoe County. He noted that Ms. Brock had mentioned that the difference in cost was minimal, so the County would not be losing or spending additional money. He reiterated his hope that the Board would listen to him as a citizen of Washoe County who was speaking in favor of keeping the development of election ballots local by not giving those responsibilities to the SOS. He said he understood that the development of the election material was being done by a company located in California.

Ms. Galassini advised the Board that she received emailed public comments for both Agenda Items 10 and 11, which were placed on file.

Mr. George Lee noted that he was speaking regarding both Agenda Items 10 and 11. He opined that the BCC would be corrupt if it were to sign a contract with Liberty Vote for equipment, computers, and software systems. He believed that anyone who dealt with property or ownership would never purchase something without first seeing

what was being purchased. He explained that the purchase would mean relying on a temporary output of the product, and for Agenda Item 11, that product was a counted vote. He stated that someone could program the machine to alter its code, allowing the machine to do whatever they wanted at any moment in time on any day. He said that the Board was dealing with a closed, proprietary software that public entities should never purchase. He opined that a contract that locked someone into an agreement with another person who was hiding something should never be signed. He stated that property should not be sold or purchased without first being analyzed and verified to ensure that it met expectations. He opined that the problem with the software and hardware package was that it was not allowed to be viewed beforehand, and that it was a secret. He asked how the Board could sell or purchase property while not being able to see it. He recalled that Commissioner Clark had mentioned the previous question during discussions regarding the process for what should happen when property was sold and removed from the books. He stated that former members of the BCC worked diligently for 15 years to destroy the Wild Creek Golf Course after claiming they would put a \$250 million high school on the land. He elaborated that those former BCC members had not initially known the construction would incur such an expense, but he noted that they had not listened to the people who had previously informed them of the cost.

Ms. Kit Waite greeted the Board. She stated that it became clear to her that the Commissioners did not listen to the majority of what the public commenters said, but she hoped that the Board would listen to the comments on Agenda Item 10. She noted that many constituents were concerned about the item. She urged the Board to table the item for later consideration to provide those individuals with more information. She opined that taxpayers deserved the right to know how their elections would be conducted, as it was part of a citizen's freedom of speech and ability to demonstrate who they wanted to vote for. She said that it was not fair for the Board to vote to approve a new machine that citizens had concerns about and did not entirely know the implications of. She emphasized that such knowledge was necessary. She said that it was the responsibility of the BCC as elected officials to listen to what citizens said and to be the representatives of their voices.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. Galassini notified Chair Hill that public comment for Agenda Item 10 had concluded. She explained that some of the same commenters had signed up to provide public comment on Agenda Item 11, and their comments would need to be heard separately from those they had given for Agenda Item 10.

\* \* \* \* \*

On the call for the public comment on Agenda Item 11, Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She stated that the actions potentially being taken regarding the contract with Liberty Vote were very serious. She explained that the document she submitted showed Liberty Vote's website, which she noted did not display menu tabs at the top. She stated that people did not know what they might get with LibertyVote.com. She reported



that the contract with Dominion Voting Systems had expired, and according to the NRS, when such an agreement expired, it had to be put out to bid and undergo solicitation. She stated that those actions had not been taken, which was a violation of the NRS, and she thought that should concern the Board. She said that it was the responsibility of the County Manager (CM) and the manager of the ROV Office to conduct those solicitation efforts. She stated the document she had submitted outlined that each county in the state of Washington could choose its own voting system option, and there were various places where Requests for Proposals (RFPs) could be sent. She encouraged ICM Thomas and Mr. McDonald to investigate the matter. She reported that the County Clerk of Boulder, Colorado, oversaw elections in that jurisdiction and had sent a letter to all local voters informing them about the new Liberty Vote company. She explained that in that letter, the Boulder County Clerk described how she had met with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Liberty Vote. Ms. Brock asked whether the Liberty Vote CEO had talked to or met with ICM Thomas, who managed the ROV. She opined that there was a lack of transparency in Washoe County. She believed that elections were one of the most important things that the BCC oversaw, and she thought that the Commissioners should be concerned. She reported that the sale of Dominion Voting Systems to Liberty Vote had been announced at the beginning of October 2025. She asked how the contract between Washoe County and Liberty Vote, included in the attachments for Agenda Item 11, had been pre-dated for August 26, 2025, as that date was before Liberty Vote had purchased Dominion Voting Systems. She thought that the contract date was strange and did not seem right. She noted that the document she had submitted also included some articles, one of which was titled *What the surprise sale of Dominion Voting Systems means for election officials*, which surmised that not much was expected to come of the sale at that time. She stated that the document also included an article by National Public Radio (NPR) titled *Does the sale of Dominion Voting Systems mean a transformation? Depends who's asking*, which she noted had been published by an organization that was not necessarily right-wing.

Ms. Tracey Thomas read from a document, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She explained that those with institutional knowledge of the ROV Office would be aware that Washoe County had used new poll books in 2018, which required voters to sign a tablet to complete their vote, causing new signatures to be added to the voter database. She remarked that digital signatures were different than those done on a piece of paper. She recalled that same-day voter registration was mandated by the Nevada Legislature in 2019, which the new voting equipment vendor could not accommodate, resulting in a waste of taxpayer money to revert to the legacy system from 2016. She opined that such events represented a costly lesson as to why the County should not bind itself to contracts that could not guarantee prudent use of taxpayer funds in future years. She noted that although she was in favor of the first suggested motion for Agenda Item 11 to purchase Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs), she disapproved of the second motion, as she believed it would significantly impact taxpayers over the subsequent three election cycles. She stated that there was no guarantee that the nearly \$2 million investment in equipment would meet the needs of voters and adhere to changes in election laws. She opined that it was unreasonable to incur 3 percent increases in charges during years when the voting equipment was not being used for an additional \$3 million. She questioned the absence of an option to wait and purchase the equipment after seeing how the trial version

would function the following year. She asked whether the \$25,000 Election Management System (EMS) server could be provided by the County's Technology Services (TS) staff, and inquired about the \$68,000 cost for shipping, the estimated return on the sale of the Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT) devices, why annual fees were being paid on equipment that was not yet owned, and why different rates were listed for the same category multiple times. She asked whether the ballots provided an option for parallel hand counts, whether the scanning device provided a receipt for the voter with a unique number they could use to retrieve a digital image of their ballot online, and whether the scanners were directly connected to the internet or loaded onto Universal Serial Bus (USB) devices that would be transported to the ROV Office. She wanted to know what the ROV was doing to address the issues in the March 25, 2025, executive order, aside from eliminating quick-response (QR) codes.

Ms. Trista Gomez was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Janet Butcher stated that she was confused after it was decided that Agenda Items 10 and 11 would be heard simultaneously. She noted that she had mostly spoken about Agenda Item 11 during her earlier comment. She stated that Mr. George Lee had mentioned something previously that resonated with her, as she had previously audited software for banks. She asked whether Liberty Vote had a good audit log of any programming changes made by their company and how people would be able to see what might have happened in that regard. She opined that Mr. Lee had mentioned some good points during his earlier comment. She asked whether the Commissioners would sign a personal contract without knowing what might be hidden within it.

Ms. Jennifer Willett self-identified as a paid lobbyist and Senior Campaign Manager for All Voting Is Local Action Nevada. She explained that All Voting Is Local Action Nevada was an organization that advocated for policies and legislative priorities aimed at expanding voter access. She stated that her organization supported Agenda Item 11 for the BMDs, as the technology strengthened the voting system by combining accessibility, accuracy, and voter confidence. She said that by continuing to use voting machines to mark ballots, voters were allowed to use English or Spanish language versions of the ballots, which supported language access in Washoe County. She stated that voting machines supported voters with disabilities through the availability of features such as adjustable text size, audio output, and other assistive technologies, which ensured that every voter could cast their vote independently and privately throughout the process. She noted that once a voter had made their selections, the voting machine would print a paper ballot that they could review and verify before casting it. She said that the printing process helped voters feel confident and comfortable with their choices. She reported that BMDs were not new and had been used throughout the State for several years. She stated that her organization believed the hybrid voting system, which combined technology and paper, achieved the proper balance between voter confidence, efficiency, and accessibility. She urged the Board to support the funding of the BMDs.

Ms. Darla Lee was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Kathy Wilson Sietsema introduced herself as a resident of Washoe County. She stated that she had approached the Board to voice her support of Agenda Item 11. She wanted the Board to give consideration to Commissioner Clark's earlier comments during Agenda Item 9, which had addressed the need to seek subject matter experts and that the BCC should rely on their expertise. She stated that digital election management was a fact of life that progressed at the same rate as the current technological lifestyle. She noted that the hardware could alleviate tampering and fear, as well as record mail-in ballots as they became available, which would reduce the time it would take to count ballots. She opined that perceptions grew and rumors circulated during the timeframe when ballots were being counted. She reported that she formerly served as a Washoe County Public Information Officer from 1995 to 1998, which coincided with the first scrutiny of several acts by the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO). She noted that those events had caused the SOS to take over the election process. She stated that while the BCC listened to public input, they recognized that it was the expertise of staff and other experts in relevant fields that informed their understanding. She opined that the public would benefit by understanding that if they wanted their comments to be seriously considered by the Board, they should hire the expert themselves to speak before the BCC. She encouraged the Board to listen to Commissioner Clark's previous comments regarding relying on the expertise of the individuals presenting information about voting equipment during the meeting.

