

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

JUNE 10, 2025

PRESENT:

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

Evonne Strickland, Deputy County Clerk
Eric Brown, County Manager
Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney

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

25-0358 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Mr. Paul White urged Commissioners to view problems at the local and national level as predictable consequences of failure to enforce laws over a long period of time. He contended that the sustained failure amplified the problems. He observed that the Washoe County Jail had a capacity of 1,200 inmates and was currently at capacity. He noted that the jail was built when the local population was 25 percent smaller. He claimed that the District Attorney's (DA) Office communicated to two law enforcement agencies that they should not arrest people because the jail did not have the capacity for additional inmates. He warned that the directive would make things worse, and the County would end up with scenes like he saw on television. He spoke about law enforcement at the Cares Campus and an editorial in the Nevada Globe about a person named Shasta Jim. Mr. White shared that Shasta Jim was a homeless person in Northern California whom he spoke with. Mr. White reported that Shasta Jim said he and everyone he knew were heading to Reno. Mr. White asked the individual how he knew about the Cares Campus, and the man responded that information about the Cares Campus was widely shared on homeless message boards. He said he personally knew a woman who had been raped twice at the Cares Campus but was afraid to report it because she thought reporting it would endanger her ability to stay there. Mr. White questioned the legal status of many Cares Campus residents. He suggested the Board could call for further enforcement of laws to prevent problems from escalating rather than allowing them to incubate. He recognized that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) was out of the purview of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and opined that the same things were occurring within the WCSD. He stated that nothing was being done to address the children entering grocery stores such

as Safeway or the Raley's locations in the North Valleys and Galena in large groups in order to steal as much food and alcohol as they could carry. Mr. White reported that a teacher in the Galena area had written to him regarding having turned in students who had been selling drugs at the school where he worked, which was an action the teacher had taken for over 15 years. Mr. White noted that the teacher had decided to stop doing so, as nobody would enforce the rules. Mr. White reiterated that the Washoe County Jail and the Cares Campus were under the jurisdiction of the Board and asked that the BCC investigate them. He requested that the Board notify him should they have any questions regarding the details he had shared.

Mr. Terry Brooks shared an original poem about the dangers of discrimination, the importance of diversity, and the value of accepting every person as unique.

Ms. Lisa O'Sullivan provided documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She read from the *Subject: Urgent Request for Revision of Wild Horse Fencing in Steamboat Valley* document regarding her concerns about horse fencing, horse safety, and fence financial burdens in Steamboat Valley.

Ms. Norma Davidson noted that she was a resident of Steamboat Valley for over 35 years and had lived in Nevada her whole life. She mentioned that she was a registered voter and taxpayer and expressed concern with the Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA) Director, Dr. JJ Goicoechea, who she felt placed homeowners in jeopardy of fires. She explained that Dr. Goicoechea did not understand what he was doing and that Galena had sheep to eat the wild grass while Steamboat Valley had horses. She indicated that Dr. Goicoechea did not listen to residents and made people believe there was water above United States (US) Highway 395, which she said was untrue. She reported that the only water source in the area was Washoe Lake and that Dr. Goicoechea was torturing residents and was uncompassionate towards wildlife by fencing the area. She communicated that insurance companies cancelled homeowners' insurance due to wildfires. She believed that there would no longer be horses available to eat the grass if the fence were built. She asserted that horses were the spirit of Nevada and thanked the BCC for their consideration.

Ms. Marcy Connington expressed concern about the Virginia Range Fencing project that kept horses out of semi-rural areas. She explained that fencing blocked horses from essential water sources that they depended on and obstructed the horses from grazing, which lowered fire risk. She noted that it was evident that the NDA tried to remove the horses on the range with the fences, causing the horses to die from dehydration and starvation. She said that many individuals loved wild horses, and she was outraged by the NDA. She reported that 80 percent of individuals at the last quarterly NDA meeting on December 6, 2024, spoke in opposition to the fence; however, the NDA continued the installation. She opined that people needed to be more vocal about their opinions to cease the fencing project. She believed that the horses needed access to adequate water due to the High Desert region and that water was essential for all living creatures.

Ms. Liz Lord expressed worry about the dangers in Steamboat Valley due to the horse fencing. She recalled that she witnessed smoke from her backyard and said that the fire grew within two or three minutes. She explained that she investigated the distance of the fire from her home, and within 15 minutes, the Washoe Drive Fire was burning out of control. She reported that an elderly woman and several animals died in the Washoe Drive Fire. She believed fencing the horses out of their natural grazing areas made residents more susceptible to fires. She indicated that fencing horses out of water was disgraceful because no animal should suffer from dehydration. She hoped that the BCC would have enough compassion to stop fencing from impacting the horses. She communicated that she was originally from California and had owned horses her whole life. She appreciated watching horses in the wild and said that they were present in the area before people, and to be fenced was inhumane and unethical. She commented that there must be a compromise and recalled that California was attempting to protect the mountain lions by building a bridge over freeways. She urged that there must be an agreement besides rounding up the horses, which she felt was cruel and should be outlawed. She speculated that politicians said what people wanted to hear to appease residents. She requested that the BCC help horses and protect the residents in high fire areas.

Mr. Oscar Williams provided documents, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He referred and read from the *Proposed Agenda Item* document regarding the five reasons why he wanted his proposed ordinance to be considered. He explained that there was nothing in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) that indicated the Registrar of Voters (ROV) must provide the BCC with an election summary report by a particular deadline. He recalled ROV Andrew McDonald noted the canvass efforts of the ROV's Office but wished Mr. McDonald would expand on details to provide a better understanding. He said that a headcount should take place to know how many people were in the ROV's Office and that quarterly reports should occur detailing election integrity violations. He noted that the BCC should consider the reasons based on common sense because the Commissioners should know the election details. He understood that Chair Hill and Commissioner Andriola enjoyed working closely with Mr. McDonald and thought it would be easy for them to support the proposal. He commented that NRS 293.387 pertaining to the canvass mandate said that the board shall note separately any clerical errors discovered and take account of changes resulting from the discovery. He wondered how the BCC could certify an election in good conscience if the BCC was not provided with all the information. He believed that there were errors in the previous election and that the ROV's Office was not candid. He encouraged the BCC to consider his proposal to keep the ROV's Office consistent and clear.