Mr. Alan Munson stated that he had little more to add to his previous comment. He encouraged the Board not to vote in support of Agenda Item 11. He recalled the earlier mention of the word *expertise*, and he opined that it did not require much expertise to count votes manually when there was a nonpartisan group watching, compared to a machine that could not be overseen because everything was processed internally. He said that people could have much more confidence in the vote counting when it was done manually by individuals from different political affiliations. He stated that citizens had concerns about the way voting was handled in Washoe County. He reiterated his encouragement to the Board not to vote in support of Agenda Item 11.

Ms. Kit Waite stated that there had been some confusion regarding the public comment for Agenda Items 10 and 11. She noted that she had essentially already said what she had intended to during her previous comment. She described herself as an old soul and opined that Agenda Item 11 unnecessarily complicated things. She said that it seemed like hand-counting ballots had fewer issues associated with it than had been generated from the use of voting machines. She opined that the voting machines created more confusion and problems during elections. She encouraged the Board to postpone voting on Agenda Item 11 until a later BCC meeting, when more information was available.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Hill stated that the Board would resume discussions regarding Agenda Item 10.

\* \* \* \* \*

Commissioner Andriola noted that while Agenda Items 10 and 11 belonged within the same broad category, she wanted to inquire whether Mr. McDonald could provide the Board with a brief summary of those items. She acknowledged that the BCC had already been given the staff reports, but she reiterated her previous question by asking whether Mr. McDonald could provide a summary and discuss the process of his evaluations with complete transparency.

Mr. McDonald explained that he would begin by discussing the State ballot printer. He reported that in 2021, Assembly Bill (AB) 321 established Nevada as an all-mail ballot election State and AB 126 created the Presidential Preference Primary (PPP) to be held every four years, which had increased the County's cost of printing ballots. He recalled that NRS 293.26991 was enacted in 2023 and directed the County to prepare and mail a ballot to every active and registered voter, further increasing costs incurred by the County during the election timeframes. He explained that the Board was being asked to choose whether they wanted Washoe County to leverage the contract with ProVote Solutions, which the SOS had presented to every county in Nevada.

Mr. McDonald wanted to address many of the comments made previously by the public regarding their desire to continue printing election materials in Nevada. He clarified that Washoe County's current printing vendor for mail ballots, Runbeck Election Services, was not located in Nevada and was instead based in Phoenix, Arizona. He suspected that people might have confused the mail ballot printing with that of the sample ballot booklets, as the booklets were printed in Southern Nevada by Taylor Printing Services. He elaborated that the County's mail ballots had recently all been printed in Arizona, where they would subsequently be delivered to Washoe County by truck. He reported that the mail ballots from Arizona went directly to the United States Postal Service (USPS) Post Office located on Vassar Street in Reno. He emphasized that the process would not involve the ballots being sent to Sacramento or California in order to bring them to Washoe County. He wanted to be clear that the ballots would be transported by truck to the USPS Post Office on Vassar Street, which would then deliver them directly to residents' local post office or residence. He stated that utilizing a new print vendor would save Washoe County money, which addressed the County's difficult financial situation that many members of the public had mentioned during their comments. He reported that the cost of utilizing the printing services of the vendor provided by the SOS to print mail ballots for the County was approximately \$200,000 per election. He emphasized that the SOS Office itself would not be printing the ballots directly and that only the vendor would provide the service. He explained that Washoe County would retain full control over the formatting of ballots, the *I Voted!* stickers, and the secrecy sleeves. He noted that all the information would be provided by Washoe County to the print vendor directly and would not be routed through the State. He repeated that the County would retain full control over that process. He reiterated that the BCC was being asked to decide whether it wanted to save the County money or continue utilizing Runbeck Election Services as the print vendor, who he opined had been a great partner and vendor, but came at a cost of approximately \$250,000 to print the ballots for each election.

Commissioner Andriola noted that some individuals had contacted her prior to the BCC meeting that day, which she thought was always wonderful, as it allowed those individuals to receive all their answers on an item ahead of time. She wanted to inquire about one of the questions she had received regarding the reason why the County's ballots could not be printed locally, or rather, what the barriers were that prevented those materials from being printed locally. Mr. McDonald responded that the SOS had very recently issued RFPs for the printing. Mr. McDonald reported that his understanding of that situation was that no companies or print vendors in Nevada had actually applied for the RFP from the SOS, which he identified as a barrier to having the ballots printed locally. He explained that if there were no companies available to print the ballots, the County had no choice but to consider vendors located elsewhere. He acknowledged that while there was a printer for sample ballot booklets in Southern Nevada, there was no local printing vendor for the ballots themselves. He referred to an earlier public comment about the SOS printing out of the Nevada State Printing Office, and explained that if the SOS wanted to do that, the service would have been offered, which he reported had not happened. He acknowledged that the SOS could print sample ballot booklets from that facility, but he clarified that they could not print the ballots themselves.

Commissioner Andriola agreed that the Nevada State Printing Office was no longer offering all the services it had in the past and was instead outsourcing some services to other vendors. She thanked Mr. McDonald for the clarification he had provided, as there were specific legal, federal, and statutory guidelines and requirements for printing those materials. She noted that if a printing company in Northern Nevada did not have the capacity to adhere to those requirements alone, it would have to seek a vendor and would need to subcontract to a certain extent, which was not part of the eligibility criteria for printing those materials. She noted that she had spoken to many printers several years ago and could personally attest that the capacity for that kind of printing was not available in Northern Nevada. She clarified that she was not referring to the printer of the sample ballot booklets in Southern Nevada. She thought it was important that the information she had provided was included in the record. She wanted to request that Mr. McDonald discuss Agenda Item 11 if there were no further questions from the Board.

Chair Hill agreed and said the Board would first vote on Agenda Item 10 before proceeding to discussions about Agenda Item 11. She apologized for the confusion caused by the order in which the items were discussed.

Commissioner Clark noted that he had a few questions. He recalled regularly mentioning that, during the previous cycle of distributing mail ballots, there were 34,000 or 43,000 returned ballots, although he could not remember the exact number. He stated that he had spoken to ICM Thomas about the matter within the previous few days. He asked Mr. McDonald to provide the Board with more information about the number of returned ballots. He stated his certainty that the act of rectifying the voter rolls likely cost the County several dollars per ballot. He asked Mr. McDonald if he could provide the Board with the exact cost for mailing out ballots, printing materials, paying for postage, and the labor of sorting the returned mail. He opined that to account for cost savings and fiscal responsibility, it made sense to ensure that the mailing addresses matched the

individuals who were actually supposed to vote, rather than sending mail only for it to be returned. He inquired whether Mr. McDonald could explain that further.

Mr. McDonald reported that since the BCC approved his appointment as ROV in February 2025, the ROV Office had conducted extensive bulk list maintenance and continued daily list maintenance as well. He explained that staff had inactivated 44,200 voters from the voter rolls, which he considered a large number in relation to the County's size. He noted that 25,000 cancellations had also been performed, which transferred a voter's status from inactive to canceled on the voter roll. He explained that those efforts reflected over 70,000 bulk inactivations since February, with more expected to occur in the future. He referred to Commissioner Clark's first question and reported that it cost approximately \$3.60 to \$3.80 to mail out each ballot. He stated that the benefit of utilizing the mail ballots was that the State would pay for the postage costs associated with mailing out ballots to voters and returning any of the returned ballots. He explained that the State was working with the USPS to set up accounts as of that day. He noted that staff at the ROV Office had inquired about that matter to confirm that the County would not bear those costs. He opined that the costs covered by the State did not make it any better to mail out ballots when not necessary, which was why staff continued to perform active bulk list maintenance and take those responsibilities seriously.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. McDonald for his answer and the good information he had provided. He stated that the public needed to hear those details as well, because there was considerable concern from constituents and citizens of the County. He noted that he had some information about Dominion Voting Systems being sold to Liberty Vote. Chair Hill explained that the Board would discuss Agenda Item 11 momentarily, as they had not yet finished Agenda Item 10. Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. McDonald again and noted that he had further questions to ask him regarding Agenda Item 11.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be elected, approved, and authorized.