Mr. Gary Weichert provided documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He read from the document regarding the Joy Lake Fire, Davis Fire, defensible spaces, and the International Wildland Urban Interface Code (IWUIC). He asked the BCC to adopt Chapter 6 of the IWUIC.

Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation (TMPF) Board President Ms. Jill Richardson indicated that she spent several years researching the history of the region's parks. She reported that her research revealed that many parks were formed as the result of

hard work by community leaders, influential businesspeople, and everyday citizens. She noted that she wished she could have met Doctor (Dr.) Massoud Dorostkar, who donated 20 acres for Dorostkar Park. She mentioned that Dr. Dorostkar took a ski trip to Denver, Colorado, from Detroit, Michigan, when his plane was detoured to Reno due to a snowstorm. She explained that when he landed in Reno, he thought it resembled his birthplace of Iran and wished to relocate to the area. She recalled that he was an anesthesiologist who faced discrimination because he was foreign-born but gained a good reputation over time. She communicated that he loved jogging and biking and, after buying the Mayberry Ranch, had decided it was important to keep the area out of development by donating a portion of his ranch for the park. She commented that he also donated the land that turned into the South Valleys Regional Sports Complex. She thanked Dr. Dorostkar and people like him for the forethought to donate land for future generations to enjoy. She believed that the community could do the same by creating a park district to preserve the valuable parks, trails, and open spaces. She hoped the BCC would leave a legacy through the parks district.

Mr. Deandre Burleson noted that he was lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans (LGBT) registered. He expressed his concerns about interactions he had with two Caucasian women. He recalled that he hit a door, causing the security guard to address him about aggressive behavior. He said that he visited the Reno Housing Authority (RHA) the previous day and spoke with a staff member who informed him his file was complete. He displayed a document containing his court information, cellphone expenditures, a hotel receipt, medical documents, and correspondence from the Salvation Army. No copy was submitted for the public record. He indicated that he was not heterosexual and expressed that he was not friendly towards heterosexual individuals. He mentioned that it upset him when individuals in the audience coughed while he was speaking and that he was attempting civility; however, being smiled at, being interrupted by coughing, receiving complaints from security, and laughing irritated him.

Ms. Yuli Chavez Camarena announced that she was a candidate for the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (OSRPC) and apologized for not being able to stay for the entirety of the meeting. She was honored to be considered for the OSRPC and knew that the BCC would select the best candidate. She noted that she had two young children who loved to explore parks and trails. She loved the community and was a huge believer in family, access, and inclusion for all. She understood how parks and open spaces brought people together and provided safety and accessibility for all community members. She said that she was a recent Washoe County Leadership Academy (WCLA) graduate and was grateful to learn about the outstanding work the County did. She explained that she was the Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) Director and worked with families and students to gain better economic opportunities. She commented that she was a board member of the United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierras (UWNNS). She communicated that she was invested in the community and its future and wished the BCC a successful search for the OSRPC appointment. She reported that she would continue to look for more opportunities to give back to the community she loved if she were not appointed to the OSRPC. She thanked the BCC for their support for the WCLA and said

that the WCLA was an excellent opportunity. She thanked the staff who participated in and organized the WCLA.

Ms. Liz Sotomayor was opposed to the Virginia Ranch Fencing Project because she believed that it was cruel and inhumane to the horses. She noted that 11 miles of the projected 23-mile fence was built, which blocked wild horses from every major year-round water source within 5,000 acres. She commented that the horses only had access to four seasonal ponds due to the fence and that the ponds had been dry since May 18. She communicated that horses followed patterns, and every path they normally took was blocked by barbed wire fencing. She indicated that there was only one way for the horses to access Little Washoe Lake, and that would be blocked by the next phase of fencing. She reported that Dr. Goicoechea stated that there was plenty of water on the Virginia Range, but she said that the horses lived in a certain area of the 285,000-acre range. She explained that some horses stood on the fence line and died, not understanding why their path had changed. She recalled that a group of 30 to 40 horses were parked at the fence above Tinhorn Road a few weeks previous, and it took the horses three days to find their way to Little Washoe Lake for water. She said that dying of dehydration was very painful and took days. She believed that the beautiful wild horses deserved better, and she questioned why they were treated poorly by the NDA. She requested the BCC to be a voice for the horses and demand a reliable year-round water source for the Virginia Range wild horses.

Mr. Cliff Low reported that he was a 25-year resident of Washoe County. He divulged that in late January, he suffered a fall and broke several cervical vertebrae, received spinal cord damage, a concussion, and a broken nose. He said that he no longer needed to wear a brace but was less than five months into a twelve to eighteen-month recovery. He noted that he was the guilty party who coughed during Mr. Burleson's comments, which was involuntary due to his injury. He expressed that he was receiving medical treatment for the chronic cough. He wanted the BCC to ask themselves what obligation they had to follow through on promises made by their predecessors. He indicated that at one time he thought about becoming a Commissioner and believed that, at a minimum, when something was brought up constantly related to promises and votes made when a Commissioner was not on the BCC, a Commissioner had an obligation to research the issue to decide whether to support the item with the information available. He commented that the meeting minutes would contain the vote on a prior issue and that, as the BCC prepared to vote on an item that could go beyond their current term, they needed to give the item careful thought. He explained that some Commissioners were term-limited while others may not decide to run again or be unsuccessful in their campaigns. He speculated that if a Commissioner thought they did not have an obligation to consider past votes and promises made by predecessors, that Commissioner should abstain from the matters that went beyond their term.

25-0359 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown stated that Agenda Item 12 would be pulled from the agenda and would be brought back at a later date. He mentioned that there were openings for two regular members and one alternate member for the Board of Equalization

(BOE), and the deadline to apply was Friday, June 20, 2025. He said that the District Board of Health (DBOH) was looking for an emergency physician to serve on the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Board, and the deadline to apply was Friday, June 27, 2025.

Manager Brown explained that requests made during the budget process were logged and forwarded to the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the Budget Team for consideration and follow-up and would continue moving forward. He said many discussions occurred with various Commissioners and department heads, and those would be logged and followed up on to ensure they were handled appropriately.

Manager Brown noted that on April 15, 2025, Commissioner Clark said he was concerned about fist fights that occurred at the Senior Center and suggested a Senior Center at the Cares Campus. He said that request was shared with the Human Services Agency (HSA) and Housing and Homeless Services (HHS) for consideration. He said that on April 15, 2025, Commissioner Clark requested information regarding \$18,000 that HSA used for Greyhound bus tickets. He added that staff notified the Commissioner of the circumstances that prompted providing bus passes to residents for family reunifications, employment opportunities, and more. He stated that on April 15, 2025, Commissioners Clark and Andriola asked if there was a way to track the number of people who visited the Washoe County Checkbook website, and both were provided with a link to the Google Analytics platform for Washoe County Checkbook that could be accessed at any time. He noted that on May 31, 2025, Commissioner Clark requested information on who wrote the library ballot measure. Manager Brown said that Assistant County Manager (ACM) Kate Thomas provided that information to Commissioner Clark. He explained that on May 20, 2025, Commissioner Clark inquired about why the Volunteers of America (VOA) were taking over Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE) at the Cares Campus when the cost was going to be higher. He indicated that Commissioner Clark was provided with the scoring document used in the request for proposals (RFP) process and the additional questions and answers that outlined why VOA was selected. He said that on May 20, 2025, Commissioner Clark asked the Communications Department to create a post about the Green Waste Program on social media. He stated that the Media and Communications Program Manager, Bethany Drysdale, contacted the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Public Information Officer (PIO), who said that information had already been communicated through X, Bluesky, and Nextdoor. He mentioned that on March 11, 2025, Commissioner Andriola inquired about the travel and employment arrangements for the Washoe County Chief Information Officer (CIO). He stated that an investigation was conducted by Human Resources (HR) and a report was issued on April 17, 2025. He explained he was unsure why the report was taking so long to get but reported that all employee arrangements regarding travel had compensations that were found to be compliant with County policy. He noted that there was a review of not just the CIO's arrangements but the arrangements of all employees, and again, the County was found to be in compliance.

Manager Brown said the BCC requested an independent review of the Office of the County Manager (OCM). He mentioned that the firm that conducted that

review was Raftelis, and the report would be provided to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), department heads, and the public. He explained that he and his direct report team had an opportunity to be briefed by the Raftelis consultants to begin mapping out the next steps. He said he was pleased with their quality of work. He thought there were innovative recommendations and best practices from other jurisdictions around the County that Washoe County could benefit from. He noted that the OCM indicated to the consultants that they were prepared to be engaged to determine what could be done, particularly around improving communication between the BCC, OCM, and department heads. He believed one of the key recommendations or observations noted by Raftelis was the need to reset the relationship between the OCM, County Manager, and BCC. He said that after reflecting on that over the last couple of weeks, he came to the realization that it was a good time to step down as County Manager. Upon reflection of the communication challenges that were addressed in the report, he felt he had to look at himself and the situation and determine if the County was the right place for him to be effective, for the County to continue to move forward. He said that he had provided his retirement from the County, effective June 30, 2025. He noted that the BCC and the organization could begin recruiting the next County Manager, so that County business could move forward. He said he was appreciative and thankful to his direct report OCM team, and the 3,100 employees in the County who embraced him over the last several years. He noted that those who challenged him made him and his team figure out a better way to do things when they may not have been done correctly the first time. He explained that the list of accomplishments was not his alone, and he considered them to be the organization's lasting accomplishments. He thanked everyone who had supported and worked with him over the past several years. He said that although he was unsure what was next, he would find something and would look upon his time at Washoe County in a favorable light. He noted that he loved the County and was hopeful of staying locally in his next endeavor.

Chair Hill thanked Manager Brown for his service and explained that it was amazing to see all the many accomplishments he had been involved with for the community. She added that she was grateful for all he had done for Washoe County.

Vice Chair Herman said that Manager Brown would be missed very much.

Commissioner Garcia echoed Vice Chair Herman's comment and said she was sorry to see him go but respected his decision to retire and pursue other endeavors. She believed Manager Brown's work had a profound impact that was felt by many. She explained that during his time of service, the County experienced COVID-19 (C19), took on homeless services, moved towards regional computer-aided dispatch (CAD), and explored the mental health realm. She felt those were monumental initiatives for Manager Brown. She expressed her appreciation for his leadership and for guiding the County through difficult times. She believed he had been a shield to many department heads and staff during volatile political times. She shared that she respected him and was excited to see where his next endeavor took him.

Commissioner Garcia noted that some Consent Agenda Items would not have a presentation. She acknowledged that for Items 7A3 and 7F2, most of the effort for

those endeavors was done in 2017, passing enabling legislation in the State of Nevada to allow a parks district in Washoe County. She thanked the staff and colleagues across various jurisdictions who were heavily involved. She said it was a big deal for the region and acknowledged the persistence needed to pursue the service plan, which had historically gotten more expensive each year. She mentioned that it was passed unanimously by the City of Reno and was on the current agenda for the BCC meeting. She explained that the contributions came from the City of Reno for \$63,550, Washoe County for \$100,000, the redevelopment agency for \$60,000, and \$20,000 came from her. She felt it was a monumental day for the region. She said the plan would outline efficiencies, financial revenue sources, and governance. She expressed her excitement for the future of parks, trails, and open space.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Garcia for her leadership and funding on the initiative and was excited to see it finally move forward.