**25-0830**      **AGENDA ITEM 11**      Recommendation to approve the transition from Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT) equipped Dominion Voting Systems (now Liberty Vote) voting machines to ICX Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) with vote center-based ballot scanning in an amount not to exceed [\$1,764,619.70], to be funded through the Capital Improvement Fund (CIP), project PW920234 and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to make the necessary purchases. If the BMD purchase is approved, staff further recommends approval of an extension to the Liberty Vote annual software license and support contract agreement for hardware and software used by the Registrar of Voters Office in connection with the BMDs, in the amount of [\$357,821.36], with an approximate 3% annual escalator, extending the contract through December 31, 2030, with two optional one-year extensions, and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the extension on behalf of Washoe County. If the BMD

purchase is not approved, staff recommends approval of the fifth amendment, which includes license and warranty extension only, with Liberty Vote for hardware and software used by the Registrar of Voters Office for the continued use of the VVPAT equipped voting machines, in the amount of [\$411,797.86], for the first year, with an approximate 3% annual escalator extending the contract through December 31, 2030, with two optional one-year extensions, and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the fifth amendment on behalf of Washoe County. Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill stated that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would begin discussions for Agenda Item 11 with Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald. She noted that Commissioner Clark had mentioned having some questions about the item.

Commissioner Clark explained that the information he had mentioned previously pertained to the sale of Dominion Voting Systems to Scott Leiendecker, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Liberty Vote. He explained that Mr. Leiendecker was a former Republican election director in Missouri. He noted that there was very little information about Mr. Leiendecker online, and no credible information on his LinkedIn profile. He asked if the County had investigated other options. He reiterated that Mr. Leiendecker was a former Republican election director in Saint Louis, Missouri, and he reported that he owned another company called KNOWiNK. He asked if Mr. McDonald was familiar with that company.

Mr. McDonald explained that KNOWiNK was the voting system provided by the State that Washoe County used.

Commissioner Andriola mentioned that a summary would be helpful. She acknowledged that everyone was aware that a change had occurred and she said she recognized that the timing of a company's purchase was beyond Mr. McDonald's control. She emphasized the importance of discussing the purpose of the item and the vetting process Mr. McDonald was responsible for, given his position and expertise, to ensure compliance with the law and proper procedures. She thanked Mr. McDonald for the extensive staff report and documents he provided. She suggested that a brief summary about how the transition happened and why would be helpful. She asked for some details about how the current situation had come to be, preferably not from the very beginning of the transition, as she was not certain when it had started. Mr. McDonald responded that he was not exactly sure. He thought that he likely heard about the transition on the same day she had learned of it. He explained that the transition was not merely a title change, but rather a comprehensive procurement of Dominion Voting Systems by Liberty Vote. He noted that many Dominion Voting Systems employees had transferred to Liberty Vote, although he acknowledged that a few might not have done so. He explained that Dominion Voting Systems had undergone a rebranding process and had become a new company. He reiterated that what he had described was all the information he knew about the matter. He stated that he had been shocked about the transition, which he thought all those in attendance had also likely felt upon hearing the news. He opined that Liberty Vote had kept

the transition confidential for a reason he was not aware of, as the information did not come out quickly. He explained that Liberty Vote was the known voting system that the County had already been using, which was why he was asking for an extension of the contract.

Mr. McDonald acknowledged that people had previously mentioned that he should consider seeking competitive procurement. He explained that there were two different kinds of voting system equipment, which could not just be swapped out since the proprietary equipment from each voting system would have to be utilized. He explained that there were only two options in the State, which included Liberty Vote and Election Systems & Software (ESS). He stated that he had called ESS and made it very clear to them that he wanted a quote that would account for the same elements the County would be given if he chose to renew the Liberty Vote contract. He reported that the estimate he received to replace the County's existing voting system with the ESS system was \$8 million. He explained that what he had presented to the Board was a proposal to replace the Voter-Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT) with a full-length ballot as the output. He noted that the equipment he was trying to procure would enable that exchange, which the ROV Office had already allocated in a Capital Improvement Fund (CIP) project previously assigned to the department.

Commissioner Andriola asked Mr. McDonald to confirm whether the voter would have a physical ballot with them when they finished voting, which would reflect their vote. Mr. McDonald affirmed that what she had mentioned was true. Commissioner Andriola proposed that Mr. McDonald discuss the process in further detail, as she was uncertain whether everyone was aware of it. Mr. McDonald noted that he would describe some of the benefits and reasons why the ROV Office wanted to transition from VVPAT machines to ICX Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs). He explained that VVPATs were difficult for some individuals categorized under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to see and read. He noted that BMDs provided accessibility by featuring a legible 12-point font on the ballot, which was the same format that would be on the paper ballots individuals would receive in the mail. He stated that the BMD ballots were also tangible, as voters would have something in their hands to actually feel, look at, and verify to ensure that the ballot reflected the vote they wanted to cast. He reiterated that the ballot from the BMD was identical to the mail ballot sent to voters. He explained that switching to BMDs would eliminate the issue of the quick-response (QR) code on VVPATs, which was mandated by an executive order. He clarified that while the executive order was not the sole reason the ROV Office was implementing the voting system change, he indicated that it provided a compelling reason to move forward with the transition. He stated that the BMDs also expedited the process of obtaining the voting results on election night. He explained that the ROV office currently had 900 voting machines that were deployed for the General Election. He explained that each of those voting machines had a primary and a backup Universal Serial Bus (USB) device inside. He noted that if the County transitioned to BMDs, there would be approximately 140 ballot scanners at the sites, each with a primary and backup USB inside. He stated that the transition to BMDs would result in a change from 1,800 Secure Digital (SD) memory cards to only 280, which meant that election night results would be received much more rapidly because there would only be 280 SD cards to upload rather than 1,800. He reiterated that the reasons he had provided



demonstrated just a few of the motivations behind his decision to move forward in the process of changing the voting machines. He emphasized that the transition would provide more transparency for the public, streamline operations, enhance accessibility, and foster greater voter confidence in the elections by enabling them to hold a tangible ballot before casting it.

Commissioner Andriola noted that she had one final comment to provide. She asked Mr. McDonald whether there was an opportunity for people to contact him, make an appointment, or discuss some of the details of the topics he had mentioned if they wanted to investigate further and create their own assessment of the matter. She believed that the Commissioners had all been briefed on the items they would discuss prior to attending each of the BCC meetings. She stated that the Board spent many hours on research before entering the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex to attend a BCC meeting, and she thought that people sometimes struggled to understand the amount of time the Commissioners worked and the way they prided themselves on the amount of research they did. She recalled that she had personally seen how Mr. McDonald had been very gracious in having people contact him, meet with him, and subsequently provide them with answers. She acknowledged that although people might not like the answers he gave, they were based on facts and supported by data, as well as his experience in the ROV Office, County leadership, and the statutory requirements he had to follow. She explained that many of the changes that people heard about resulted from actions of the Legislature, which meant that those directives had to be followed because they were statutorily required. She stated that the Board's purview and the things they could do could be very limited. She described Mr. McDonald's commitment to transparency and to implementing measures that would ensure a very clear, checkable, and auditable process, which she hoped would be the focus of a presentation when the time was right. She reiterated her question about Mr. McDonald's availability to speak with the public. She acknowledged that he was very busy, and she emphasized that she was not trying to overburden him. She opined that it was important that everyone had access to his office.

Mr. McDonald agreed, noting that while he obviously could not personally take every member of the public into the ROV Office every day, as he would never be able to fulfill his other responsibilities, he would be happy to arrange certain office hours when people could visit so that staff could answer their questions. He explained that he would also like to arrange for a public display of the BMDs, which he thought might have been an idea Commissioner Andriola had initially suggested. He suggested that the display could include 30 to 40 of the BMDs in one of the Commissioner's districts at the Reno-Sparks Convention Center or Earl Wooster High School, where the public could view the devices in person, similar to what had been done that day at the Washoe County Administration Complex, but in a larger setting available for anyone to visit. He explained that the display could be hosted after standard working hours or on a weekend, noting that staff could figure out the timing. He thought the display would be a good use of time and would encourage as much transparency as possible, while also providing an opportunity to answer any questions from the public. Chair Hill agreed and recalled that Mr. McDonald had recently conducted a podcast interview on *Ballot Battleground: Nevada*, which people could watch

to research the work that the ROV Office had been doing. She wanted to mention that podcast appearance and thank Mr. McDonald for representing Washoe County so well during the interview.

Commissioner Garcia asked Mr. McDonald to remind her about the software licensing and contracts, as she often got them confused with one another. She noted that each of the voting machine options presented to the Board had a 3 percent annual escalator, as described on page 4 of the Staff Report. She asked Mr. McDonald to explain what that annual escalator was, and why it was included. Mr. McDonald noted that the annual escalator was already embedded in the County's existing contract. He explained that the percentage accounted for costs increasing with inflation. He stated that it was no different from the annual price increases for items like milk at a grocery store. He noted that the voting system vendors, like many of the other vendors contracted with the County, had an annual escalator of a certain percentage, and having one in their contracts was not exclusive to a single kind of vendor. He supposed that the 3 percent outlined in the contract with the voting system vendor was roughly equivalent to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), ensuring that they would receive the same amount of money each year for providing the same services.

ICM Thomas noted that, since the discussion had continued to focus on transparency, she wanted to mention the substantial size of the BMDs that would be purchased if the Board moved forward with that action. She acknowledged that the Board was already aware of that, but she wanted to be transparent about the associated factors related to the size of the BMDs. She stated that there were already constraints associated with the space available in the warehouse that the County was renting, and she wanted the information to be put on record that more space would be needed should the Board proceed with the BMD procurement. She explained that the number of pallets that would necessitate staff receiving and unpacking the BMDs had led them to consider the need to find additional warehouse space. She reported that staff would be presenting an item on a future agenda for an upcoming BCC meeting in December to relocate the warehouse that the County was currently leasing to a different location within Washoe County. She opined that the relocation would provide the County with an opportunity to offer more transparency. She stated that those who had participated in an election and visited the ROV Office would know that it had limited space; however, a new warehouse location would ensure increased transparency by allowing the public to visit the facility, observe the operations, witness all the functions, and participate in election night. She explained that while she was aware that the Board had already discussed with her the fact that changing the voting machines would necessitate the procurement of additional space, she wanted to provide complete transparency and put the information on the record, while also describing the other benefits associated with relocating.

Chair Hill opined that the change was exciting because the suggestion had come from an audit conducted in the past, which determined that the ROV Office would need more space if it were to transition from a pre-mail-in ballot process to a post-mail-in ballot process due to the needs associated with scanning the mail and the knowledge that more than half of constituents preferred mail-in ballots. She noted that those efforts were

the bulk of the work being done by Mr. McDonald and the staff of the ROV Office, and they did not have enough space or visibility for the public. She believed the investment would be pivotal, and she expressed her enthusiasm about it.

\* \* \* \* \*

Public comment for Agenda Item 11, Minute Item Number 25-0830, was heard during Agenda Item 10, Minute Item Number 25-0829.

\* \* \* \* \*

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Vice Chair Herman voting no, it was ordered that the transition from Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT) equipped Dominion Voting Systems (now Liberty Vote) voting machines to ICX Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) with vote center-based ballot scanning in an amount not to exceed [\$1,764,619.70], to be funded through the Capital Improvement Fund (CIP), project PW920234 be approved, the Purchasing and Contracts Manager be authorized to make the necessary purchases, the extension of the Liberty Vote annual software license and support contract agreement for hardware and software used by the Registrar of Voters Office in connection with the BMDs, in the amount of [\$357,821.36], with an approximate 3% annual escalator, extending the contract through December 31, 2030, with two optional one-year extensions be approved, and the Purchasing and Contracts Manager be authorized to execute the extension on behalf of Washoe County.

**01:53 p.m.**     **The Board recessed.**

**02:33 p.m.**     **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

**25-0831**     **AGENDA ITEM 12** Discussion and direction to staff on a request from the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees, after many hours of deliberation and discussion at publicly agendized, noticed, and executed meetings, for a fiscal year 2027 (July 1, 2026 - June 30, 2027) base budget equal to the combined current fiscal year 2026 budgets [General Fund \$14,374,168 and Library Expansion Fund \$3,299,910) adjusted as appropriate to account for future contractual obligations as the baseline budget within the General Fund of Washoe County for purposes of supporting library services in our community. Library. (All Commission Districts).

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro indicated that the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) operated as a regional library service, providing access to information, educational resources, and community programming through a network of 12 locations, including partnership libraries and specialized outreach services. He noted that the WCLS's mission was to connect people with information, ideas, and experiences to support, engage, and enrich the community one person at a time. He explained that the

Library Board of Trustees (LBT) was appointed by the Board of County Commissioners pursuant to the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 379.020 and was responsible for the governance, policy setting, and oversight of the library system, including the appointment and evaluation of the Library Director, approval of policies, monitoring finances, and system effectiveness. He recalled that during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 budget setting process, there were questions related to the appropriate budget for the WCLS. He reported that the Board requested that the LBT review the community's needs and propose a FY 2027 operating budget to the Board in October or November of 2025. He reminded the Board that Agenda Item 12 was not for the approval of the budget, but rather a recommendation from the LBT for County staff to proceed with creating the FY 2027 WCLS budget.

ACM Solaro noted that the FY 2026 combined adopted budget was \$17.6 million, which included personnel, central services, overhead, services, supplies, and the current titles budget. He said that the current titles included physical and electronic books (e-books) that the community enjoyed. He reported that a majority of the budget, approximately 83 percent, was personnel-related across 12 library branches. He said that through the process of several meetings, the LBT focused on policy discussion related to service days and hours for all branches. He indicated that the goal was to provide programs that were the most impactful and in the correct locations for the community while offering more hours after traditional 8-5 work hours; however, not every branch needed the same level of services. He relayed that all trustees agreed that providing programming, such as early literacy, was important, which was helpful when creating the cost model, as more staff were needed rather than just a building with books to check out. He stated that numerous options for different hours, days, and locations were reviewed and priced, and on October 15, the trustees voted to request that the FY 2027 operating budget be equal and adjusted through the contractual obligations of the existing FY 2026 budget.

ACM Solaro explained that when non-traditional hours were researched, it was discovered that more staff were required to cover the various services. He reported that the trustees had done a significant amount of work to review the services provided by the WCLS. He mentioned the hard work performed by the WCLS staff who bore with him while he and the LBT researched options and understood impacts. He explained that a new operating schedule for FY 2027 was created and proposed through staff recommendations to maximize efficiencies, which would be discussed later. He indicated that different populations utilized different branches for various reasons and tended to continue attending the branches where they felt most comfortable. He stated that the research showed that the current and existing budget was necessary to provide programming. He recalled that the LBT realized that the BCC did not want to put the library in a different position than other departments and that the Board would have choices during the budget process. He noted that it was the Board's decision to determine how much money was spent on the WCLS, and that the LBT would react accordingly. He said that a new library director would be hired in early 2026, and the embarkment of updating the WCLS's strategic plan would occur, in which programming and specific community needs would be identified.

Chair Hill thanked ACM Solaro for his work, including overseeing many operations within the County while supporting the WCLS in a more intensive capacity, as there was no current library director. She recognized that there had been many late nights and long hours spent on tough discussions with the LBT and WCLS staff. She was glad that there was a 4 to 1 vote to approve the budget process.

Commissioner Garcia recalled that many public commenters expressed appreciation for ACM Solaro and his excellent communication, organization, thoughtfulness, and patience. She thanked ACM Solaro for his calmness and professionalism, as she felt that some library staff members had experienced many difficult and exhausting situations over the years. She believed that library staff morale had historically been low, and it meant a great deal to her to have leadership that could help stabilize and offer a calming presence. She thanked the staff who participated in the lengthy process of researching efficiencies and providing ideas and suggestions. She speculated that the County had very talented and innovative employees, with the librarians being some of the brightest. She expressed appreciation toward the LBT for prioritizing programming. She opined that the heart of the library was offering the magical feeling that individuals experienced when taking their children or senior citizen families to the library. She opined that if programming were taken away, the magical feeling would also be lost. She felt that constituents were very vocal about wanting to preserve access to the library, and she looked forward to the LBT's strategic planning process. She offered her full support for the recommendations presented.

Commissioner Andriola asked ACM Solaro about the hiring process for the new library director. She said she understood that programming was the priority, but wondered if the LBT would re-examine the budget once the director was hired and strategic planning was discussed. ACM Solaro said that there were two funds, an expansion fund and the general fund. He noted that the process for the upcoming fiscal year would be to submit an above-base request, aiming to increase from the current \$12.5 million to the overall budget request of \$17.6 million. He explained that strategic planning would usually be tied to the budget; however, since the WCLS was without a director, it was difficult to understand the direction the LBT wanted to pursue. He reiterated that the recommendation was to establish the library system at a baseline of services provided to the community, with roughly the same number of hours allocated across the 12 locations. He thought the recommendation set the library up for future success with a new director and a new strategic plan in FY 2027, which would begin on July 1, 2026. He said that after FY 2027 began, the adoption or adaptation of the budget would involve the new director aligning it with the strategic plan and potential future recommendations to the Board for the budget. He explained that the WCLS was at the end of its three-year strategic plan, which put them a bit behind where they would usually be in the process. He believed that hiring a new director and forming a new strategic plan would set the WCLS up for great success.

Commissioner Andriola appreciated the LBT, the staff, and ACM Solaro for partaking in a robust discussion. She noted that the LBT would follow the same budget constraints as other County departments and hoped that moving forward, they could explore the possibility of contingencies. She thought it would be beneficial to know when

the BCC's budget would be processed, so she could determine how it aligned with the LBT's budget timing. ACM Solaro stated that timing was sensitive because the LBT did not want to be treated differently from the rest of the County departments and had asked the Board to review their recommendations fairly, as the budget information was a request from the BCC. He speculated that when the budget was being discussed, the LBT would accept the terms created by the Board.