Commissioner Andriola shared that Lazy 5 Regional Park's 20th anniversary celebration, which occurred on June 7, 2025, was terrific. She indicated that there were vendors, many attendees, and musicians. She mentioned that there was a music series every Wednesday evening at 6:30 through August 13th. She hoped the community would remember to put Lazy 5 Regional Park on their list of things to do. She thanked the park rangers and all who contributed for their hard work.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Manager Brown for everything and said she could not imagine navigating the challenges of C19 and the changes with the Commission. She realized the job was not always easy. She said she was encouraged by the report from Raftelis and thought there were fantastic opportunities. She believed Manager Brown's legacy would be a part of that, and she believed that should be celebrated. She hoped that one day she could use the word retired and said she could imagine what it might feel like to wake up every day and be retired. She mentioned that she wanted him to enjoy every day and know that he made a difference in Washoe County.

Commissioner Clark congratulated Manager Brown and wished him the best for his future. He said he left the previous Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) meeting extremely disgusted and unhappy, not only for himself but also for the citizens of District 2 in Washoe Valley. He explained that the residents had been promised a fire station for many years, but they found out they would not get one. He felt that those residents should have been notified before the interim chief revealed that information to a local news station. He thought a public commenter mentioned honoring Commissioners who came before and voted on things. He believed the fire station had been previously approved, and now that the current members of the BCC were on the dais, it did not appear that it would happen. He said he hoped that he could reach out to the new fire chief and explore options to resuscitate the project. He felt it was a health and safety issue for the residents. He stated that there had been discussions about fires and how they affected the community, and he thought one of the best ways to slow down a fire would be to have a fire station nearby to begin fire suppression. He explained that he was disappointed that the promise of a fire station was delayed or would not happen.

Commissioner Clark said that several weeks ago, he met with some judges from the courthouse. He urged the community to read an article posted for This is Reno by Mr. Bob Conrad about radon at the courthouse. He explained the article as an in-depth look at what was happening there. He alleged that the leading cause of lung cancer was radon, which was secondary to smoking. He believed it was something that the community should be concerned about. He said judges expressed their concern regarding certifications and inspections when they called a meeting with him. He indicated that judges were reluctant to go on the record with that information because of the appearance of impropriety, but they asked him to relay their concerns. He believed that if the individuals in the County read the article, they would have a better understanding of the situation.

Commissioner Clark thanked the individuals from District 2 who spoke about wild horse fencing. He mentioned that the last Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meeting had a large turnout with about 50 to 60 individuals. He noted that there were six people who showed up at the BCC meeting, which was about 10 percent of the CAB meeting attendees. He said nearly 100 percent of the attendees had the same concerns about horses not being able to access water, experiencing inhumane treatment, and fire mitigation concerns regarding horses eating grass. He thought the fencing was possibly the State's, and that the City of Reno had been involved as well. He explained that Councilwoman Naomi Duerr was passionate about that topic, and he thought it would be helpful if she could give a presentation to the BCC. He stated she had about a 10-year head start on studying that issue.

Commissioner Clark said he met with four of the seven elected officials in the County. He said he had breakfast with the Clerk, Treasurer, Public Administrator, and Assessor, and discussed their concerns. He believed that \$100,000 to \$200,000 could be life-changing funding, which might be too strong of a word, but he felt those funds could be helpful. He explained that funding was not a big ask in a budget of over \$1 billion. He questioned why the County replaced one contractor with another, who charged \$1.1 million more. He noted that when he asked each elected official if that money would allow them to do a better job if it went towards their department, they agreed that it would be life-changing for their teams.

Commissioner Clark said he overlooked how an item was listed on the agenda and voted yes. He stated that, according to the Commissioner's Rule Book, reconsideration was allowed if there was an affirmative vote on an item. He mentioned that he was told no when he requested that his vote be reconsidered. He indicated that the item would likely pass anyway, but he at least wanted to have a discussion or have his comments on the public record. He said that when a company was hired to complete a job and then replaced with another company that charged an additional \$1.1 million, he questioned why that would be done during times of economic hardship. He felt that if the savings of \$1.1 million were available, they could have been distributed among the other offices. He believed it was fiscally responsible to communicate that his request was denied. He requested information on the number of times in the past ten years a Commissioner asked

for a reconsideration and was denied. He submitted documents to the Clerk for the public record.

Commissioner Clark said he wanted to discuss Agenda Items 7C1, 7D2, 7E1, and 13 before those items were voted on so that they would not be overlooked.

Commissioner Andriola informed that the budget 101 meeting for the Washoe County Checkbook would take place on July 22, 2025, in the Chambers from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m. She mentioned that the notice went out prior to the BCC meeting and included an input portal to provide feedback and ask questions in advance, which was helpful for preparation. She recognized the staff and everyone who participated. She felt hopeful for a good turnout and was excited that it would become a part of the budget process each year. She explained that since the meeting would be recorded, everyone would have an opportunity to review the recording.

Commissioner Garcia stated that her colleague liked to clarify things for the public record. She welcomed the public to watch the June 3, 2025, BOFC meeting. She explained that her colleague said he walked out because he was unhappy and disgusted. She wanted it on record that she felt he failed to mention that he purposefully and deliberately broke quorum and left two Commissioners to handle County business. She stated that for 15 minutes, a room full of people and 24 full-time employees (FTEs) who were lawyers, firefighters, and County staff on taxpayer dollars waited for a Commissioner to return to a meeting and fulfill his duty. She indicated that when that did not happen, staff frantically called two other Commissioners who had excused absences, one of whom had to step out of a private dental exam to assist in finishing County business. She believed finalizing the new fire chief's contract was the most critical health and wellness decision and vote that could be made. She noted that she appreciated his concerns and had no complaints about his comments, questions he asked, or the advocacy for Washoe County to provide the highest level of service for Washoe Valley residents. She said, as Manager Brown noted previously, communication was critical and was reciprocal and added that she would like to have more productive conversations in a manner that served the public best.