Commissioner Andriola believed that tough decisions and discussions were ahead. She asked ACM Solaro to extend the Board's appreciation to the LBT and staff for their understanding of the constraints and the need to maintain consistency and equality, as in every other department. She asserted that the County was going through tough times, and she did not believe that anyone would disagree. She found it interesting that ACM Solaro had examined the different models, and the recommended approach was to maintain the same mission without adding additional staff. She wondered how that would impact programming in the future. ACM Solaro said that more programming required additional staff. He noted that the LBT recognized the need to tailor the programming to each branch's specific requirements and wanted to focus on what was most important to the community. He expressed excitement for the upcoming strategic planning process. Commissioner Andriola appreciated ACM Solaro for keeping the Board informed and taking on additional responsibilities. She believed that the County had an obligation to gather as much information and direction as possible throughout the process, so that contingencies and options could be considered through strategic planning.

Commissioner Clark thanked ACM Solaro for his report and said that he was supportive of the library. He expressed a desire to see future efficiency experts detail what was happening at the library. He believed that an outsider's report could highlight best practices and configurations. He appreciated ACM Solaro's undertaking of the library responsibilities and expressed gratitude towards the LBTs. He speculated that the County did not currently have the time to organize an outside study of the library; however, he felt it should be explored for the future. He asked ACM Solaro if the Library Director position was something he was interested in applying for. ACM Solaro said that as much as he had enjoyed his experience with the WCLS, he was fond of his current position.

Chair Hill said she was supportive of the recommendations and glad that the WCLS was researching strategic options and where staffing was best needed for programming. She looked forward to the strategic planning session in January 2026 to analyze the full budget and understand what the Board needed to do to put the County on a good path. She noted that she supported the WCLS's proposal and appreciated the work performed by the LBT and ACM Solaro. She thought that Commissioner Garcia made a good point regarding employee morale and asked that ACM Solaro relay the Board's appreciation to staff for their work. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that everyone in the community had access to free materials for learning, reading, and engagement. She agreed with Commissioner Clark's comments regarding the public commenter who recalled her trip to Cambodia during Agenda Item 6, citing the experiences she had at the library. She expressed excitement about learning how the Board would support the library while also ensuring that fiscal concerns were balanced. She explained

that public comment would be allowed for Agenda Item 12 even though it was for discussion only.

On the call for public comment, Dr. Shari Sanders indicated that she recently graduated from law school with a degree focused on public interest and constitutional law. She noted that she wore a mask because she did not have health insurance and could not afford to get sick. She explained that she lived downtown and volunteered within interfaith and multid denominational communities. She asked the Board to accept the library budget as recommended by the LBT. She recalled that the meeting opened with an invocation for wisdom and compassion, which she believed the library provided. She said that learning was how individuals received wisdom, and wisdom was how compassion was made. She thought that students used the library alongside seniors and veterans who might need food, housing assistance, mental health resources, legal assistance, meeting rooms, internet access, or a place to apply for jobs. She said that many public interest programs and nonprofit legal services were being defunded while the library was serving as a lifeline for people. She urged the Board to advocate for those in need of library services by funding the library.

Ms. Kari Buccambuso noted that she lived in Commissioner Andriola's district. She thanked Commissioner Clark for his comments regarding the desire for the BCC to be efficient and save money for library programs. She wished to express her support and appreciation for the WCLS and request that the Board fund the library, librarian education, and training. She said that she loved the library and the WCLS, with the Downtown Reno Library being her favorite. She explained that her family had bonded over reading stories together, and her children had expanded their knowledge, vocabulary, critical thinking skills, and imagination while learning about a variety of topics, which she attributed to the library's diverse book collection. She thought it was nice to select books as a family, while ignoring ones that may not meet her family's standards or interests; although, she believed those books should be available for those who wanted to check them out. She said that she enjoyed sharing the books she read with her parents, husband, and friends. She recalled that she had listened to 56 books through Libby in 2025 while also checking out physical books. She noted that many of the books she currently had checked out related to foods to improve her family's health. She said that she had visited the library to listen to musicians, watch dancers, and learn about other cultures. She indicated that she used the publicly available meeting room to host an event and planned to host another in the coming year. She opined that the services provided at the library had improved her family life and personal development, which she would not have been able to afford otherwise. She speculated that the library provided a space to meet, learn, and develop oneself, while offering a variety of educational resources, community resources, services, and programs. She relayed that while attending the BCC meeting, she placed a hold on two books, one with a waitlist of 176 people and another with a waitlist of 209 people. She asserted that the WCLS was being used because people needed the resources and wanted access to books. She said that she may have to wait 23 weeks for a book, but it would eventually be her turn. She felt that the library provided invaluable opportunities to the community. She urged the Board to continue funding for the WCLS.

Ms. Janet Butcher noted that she had attended many LBT meetings and was aware that the trustees had worked diligently. She believed that ACM Solaro had performed an excellent job in understanding what it took to run the WCLS. She indicated that ACM Solaro was a union employee working with union librarians; therefore, she felt she knew what the outcome of ACM Solaro's research would entail. She pointed out that she did not oppose funding the library if the County had funding; however, she believed that the funding was not available. She said that the book procurement funding was on the agenda for a future meeting and wondered if a lot of the programs the library offered were necessary. She recalled needing to work with unemployment issues during COVID-19 (C19) and indicated that she was referred to Job Connection, which was able to provide services. She said that she did not think that people needed to be referred to the library for certain services because places like Job Connection already had them. She recalled that no one ever directed her to the library when she was unemployed or in need of social security assistance. She asserted that library staff spent time creating displays for banned books, which she thought was a fallacy, since she indicated that there was not a single book in the United States (US) that was banned. She reported that she grew up going to the library and challenged people to provide their own funds to the library budget.

Ms. Odalys Farias was not present when called to speak.

Mr. Jonathon McNeill indicated that he was a lifelong Washoe County resident and a current student of radiologic technology at Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC). He knew that most of the Board supported the library, but he wished to convey how essential the services were and urged the Board to continue funding the WCLS. He recalled that he grew up visiting the library and that, as a TMCC student, the TMCC Library was difficult to access due to traffic; therefore, he frequently visited the WCLS. He explained that he utilized the WCLS to attend interviews in a private space, print and copy application materials, use the Wi-Fi, and have a peaceful and quiet place to study for exams. He said that the WCLS had a copy of the study guide for an entrance exam that was required by the program he was attending at TMCC. He asserted that libraries were essential to his entry into the TMCC program and continued to be a tool for his success. He believed that the library provided him with the opportunity to enter a field that offered a brighter future and opportunities to give back to the community through healthcare. He believed that libraries were a vital means of providing access to fundamental services essential for living in society, and that failing to fund them was a failure to the past, present, and future citizens of Washoe County. He speculated that if the Board's vision was for the County to be the social, economic, and policy leadership force in Nevada and the Western US, they needed to provide the necessary funding to keep the libraries open and thriving.

Chair Hill looked forward to the strategic planning session to discuss the budget. She relayed that the Board supported the library and wished to see how the County could keep the WCLS whole.

There was no action taken on this item.



**25-0832**      **AGENDA ITEM 21** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending the Washoe County Code by repealing Chapter 11 (Alternative Sentencing) and by retaining, modifying and relocating a provision authorizing the Board of County Commissioners to adopt a fee schedule for the cost of supervision of probationers and supervised releasees, and providing for imposition and waiver of those fees; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and properly relating thereto. Manager. (All Commission Districts).

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1746, Bill No. 1940.

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas noted that the Board would recall the first reading, which proposed dissolving the Department of Alternative Sentencing (DAS) and relocating its functions to areas with more oversight.

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

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Tammy Ingraham said that her husband, Joe Ingraham, was the retired Chief of the DAS. She read from an email regarding her husband's accomplishments during his tenure while managing the DAS, as well as concerns he had about moving the functions of the DAS to the WCSO. Copies of the document were not placed in the file with the Clerk.