25-0360 **AGENDA ITEM 5A1** Presentation by Mike Larragueta, President and CEO of the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority on 2024 tourism research findings. (All Commission Districts.)

Mike Larragueta, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA), and Alex Molin, Future Partners Research Director, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Reno-Sparks Convention & Visitors Authority 2024 Destination Research; Table of Contents; Travel Sentiment Trends; Expected Travel Spending...; Confidence That Now is a Good Time to Spend...; An Increasing Number of Travelers Report...; Recession Fears Are Growing...; Traveler Confidence About Their Financial Future...; Reno Brand Health Metrics; Destination Grade and Change in Destination Popularity; Destination Familiarity and Uniqueness; Travel Accessibility and Welcoming

Atmosphere; Motivation to Visit and Likelihood to Visit; Destination Deterrents; Appeal as a Place to Live and Meetings Destination; Visitor Profile; Research Overview; Executive Summary; Reno Tahoe Visitors...; Origin Markets; Demographics (2 slides); Visitors Typically Traveled...; Most Visitors Traveled to Reno Tahoe For Vacation...; Overnight Visitors...; Most Visitors Arrived...; Overnight Visitors Stayed, on Average, 3.2 Nights in Market; Most Overnight Visitors Stayed in...; Visitors Most Commonly Traveled With...; A Quarter of Visitors Traveled to the Area With Children...; Most Visitors Went to Downtown...; The Top Activities...; Among Overnight Visitors, the Average Daily Spend...; Visitors Perceived...; Most Visitors Agreed...; Four-in-Five Visitors Rated the Area...; Visitors Reported that Reno Tahoe Overperforms...; Visitors Typically Planned and Booked Their Trip Shortly Before Their Intended Arrival; Most Visitors Started to Plan Less Than Two Months Before...; Visitors Booked Travel Arrangements...; Visitors Had a Positive Reno Tahoe Experience and Are Likely to Return; Most Visitors Reported High Satisfaction...; Most Visitors Would Recommend...; Four-in-Five Visitors Said...; Resident Sentiment; Research Overview; Executive Summary; Residents Have Positive Perceptions...; In General, Washoe County Residents Feel...; Residents Have Positive Perceptions...; Tourism Industry Sentiment...; Positive Sentiment About The Tourism Industry's Impact...; Residents May be Hesitant to Pursue Tourism Jobs...; Resident Perceptions About Tourism's Impact on Jobs...; Tourism is Seen as Important...; Most Residents Believe Tourism is Important...; Residents Increasingly Believe...; While Residents Express Concerns About the Impacts...; Residents Believe Tourism Significantly Impacts the Community...; Compared to 2023...; Future Partners.

Mr. Larragueta thanked County Manager Eric Brown, said it was a pleasure working with him, and wished him luck. He said he was unsure of Manager Brown's retirement plans but mentioned that the indoor track season was around the corner, and he would love to see him at the Reno-Sparks Convention Center blowing a whistle.

Mr. Larragueta said that Future Partners recently presented the 2024 visitor profile study and resident sentiment study at the RSCVA's April board meeting. He explained that the data were used to strengthen Visit Reno Tahoe's marketing, advertising, and organizational strategies. He noted that the RSCVA's board and senior staff felt that sharing data with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would be beneficial. He introduced Ms. Molin and said she resided in San Francisco, but was a graduate of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR).

Ms. Molin said Future Partners was a creative insights agency that shaped winning strategies for the travel and tourism industry. She noted that in addition to working with destinations like RSCVA, they had a rich data set that tracked American traveler sentiment over time. She mentioned that in the past year, recession fears had grown, but the month of May indicated a potential ease in that worry. On the slide titled *Destination Grade and Change in Destination Popularity* she explained that within the rich syndicated data set, American travelers rated their perceptions on different destinations across the United States, including Reno. She highlighted some perceptions and sentiments around Reno and said that about one quarter of the individuals gave the area an A, and about half

of the respondents believed Reno was becoming more popular as a destination. She noted that a quarter of people were familiar with the things to see and do in Reno, and over half believed Reno was a unique destination, different from other places.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Travel Accessibility and Welcoming Atmosphere* and said that about half of the people felt like the experiences in Reno were accessible to diverse travelers, and three in five believed that Reno had a welcoming atmosphere. On the slide titled *Motivation to Visit and Likelihood to Visit*, she stated that the numbers tend to be slightly lower, around 40 percent for motivation and 25 percent for likelihood to visit.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Destination Deterrents* and noted that the slide captured the top reasons why people were not visiting Reno. On the slide titled *Research Overview*, she said that when conducting research, they tried to understand who was coming to the Reno-Tahoe area and why, to determine how to get them reengaged to return. She explained that to address the primary objective, an online survey was conducted in 2024 with 600 visitors to the Reno-Tahoe area, including Washoe County.

Ms. Molin mentioned that visitors predominantly came from California. She detailed that on the slide titled *Origin Markets* that California was the top origin state, and the largest share of visitors came from San Francisco and the Sacramento metropolitan areas. She explained on the slide titled *Demographics* that visitors were equally likely to be male and female, with an average age of 46.8 years. She stated that most identified as white, but Asian and Hispanic were also sizable numbers. She said that most of the visitors were married, one-third had a child in the household, and the average household income of visitors was \$103,000.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Demographics 2023 vs 2024* and noted that 2024 demographics remained largely consistent with 2023. She highlighted that in 2024, visitors were slightly more male and affluent. She reviewed the slide titled *Most Visitors Traveled to Reno Tahoe For Vacation...*, and pointed out that the primary purpose for travel to the area was to take a vacation.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Most Overnight Visitors Stayed in...* and said visitors predominantly stayed at casino hotels, though one in five stayed at either a non-gaming hotel or at a private residence with family and friends. On the slide titled *A Quarter of Visitors Traveled to the Area With Children...*, she stated that most visitors traveled with their significant other, and one quarter of visitors traveled to Reno with children under the age of 18.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Among Overnight Visitors, the Average Daily Spend...*, and noted that overnight visitors spent, on average, \$273 per person per day, which was money being infused back into the County. She pointed out on the slide titled *Most Visitors Agreed...* that visitors rated Reno-Tahoe on a set of brand statements, and most said that Reno-Tahoe was a fun and vibrant atmosphere. She mentioned that