Mr. Ingraham, founder and retired chief of the DAS said he wanted to clarify a statement he made during his previous appearance before the Board because he felt he had spoken too generally. He explained that he had received full support from the County, the Comptroller's Office, and Human Resources (HR), and he thanked those departments for their support. He encouraged the Commissioners to read the letters, memoranda, and emails regarding the DAS that had been sent to them. He stated that, under the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), the DAS was required to submit an annual report. He suggested the Board review the reports from 2006 to 2019, which included goals, accomplishments, and objectives for the following year. He believed that if former Chief Justin Roper had adhered to those practices, then the Board would not have needed to make an \$878,000 budget adjustment for 2023 to 2025. He mentioned that, for 15 years, the department had been a regional and national model, having received several awards, including the Life Saving Award from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Integrity Award from Washoe County. He added that Crossroads had also recognized the DAS multiple times. He said that the lab was added in 2018 to achieve a longstanding goal for the department and the BCC, which also reduced participant costs. He indicated that the lab reduced the number of false positives to less than 2 percent. He emphasized that reduction was a crucial data point, as a failed drug test could impact an individual's civil liberties. He believed that a key point remained that the DAS was

primarily a misdemeanor probation department. He explained that shortly after its creation, it was discovered that many clients had prior convictions for home invasion, aggravated stalking, robbery, burglary, and child abuse. He mentioned that past statistics showed that under intensive supervision, both recidivism and opportunities to commit new crimes were reduced. He commented that Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Undersheriff Corey Solferino was effective in addressing mental health, addiction, and criminal activities in the County. He thought that the County would benefit from a team approach rather than combining the DAS with the WCSO. He suggested that there could be legal issues if services were combined and encouraged Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large to review the points previously outlined by Ms. Ingraham. He believed that a partnership between the WCSO, the DAS, and pretrial services would enhance each department's capabilities and break down silos, ultimately benefiting the community. He mentioned that, as a citizen, he had complete confidence in the DAS.

Mr. Mark Wickman displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He expressed concern over the dissolution of the DAS and felt that the reasoning for that decision had consistently changed. He recalled that the initial concern was fiscal mismanagement, which he believed had persisted for three years despite being approved by several individuals. He stated that the justification had then shifted to inefficiency. He speculated that Commissioner Clark implied that the action stemmed from the perception that the DAS had damaged the County's reputation, and that there would be no opportunity to correct those actions, which he viewed as punitive rather than financial. He suggested that Commissioner Clark stated the fiscal impact of dissolving the DAS was insignificant, and the decision was driven by optics, perceived as an embarrassment rather than a cost-related impact. He explained that the DAS officers had been cleared by the United States Secret Service (USSS). He believed that Mr. Roper's lack of supervision was the responsibility of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He said it was offensive to suggest that dedicated law enforcement professionals would deliberately ignore internal criminal conduct. He stated that those accusations violated the very principles the officers upheld. He noted that the DAS categorically denied any involvement in Mr. Roper's actions. He felt that the audit, which continued to be cited, was poorly executed and inefficient. He added that the department had submitted 67 rebuttals to the audit findings, yet no one had addressed or acknowledged that effort. He informed that Mr. Roper's direct supervisor, who could have identified and prevented the misconduct, was recently appointed as the new County Manager (CM), while the Comptroller, who had approved expenditures prior to March, also remained in her position. He shared that the DAS operated at a nationally recognized level and received awards and praise from the BCC. He asserted that the DAS was trusted and provided support to five nationally recognized specialty courts. He indicated that the DAS budget remained one of the lowest in the County, while having an immeasurable impact on people's lives. He explained that he submitted documentation regarding Averhealth, which included litigation and settlement history uncovered during due diligence after Averhealth was awarded the County contract. He believed that, by every meaningful measure, Averhealth was less efficient than the DAS. He alleged that the DAS and Sober 24 had no litigation or settlements. He stated that Averhealth had multiple lawsuits, including a class-action lawsuit, in which a doctor reported that 30 percent of the tests were inaccurate,

resulting in both false positives and false negatives. He mentioned that Averhealth would not allow law enforcement into its facility and would not provide video footage due to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). He explained that the DAS was located two blocks from the CARES campus, between two regional bus stations, which provided central and convenient access for clients. He noted that the testing center's hours were designed to accommodate working clients. He added that testing fees were among the lowest in the region, at \$15, \$13, and \$5, with all revenue returned to the County's General Fund. He stated that electronic monitoring offered the lowest cost and immediate response capabilities. He emphasized the importance of on-site officers and case managers who addressed violations. He said that Sober 24 remained committed to helping individuals with addiction and mental health challenges by providing support with compassion.

Ms. Evelyn Grosenick reiterated her prior statements regarding the DAS officers she had the pleasure of working with, emphasizing their genuine care for the community, sobriety, and involvement in helping people regain stability. She said she felt that the change would provide an excellent opportunity for the County to pause, reevaluate, and rebuild in a way that would align with the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM). She expressed concern about a prior statement that suggested that the DAS could enter a person's home at any time without a warrant. She thought that the law required reasonable grounds of a probation violation to enter without a warrant and surmised that was what the commenter intended to say. She believed that the timing of the matter allowed the County to seek input from many stakeholders and County management to determine how to proceed with future opportunities to receive feedback. She said that the changes in the County had been significant, and being involved would provide a perspective from indigent defendants, offering additional opportunities to collaborate within the criminal legal system to determine the best way to continue and support people more effectively.

Chair Hill indicated that she supported a vote to approve the item. She emphasized the importance of communicating with the judges as soon as a process was established. She said she heard that judges were concerned about sentencing and what they could tell clients who needed those services. She felt that future discussions would be necessary since the chapter was being repealed. She informed the individuals involved that they needed to communicate with the Board to ensure everyone was comfortable with the new process. She stated that any necessary changes could be discussed and addressed. She indicated that it would be important to explore the potential for offering the service in-house with the WCSO. She mentioned that she wanted to provide the courts with an equal opportunity to express their concerns and provide feedback, rather than having decisions made by one court, since all courts were equally important.

Commissioner Clark said he thought that he had made statements that were perceived as questioning or accusatory, but he clarified that he was not accusing anyone. He believed he had posed prudent questions that should be asked of someone who was not involved with the organization. He said that he had heard about problems in the DAS long before they were revealed and wondered how employees who worked for the DAS could have been unaware of those issues. He questioned how, as a practical person, the DAS had reached its current state. He said that he had asked various people when, in the County's

history since 1861, a federal agency had shut down a County department. He acknowledged that there had been a receivership and that the State had taken over certain assets, adding that having a department closed down by a federal agency was an embarrassment. He indicated that the person who previously oversaw the DAS was no longer employed by the County. He added that former CM Eric Brown had received pay raises and bonuses each year and mentioned that Mr. Brown had received an evaluation indicating that there was no room for improvement. He questioned how, if Mr. Brown were perfect, he could have been unaware of what had occurred within the DAS, especially after being given information from Commissioner Clark that there were issues.

Commissioner Clark explained that he had lengthy discussions with ICM Thomas, who seemed receptive to input from stakeholders at all levels. He stated that once a new process was implemented, the Board could make adjustments as needed. He noted that he had confidence that ICM Thomas and his fellow Commissioners would create a successful program. He remarked that there was a need to conduct business more effectively and hoped the new program would run smoothly without causing any embarrassment. He noted that Mr. Ingraham had won awards and had done a great job while working at DAS. He noted his disappointment when Mr. Ingraham retired but acknowledged that retirement was an inevitable part of life, which was why a succession plan was necessary. He indicated that no one had all the facts about what had occurred at the DAS and suggested that all the information would likely become public during a trial, when evidence was presented in the courtroom. He stated that he relied on the available information, which indicated that a federal agency had closed the facility, thereby preventing individuals from receiving services. He hoped that no one was incarcerated because of the lack of proper testing. He stated that the Board had to address the consequences and embarrassment of the situation and find a more effective way to conduct business. He mentioned that he supported the approval of Agenda Item 21 and requested clarification from CDDA Large on whether the proposed program was similar to what had been implemented in Clark County, and if the WCSO would be involved in monitoring the program. He said that District Attorney (DA) Christopher Hicks sent a letter that discussed the legality of the Board's approval of the item.

CDDA Large clarified that, according to DA Hicks, Sheriff Darin Balaam was empowered to oversee misdemeanor probation for Washoe County. He stated that Clark County operated slightly differently and did not have a DAS but instead had a misdemeanor probation unit managed by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. He mentioned that the program would be similar to the model that Washoe County would have if the Board adopted the ordinance.

Chair Hill offered time for Judge Egan Walker and Judge Tammy Riggs to comment.

Judge Riggs said she looked forward to discussing court matters with the BCC. She indicated that she and Judge Walker were available to answer any questions. She offered support for their own pretrial services supervision unit at the Second Judicial District Court. She explained that pretrial services had supervised pretrial offenders,

including those charged with gross misdemeanors and accused felons, since 1994. She added that the program had operated professionally and effectively for 31 years. She noted that, over the past few years, misdemeanor and felony supervision had been assigned by one of the limited jurisdiction courts to another entity. She mentioned that she supported Pretrial Services resuming responsibility, if that was what the Board decided. She added that, since she was not present at the last BCC meeting, she would address any potential concerns the Board may have regarding the Pretrial Services Department.

Commissioner Garcia honored and thanked the dedicated men and women whose decades of work had positively changed lives. She stated that, while she appreciated past efforts, she supported moving forward with the newly proposed plan. She explained that, under NRS 211A, the Board would receive the annual report from the DAS each January. She mentioned that drug testing would be handled by Averhealth. The Support, Treatment, Accountability, Recovery (STAR) program would be administered by the Human Services Agency (HSA). Probation would be administered by the WCSO, and pretrial services would be overseen by the Second Judicial District Court. She acknowledged that prior news about the DAS had been difficult and caused significant heartache for many. She questioned how the court would communicate with the Board and provide timely updates, emphasizing that everyone involved had to remain committed to maintaining smooth communication as operations continued to evolve.

Judge Riggs said that staff were available to communicate with anyone who had questions about operations. She highlighted that Angelina Wencke, the Manager of Pretrial Services, was a recognized State expert. She added that Ms. Wencke was so accomplished that Nevada Supreme Court Chief Justice Douglas Herndon requested her participation in the reassessment and revalidation of the Nevada Pretrial Risk (NVPR) Assessment. She noted that Ms. Wencke was highly responsive, and she believed the chief judge would always respond to any questions from the BCC. She stated that court staff remained responsible for those who received pretrial services, many of whom had been represented by Ms. Grosenick. She explained that both court staff and Court Administrator Alicia Lerud supported open communication and were not aware of any issues. She agreed with a prior statement that if Mr. Ingraham had continued to oversee the DAS, no issues would have occurred.

ICM Thomas explained that staff had worked hard to create a new process that was both effective and efficient. She said those measures were not intended to diminish the excellent work of the DAS, and that staff would continue to perform the same duties and serve the same individuals, but in a slightly different manner. She suggested that she could coordinate monthly updates and a communication plan. She indicated that a current communication structure was in place that encompassed all stakeholders, including judges. She shared that she had been in communication with all organizations, which included the Incline Village Justice Court and Wadsworth. She stated that she would provide the Board with monthly updates and noted that, if any issues arose, the team could reassess the process to ensure it remained effective and utilized taxpayer dollars efficiently.

Commissioner Clark emphasized the importance of receiving input from the departments that would use the new process to ensure it was both effective and efficient. He indicated that continuing the current process was not an option and stressed that the departments that utilized the program needed to provide their suggestions and feedback to the CM to help develop a process that was beneficial to everyone.

ICM Thomas stated that staff would present the budget allocation on December 16, 2025, to outline where the functions would be assigned. She added that Agenda Item 21 was intended to take action to dissolve the DAS.

Commissioner Clark inquired whether the DAS would be dissolved immediately and how that change would impact services during the interim.

CDDA Large explained that the ordinance being repealed would take effect on January 1, 2026, and that an interim adjustment would be made. He clarified that Agenda Item 21 concerned the repeal of Chapter 11, effective as of January 1, 2026.

Chair Hill thought there was some confusion regarding the timing of future steps. She emphasized the importance of communicating with the judges and other staff who were working to develop a process for the period between the present time and January 1, 2026.

ICM Thomas apologized for the lack of communication and said that staff would work together to keep the Board informed. She noted that, if approved, Agenda Item 21 would dissolve the DAS as of January 1, 2026. She stated that the next discussion with the Board would be on December 16, 2025, when budget allocations for the different departments and their functions would be presented. She said that, until that time, she would share all updates with the Board as they became available. She explained that the County would seek to divest itself of any interest in the DAS building and confirmed that she would continue to provide updates to both the Board and the judges.

Chair Hill thought that a discussion was needed before the next legislative session regarding potential updates to the legislation verbiage. She asked staff to note that a conversation with Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich was needed to explore ways to adjust the current language so that the State could provide additional support. She emphasized the importance of taking advantage of the opportunity to propose necessary changes while the process was being developed.

Commissioner Clark said that it was clear who the point of contact was for the WCSO, but wondered who the judges could speak with to share their concerns. He thought that many judges would likely have opinions or suggestions on the new process; however, he was uncertain whether a committee of judges would be established to ensure all viewpoints were heard. He added that a similar issue could occur with the Public Defenders' Office, the Alternate Public Defenders' Office (APD), the DA, court administrators, and others. He questioned whether a single person would be appointed to hear concerns and relay them, or if each individual would contact the CM directly.

ICM Thomas said that the court administrators were connected to the judges. She explained that when judges had concerns, they shared them with the court administrator, who would relay them to ICM Thomas. She noted she would then communicate those concerns to the Board. She stated that a similar chain of command existed if the Board had concerns, in which case she would relay them to the court administrators, who would then share the concerns with the judges.

Commissioner Clark noted that judges had called him at home to discuss their concerns. He believed it was essential to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to voice their concerns so they could be addressed collaboratively and effectively.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1746, Bill No. 1940, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**25-0833**      **AGENDA ITEM 19** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three-Regulation of Uses. These amendments include: modifying the title of Article 336 from “Affordable Housing Incentives” to “Housing Incentives”; adding provisions to describe the purpose of Article 336 Housing Incentives, and creating incentives for senior housing; and amending provisions to include “Senior Housing” as a residential use type in Table 110.302.05.1 and defining the term; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for December 16, 2025. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1941.

Community Services Department (CSD) Senior Planner Katherine Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WDCA25-0009 (Senior Housing); Background; Senior Housing; Article 336 Housing Incentives; Public Workshop; Planning Commission; Recommendation; Thank you.

Ms. Oakley explained that Agenda Item 19 was the first reading of a proposed ordinance to create a senior housing use type and establish incentives. She reviewed the slide titled *Background* and said that Washoe County had a highly cost-burdened community for both renting and owning, with the senior population being the most impacted age group. She stated that more than 60 percent of seniors were renters. She indicated that there was an anticipated increase in the senior population of 30,000 people by 2044. She mentioned that after the expected growth, seniors would make up 2 percent more of the population than they currently did. She noted that there were many people to house in an already existing shortage, which was why there was a need for additional senior housing options.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Senior Housing* and said that the proposal was to add a definition for senior housing, which was not currently included in the Washoe County Code (WCC). She indicated that the explanation would align with the federal meaning under the Fair Housing Act. She explained that the added language would refer to a residential development in which at least 80 percent of the dwelling units were occupied by at least one individual aged 55 years or older. She added that permitting requirements would vary by housing type and that ancillary commercial uses would be allowed for senior amenities, including indoor recreation and community spaces.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Article 336 Housing Incentives* and said that a secondary change would be to activate Article 336 for housing incentives, which she believed was long overdue. She stated that the activation would be referred to as housing incentives and would establish incentives for senior housing, specifically creating a 25 percent density increase above the allowable base density per housing type and zone. She indicated that, in exchange for a deed restriction or a Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) provision, whichever was more appropriate based on the development type, the property would be restricted to senior housing for a minimum of 20 years.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Public Workshop* and said that a public workshop was held in September, with three attendees. She noted that some of the questions and comments related to deed restriction enforcement incentives for income-restricted housing were not part of the current proposal but would be a separate topic for future discussion. She stated that there was overall support for the proposed amendments.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Planning Commission* and explained that the proposal had been presented to the Planning Commission (PC), which voted unanimously, 5 to 0, to recommend approval based on the ability to make one of the required findings for a development code amendment.

Chair Hill indicated that the proposal was part of a multi-step housing package that was previously presented to the Board. She questioned which version of the proposal it was. Ms. Oakley replied that she referred to the version as *senior housing* because staff had abandoned the numbering system, as it had become too confusing. Chair Hill explained that Agenda Item 19 was the fourth piece of the housing package. She commended Ms. Oakley for her involvement and acknowledged that it had been challenging. She said the project was something that the community needed, and she hoped it would inspire other jurisdictions to pursue similar initiatives. Ms. Oakley explained that she was unaware of what programs other jurisdictions had, as she was only familiar with the senior housing incentives in the Reno area, which were based on income and unit size. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Oakley for taking the initiative and for her leadership.

Commissioner Garcia stated that changes to the definition were clear and positive. She questioned how the staff decided on the 20-year deed restriction. Ms. Oakley said that many affordability deed restrictions typically had a 20 or 30-year time frame, and



staff agreed that 20 years would be the most beneficial. She indicated that developers expected a 20-year term for deed restrictions, which was the standard timeframe.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Oakley and acknowledged that after the housing package was approved, the focus could shift to the equine project. She stated that she was closely monitoring the order in which projects were being approved. She recognized the importance of housing and appreciated that the Board unanimously prioritized projects. She inquired about the anticipated timing for when the remaining portion of the housing package would be ready for approval.

Ms. Oakley explained that additional housing projects were still being considered and that the timeframe would depend on how the proposals were combined. She indicated that the PC had previously mentioned that when projects were too large, they became overwhelming, so staff wanted to ensure they were manageable. She believed that the remaining projects were in mid-process of being drafted. She noted the projects were awaiting public outreach and nearing completion.