Reno-Tahoe was a place where individuals lived life to the fullest and had a spirit of independence.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Four-in-Five Visitors Rated the Area...* and noted that visitors were asked to rate Reno-Tahoe on a set of attributes. She explained that outdoor-oriented attributes rose to the top of the list. Those activities included having access to the outdoors, water, and winter activities. She stated that gambling and family-friendly activities also received high marks.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Visitors Reported that Reno Tahoe Overperforms...* and mentioned that the light blue line was the percent of visitors who rated each attribute as necessary when selecting a vacation destination, and was compared against the wavy dark blue line, which was Reno-Tahoe's rating. She explained the difference between the two lines was that Reno-Tahoe overperformed on most of the attributes tested. She noted that the chart showed the attributes that visitors said were important when selecting a vacation destination, and pointed out where Reno-Tahoe overperformed, which were the outdoor-oriented attributes. She stated that Reno-Tahoe underperformed on value for money and having a variety of museums and art galleries.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Most Visitors Reported High Satisfaction...* and stated that three-fourths of visitors reported high satisfaction with their overall trip. She indicated on the slide titled *Most Visitors Would Recommend...* that a similar number of visitors said that they would recommend Reno-Tahoe to others looking for a vacation destination. She explained that on the slide titled *Four-in-Five Visitors Said...*, a larger number of visitors were likely to return to Reno for vacation.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Research Overview* and said that the intent of the resident sentiment survey was to understand Washoe County residents' perceptions of the tourism industry and how it impacted them personally. She noted that an online survey was conducted with 400 Washoe County residents. On the slide titled *In General, Washoe County Residents Feel...*, she pointed out that the right side of the chart showed that over half of residents expected that their quality of life would improve within a year. She said that was higher than the number of residents who said that their quality of life had improved since the previous year, which reflected an optimistic feeling.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Residents Have Positive Perceptions...* and stated that the chart on the left showed that 60 percent had positive perceptions about Washoe County's tourism industry. She mentioned that the chart on the right showed that individuals felt that the Washoe County tourism industry impacted them and their families in a positive way. On the slide titled *Tourism Industry Sentiment...*, she explained that positive sentiment was consistent from 2023 to 2024.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Residents May be Hesitant to Pursue Tourism Jobs...* and said that when residents were asked to rate their level of agreement with how Washoe County tourism impacted jobs, about half said that the area provided ample job opportunities. She noted that only a quarter said that tourism jobs paid well. She

believed that, while there was the perception that there were readily available tourism jobs, people may not be pursuing them because they perceived the jobs to be associated with low wages. On the slide titled *Tourism is Seen as Important...*, she mentioned that tourism's impact on the local economy was positive.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *Most Residents Believe Tourism is Important...* and said that when residents were asked to rate their level of agreement with how Washoe County's tourism industry impacted the local economy, a large number of people said that it was important in the present and the future. She noted that a third of Washoe County residents said that they felt that Washoe County was too dependent on tourism. On the slide titled *Residents Increasingly Believe...*, she mentioned that positive perceptions about how the local tourism industry impacted the economy improved since 2023.

Ms. Molin reviewed the slide titled *While Residents Express Concerns About...* and indicated that in looking at how the tourism industry impacted the community, residents saw both positive and negative benefits. On the slide titled *Residents Believe Tourism Significantly Impacts the Community...*, she pointed out that the metrics shown inside boxes indicated that a large number of residents believed that the tourism industry supported local sporting events, festivals, and cultural experiences. She said a very similar number of people also felt that tourism brought crowds and traffic to the community. On the slide titled *Compared to 2023...*, she explained that positive and negative impacts increased each year, which highlighted the need to help mitigate the potential risks that residents saw with tourism in Washoe County.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Molin and said she thought the presentation was a comprehensive snapshot of visitors and what residents thought about tourism. She was excited and optimistic because residents were concerned about the future of Washoe County, but also because the County had a strong market, even with a potential recession. She hoped that people would continue to see Lake Tahoe and Reno as being in their backyard and felt the area was accessible. She noted it was wonderful to see that families needed to be catered to. She thought the presentation brought awareness to local businesses of the individuals who brought money to the community.

Vice Chair Herman said the presentation was interesting and informative.

Commissioner Garcia wondered if the data that was provided was available to the public. Ms. Molin said the information was available on RSCVA's website. Commissioner Garcia appreciated how the who and why were outlined in the presentation. She mentioned that she had made a note that one quarter of the people visiting traveled with children under the age of 18. She explained that she wished the Reno area could have the best outdoor sporting venues, flat fields for baseball, soccer, and all sports in the region. She said if the land and transit were available to get people around efficiently, she felt that would be an economic driver. She noted that anyone traveling with youth for sports would understand the cost of hotels, food, and outings. She asked for an update on the indoor track since a few events had been held there. She wondered if there had been a positive

impact because of the state-of-the-art facility, which was an asset for the region. Mr. Larragueta said that the indoor track was embarking on its second season. He mentioned that the first year had eight meets, with four hosted by UNR and four outside meets by the Pacific Association and one other entity. He indicated that for 2025, 12 track meets were scheduled, with 6 to be hosted by UNR and 4 by the Pacific Association. He said it was announced that the facility would host two Mountain West conference championships for men and women, and then a second conference made up of several West Coast schools not directly affiliated with a conference. He stated that the goals were to grow the size and number of meets and expand participants to go from being a regional destination to a national one for indoor track. He noted the goal was to have competitors from the Midwest, the East Coast, and the Northeast. He mentioned that one thing learned during the first season was that Reno's track was considered a very fast track in the world of indoor track. He believed that setting records and establishing personal best times was a priority and thought that as things progressed and word spread across the Country about the speed of the track, it would attract people from all over.

Chair Hill said she would like Mr. Larragueta to return to expand on the various initiatives that the RSCVA had taken on since he started. She thought there were many exciting things happening.

Commissioner Andriola appreciated the presentation and thanked Chair Hill for requesting it. She wondered if the information would be available for businesses to review so they could adjust accordingly for outdoor activities, gaming, or whatever their focus was. Mr. Larragueta explained that the RSCVA reviewed the data, which drove decisions related to where, how, and who was marketed. He stated that the information was utilized to assist with decisions for the best allocation of funds in marketing and advertising.

Vice President of Marketing Christina Erny said the RSCVA had conducted the survey over the years and used it to compare data each year to ensure that marketing efforts were getting to the right people and to determine future customers. She mentioned that as the household income for visitors grew each year, more affluent travelers were attracted. She noted that as more families visited, it reflected an expanding market. She said that the average age several years ago was higher and flattened out to around 46 years old, which attracted the middle of one of the target audiences. She mentioned that the data collected was used and integrated throughout RSCVA's marketing efforts. She stated that the data could be found on the RSCVA website. She described the data as in-depth, with a report consisting of hundreds of pages.

Commissioner Andriola suggested that the community review the data, especially businesses and those who could benefit from it. She noted areas identified related to good value, the variety of museums and art, and the convenient access to the outdoors. She wondered if there was a way to leverage economic opportunities. She explained that the RSCVA did a great job of getting individuals to visit, but said it was one thing to market and another to deliver. She indicated there was an equation for economic development that led to financial benefit. She thought there may be an opportunity to share

the RSCVA's information, because their numbers equated to dollars spent and money that stayed local. She said visitors likely share their experience with others when they go home.

Mr. Larragueta noted that the RSCVA made an effort to communicate the information throughout their website and worked with the Reno and Sparks Chamber of Commerce. He explained that, as Chair Hill was aware, one of RSCVA's goals last fiscal year and continuing forward was community engagement and sharing the information. He said there was valuable, rich data to share that businesses did not realize was available. He explained that the list of the RSCVA's upcoming events had previously been restricted on their website, but changes were made in 2024 to show which events were occurring within the next ninety days. He mentioned the website listed upcoming meetings, conventions, sports, youth groups, and other events. He believed that the information was critical to local business owners to determine the demographic of the attendees and what their hours of operation and staffing would be. He felt that the RSCVA needed to do a better job of distributing that information to the commercial areas.

Commissioner Andriola said there were plenty of opportunities to receive economic updates from other organizations on an annual basis, and she thought there might be more. She felt that the platform would be helpful because the individuals in that audience were the actual businesses that could benefit. She said she appreciated that engagement was part of the strategic plan's focus.

Commissioner Clark said he was particularly interested in the review and information about local individuals and their thoughts. He felt their input was key since they lived in the region. He wondered about the possibility of tracking Nevadans who visited the area. He thought about tracking whether someone spent the day, had a meal, or stayed in a hotel or campground. He believed those people were considered tourists because money was being spent, and there was tax revenue. He mentioned it would be nice to see what impact those from Nevada who visited the County might have on the Reno area. He noted that Reno had things that Las Vegas did not have. He explained that Reno had Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River, which Las Vegas could never have. He indicated that people from nearby areas visited the area for medical appointments, banking, or financial reasons. He stated that tourists stayed overnight and ate, drank, and gambled. He wondered how far away someone needed to live to be considered a tourist or visitor. He said the economic impact on the community was an important focus. He believed the focus should be on Washoe County instead of just Reno. He thought people who lived in the area would like to do other things besides visit Reno. He said there were many things happening in the area, such as concerts and festivals, that drew people in.

Chair Hill said that the RSCVA had quarterly stakeholder meetings to share information so that businesses and people in the community could learn about transformative things coming up at the RSCVA.

25-0361 **AGENDA ITEM 5A2** Presentation by Tracey Bowles, Washoe County Public Guardian, to give an annual update on work of the Public Guardian's office. (All Commission Districts.)

Washoe County Public Guardian Tracey Bowles conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Public Guardian Annual Update; Mission; Budget; NRS 159 and NRS 253; Standards and Ethics of Guardian; How to Spot A Good Guardian; Fun Facts; Caseload 1:24 Ratio*; Caseload Numbers 2025; Time Spent Managing Personal and Real Property; Referred to Guardianship with Homes; Estate Management; Mandatory Reports; Impact of Guardianship; Accomplishments: Collaborations; Accomplishments: Intern Program with University of Nevada School of Social Work; Accomplishments: Internal Training Academy; Challenges for our Staff; Challenges for our Community; Questions?

Ms. Bowles described that the mission of her department was to serve as court-appointed guardians for people 18 years of age and older. She displayed her *Budget* slide and communicated that the expenses of her department represented 0.25 percent of the County budget. She added that their revenues were small, and they were only allowed to take the costs for their department after court approval. She reported that the department had 20 staff members, many of whom were in Chambers at the meeting that day. She displayed her *NRS 159 and NRS 253* slide and explained that the Public Guardian was primarily governed by two statutes in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). She noted that there were many other statutes that her department had to comply with because guardianship was diverse. She showed the *Standards and Ethics of Guardian* slide and advised that her department used the National Guardianship Association (NGA) standards of practice as their guiding principles. She mentioned that the NGA was not often discussed in her presentations, but she included information about the organization to acknowledge its importance. She read from her *How to Spot a Good Guardian* slide, which contained information shared by the NGA. She described that the daily work undertaken by her staff was difficult. She reviewed her *Fun Facts* slide. She highlighted the 40-60 age group and said those were the most challenging cases because of the gaps in services and housing for those individuals. She specified that there were insufficient resources for adults in the community between the ages of 40 and 60 who had cognitive impairments that limited their ability to manage their own finances and property. Her department worked hard to serve that population, which accounted for 18 percent of the individuals under County guardianship. She noted that Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 was not complete, but her department had already taken on 46 new cases. She communicated that her staff got to know the individuals they worked with well, and sometimes supported them for many years, including up until the end of their lives.