Commissioner Andriola said that she appreciated how methodically the staff approached the task, not only identifying what was needed but also gathering data and information that helped guide the process. She thought that was an important factor that often went unnoticed by the public. She appreciated the staff's awareness of community needs and their ability to accommodate the target audience effectively. She mentioned that, according to basic economics, increased supply leads to lower prices while limited supply resulted in higher prices. She indicated that she supported the item and would do her best to help expedite the housing package process. She thanked Ms. Oakley for her hard work.

Commissioner Clark stated that he supported any initiative that benefited seniors. He believed that Agenda Item 19 would create an affordable option for individuals aged 55 and older who were on a fixed income due to retirement, disability, or other factors. He suggested that each establishment may have its own definition of what constituted a senior citizen, but felt that setting the eligibility age at 55 encompassed a larger population. He thanked Ms. Oakley for her hard work.

Chair Hill acknowledged Commissioner Clark for mentioning the age that defined a senior and added that over half of the population in homeless shelters were individuals over 55 with disabilities and mental or behavioral health issues. She thought that Agenda Item 19 would also help those individuals and provide them with housing.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Pat Davison provided and read a document regarding the change to the WCC to support affordable senior housing and incentives, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Bill No. 1941 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Agenda Item 19 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**25-0834**      **AGENDA ITEM 20** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 60 (Fire Prevention and Protection) to update the adopted editions of the International Fire Code (“IFC”) and International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (“IWUIC”) from the 2018 editions to the 2024 editions, with modifications to make them applicable to conditions within Washoe County; and to remove the adopted permit and service fee schedule from the Washoe County Code and provide for its adoption by resolution; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. And if introduced, set the second reading and public hearing for possible adoption of the ordinance on December 16, 2025. TMFPD. (All Commission Districts).

Chair Hill asked if she needed to convene as the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) for Agenda Item 20.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large declared that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would be convening in a joint session with the BOFC. He noted that Commissioners would be sitting in both capacities of the BCC and BOFC for Agenda Item 20 alone. CDDA Large welcomed Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards to sit at the dais for the hearing of Agenda Item 20.

Chair Hill thanked Chief Edwards and inquired whether the Commissioners required a report from staff regarding Agenda Item 20, and it was determined that they did not.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1942.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1942 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Agenda Item 20 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**25-0835**      **AGENDA ITEM 22** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 to adopt a development agreement between Washoe County and Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC, to extend the deadline for recording the initial final map for Silver Hills, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. WTM21-006), to August 24, 2029. The project is located on the east side of Red Rock Road, north of Longhorn Drive. The project encompasses a total of approximately 308.6 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 358 lots. The parcel is located within the North Valleys Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 5. (APN: 087-390-10). If approved, authorize the Chair of the

Board of County Commissioners to sign the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1747, Bill No. 1939.

Chair Hill asked whether the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) required additional information on Agenda Item 22, and it was determined that they did not.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Vice Chair Herman voting no, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1747, Bill No. 1939, be adopted, approved, authorized, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**25-0836**      **AGENDA ITEM 23**      Second reading and possible adoption of an Ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and Toiyabe Investment Co., a Nevada corporation, Helvetica CTV Crossbow, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, Helvetica Tampa 24, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and Passive Creek, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company for Montreux 2000, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. TM0007-002). The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the next final map from July 24, 2025, to July 24, 2026, and to adopt amended conditions of approval (WAC25-0016). The project is located south of Mount Rose Highway at Bordeaux Drive. The project encompasses a total of approximately 411.11 acres and a 37.01-acre portion of the project is subject to the development agreement, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 357 with 301 lots recorded and 34 lots remaining to be recorded. The parcels are located within the Forest Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 2. (APNs: 148-010-60, 148-351-08). If approved, authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the development agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1748, Bill No. 1938.

Chair Hill inquired if the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) required additional information on Agenda Item 23, and it was determined that they did not.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1748, Bill No. 1938, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**25-0837**      **AGENDA ITEM 24** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 to adopt a development agreement between Washoe County and Petersen Village Phase 1 LLC, for Petersen Village (previously Village Parkway), a residential, common open space subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. WTM21-007). The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline to present the first final map from September 7, 2025, to be recorded no later than September 7, 2027. The project is located on the west side of Village Parkway, north of Cold Springs Drive. The project encompasses a total of approximately 124.6 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 349 lots. The parcels are located within the North Valleys Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 5. (APNs: 087-400-11, 087-400-23, & 087-400-24). If approved, authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1749, Bill No. 1937.

Chair Hill asked whether the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had any questions or concerns regarding Agenda Item 24, and it was determined that they did not have any.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1749, Bill No. 1937, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**25-0838**      **AGENDA ITEM 25** Public Comment.

Mr. Todd Bailey self-identified as a paid lobbyist for Nevada Accountability and stated that a question could not be false. He recalled having been called a liar after previously inquiring during his comment on Agenda Item 9 about the amount the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) would pay for the surplus County property. He stated that nobody employed by Washoe County or EDawn had said that EDawn would purchase the property at the market rate. He opined that asking the question he previously described did not constitute a lie and that suggesting he had done so was not transparency, but rather slander and libel. He expressed curiosity about

what it would be worth if a County official libeled and slandered somebody who was asking a question. He hypothesized whether that value would be \$10 million. He explained that the answer to his earlier question could be found through a public records request (PRR), in which he would ask for a complete list of all surplus County property and the amount EDAWN or its nonprofit would be paying for that land. He opined that his question had been very reasonable, and he thought it was inappropriate for him to have been called a liar for having asked it. He wished a happy Thanksgiving to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), all elected County officials, employees of every department, as well as everyone working during the holiday, including first responders, Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) personnel, and employees of the fire departments. He stated that he was aware that those individuals had become an at-risk population who were also taxpayers and were similarly frustrated with the current situation. He thanked the Board and noted that he would see them again in December.

**25-0839      AGENDA ITEM 26 Announcements/Reports.**

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas reminded everyone that the next Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting would be held on December 9, 2025.

Commissioner Andriola wished everyone a wonderful Thanksgiving and hoped everyone would eat well, enjoy time with family and friends, and spend time feeling grateful for everything the community had to offer and for the efforts of Washoe County to make it a great place to live.

Commissioner Clark commended the Board for showing that they still had the endurance to make it through a long meeting, noting that it was 4:00 p.m. He opined that the Board could likely last through a seven- to eight-hour meeting or a blizzard, as they had in previous years. He encouraged the BCC to remember those times. He wanted to discuss the ordinance related to equine businesses. He recalled that it had occurred to him a few days prior that Washoe County was surrounded by 16 other counties, as well as jurisdictions in northern California, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado. He asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large if the County could investigate and utilize the language of ordinances from other regions to incorporate details from them, thereby expediting the process of enacting its own ordinance. He explained that there had been at least one person who had reported waiting for a solution to the matter for 26 months, and he reiterated his previous question. He emphasized that the matter needed to be advanced and noted that, if necessary, details from ordinances based in other regions could be utilized and subsequently adjusted as required. He expressed a desire to discover exactly how the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) would market the County's properties, whether the County had to pay EDAWN, how much might be paid to the organization, whether EDAWN would be awarding contracts or listings to other entities, and whether those entities had to be members of EDAWN. Commissioner Clark recalled that Taylor Adams, the President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of EDAWN, had mentioned that many brokers were members of the organization. Commissioner Clark wondered about the good commercial brokers in the area who were not members of EDAWN, and he asked if those entities would

still have the opportunity to participate in transactions associated with the sale of County properties. He noted that he wanted a written report addressing his questions.

Commissioner Andriola acknowledged that time passed quickly and there were always many efforts being undertaken simultaneously with competing priorities. She shared that staff had completed a significant amount of work comparing best practices for equine business regulations and recommendations. She explained that those efforts had been previously set aside to meet other requirements and priorities established by the BCC. She noted that addressing the equine business regulations had since been determined to be the Board's second priority, rather than the fifth, with housing being the first. She emphasized that the County would begin addressing the matter further as soon as possible, as much of the necessary work and comparisons had already been completed. She stated that there were many complexities involved with solving the issue, and she offered to meet with anyone who wanted to know about the intricacies of the matter to explain them further. She likened the effort to address the situation to untangling jumbled cords attached to Christmas lights, noting that numerous overlapping, intricate, and incongruous regulations from different jurisdictions had contributed to the difficulty in finding a solution. She thought that all of the involved jurisdictions would be eager to participate in addressing the overlapping regulations, implementing necessary measures, and ensuring equity for everyone who had been impacted in the past and those who were currently affected. She opined that the issue was too complex to be solved simply by comparing similar regulations in other states. She commended the staff for the hard work they had already done and for bracing themselves for the endurance required to continue the process when the timing was right. She stated that she, along with everyone else, was eager to resolve the issue.

Commissioner Clark commented on the extreme length of time it took for a County ordinance to be passed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**4:16 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:*  
*Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*

Pending Board Approval