Ms. Bowles showed her *Caseload 1:24 Ratio** slide and pointed out the caseload increase over the last two years. She said the department's caseload ratio at that time was 1 to 24, and the national standard they aimed for was 1 to 20. She noted that 1 to 24 was a departmental ratio, not an individual case manager ratio. She showed her *Caseload Numbers 2025* slide, which depicted the ratios and caseloads of individual case managers. She shared that Guardian Case Manager IIs carried higher caseloads. Guardian Case Manager IIIs tended to have lower caseloads because they carried extra duties and worked with more complicated cases. Guardian Case Manager Is were new people being onboarded into the department. Ms. Bowles emphasized the importance of providing new employees with deep learning and ample training time to improve employee retention and

reduce departmental turnover. Caseloads were kept low until staff knew their jobs well. She showed the *Time Spent Managing Personal and Real Property* slide, which contained information Board members had not previously seen. She shared that even though the department's caseload numbers had not changed significantly, the time spent managing personal and real property had dramatically increased. She said the people who were coming to them under guardianship now had markedly more financial resources, and in some cases even owned property. She advised that those factors took extra time, and her department did not have a history of managing those kinds of resources that they could refer to for guidance. She showed the *Referred to Guardianship with Homes* slide, which demonstrated how the number of houses her department managed had multiplied yearly since 2022. She displayed the *Estate Management* slide, which depicted the increase in the finances they managed for people under their guardianship. She directed attention to a decrease in FY 2025, which she said represented some targeted work her office undertook to find other community partners. They identified individuals under their guardianship who had significant financial resources and worked to make alternative guardianship arrangements for those people. She explained that her department actively engaged in partnerships to find cases for which the County did not need to be responsible.

Ms. Bowles showed the *Mandatory Reports* slide and said that her department aimed to submit 90 percent of their mandatory reports on time. She indicated that they got close to that target in FY 2024 by submitting 85.2 percent of their annual reports on time. She suspected that a slight dip would be seen in that number for FY 2025 because of new staff and resultant changes to the distribution of caseloads. She said the on-time percentage would increase in the coming years as they worked towards their goal. Ms. Bowles showed her *Impact of Guardianship* slide, which depicted the breadth of agencies and people they interacted with in guardianship. She communicated the importance of collaborating with the community partners.

Ms. Bowles showed her *Accomplishments: Collaborations* slide and highlighted extensive collaboration as an accomplishment for the Public Guardian's Office. She said they spent a lot of time collaborating with community partners, other County organizations, State partners, and private partners. She added that they eagerly anticipated collaborating with the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA) beginning in the summer of 2025, which would include training to provide more assistance to isolated seniors in the community. She conveyed that assistance did not have to end in guardianship, and she wanted community partners to more fully understand what could be done before establishing County guardianship. She showed the *Accomplishments: Intern Program with University of Nevada School of Social Work* slide and highlighted the intern program her department established with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) School of Social Work. She shared that two Guardian Case Manager IIIs, Ashley Knorr and Natasha Cain, spearheaded the intern program in 2025. She noted that they did an amazing job onboarding the interns and were in attendance at the meeting that day. She said the interns received training on what the Public Guardian's Office did for work, including the most joyful and the most challenging parts. She applauded Ms. Knorr and Ms. Cain for their work in shepherding the interns to graduation. She showed her *Accomplishments: Internal Training Academy* slide and highlighted the internal training

academy of the Public Guardian's Office. She shared that her Supervising Guardian Case Managers, Sue Weyl and Allyson Bitz, who were both present in Chambers, created and led the internal training academy. She explained that Ms. Weyl and Ms. Bitz learned how to tailor their teaching styles to meet the needs of internal training academy participants, which helped the participants gain confidence before starting their field work with protected people. She thought her department was doing a great job with that program, and she shared that they were excited to present it at the NGA Conference in Oklahoma City later in 2025. She looked forward to showing other Public Guardians what the County was doing.

Ms. Bowles displayed her *Challenges for our Staff* slide and disclosed that, as Commissioners knew, the senior population of the County was predicted to increase significantly along with the number of individuals experiencing dementia. She predicted that her staff would need to do more work with the same resources. She reviewed the actions listed on her slide that would be taken to support staff and added that the Public Guardian's Office would look for opportunities to restore rights for individuals under their guardianship, where possible. She expected that simplifying departmental policies and procedures would reduce the time staff spent looking for those and would improve their understanding of the scope of work they were responsible for with their cases. She said the Public Guardian's Office had a very diverse team with different strengths that she wanted to capitalize on in the year ahead. She showed her *Challenges for our Community* slide and advised that she did not have any requests for the BCC at that time, though she mentioned that increasing the amount of supportive housing available in the community for adults ages 40 to 60 would help. She emphasized the importance of strengthening protections against elder abuse in the community. She disclosed that most of the people who came to the Public Guardians Office had been exploited in some way or another, and the Public Guardian's Office tried to untangle those challenges for them.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Bowles for her presentation and her team for their work. She acknowledged that the work was hard, and the individuals under their guardianship were often in difficult situations and had many personal issues. She knew that the commitment and dedication the Public Guardian's Office exhibited to serve the community was incredible. Chair Hill said she was in awe of Ms. Bowles and her team and thanked them for showcasing Washoe County as a national model at the NGA conference. She expressed her pride in that.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Ms. Bowles for attending the meeting and explaining the work her office did. She said it was very important.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Ms. Bowles and her team for spending time at the meeting. She summarized that they advocated for dignity every day, and she could not think of more compassionate work than fighting for vulnerable children and adults in the community. She applauded Ms. Bowles and her team for their service and dedication. Commissioner Garcia commented that Ms. Bowles had already partially answered a question she had about efforts to prevent future neglect and abuse of vulnerable adults in the community. She understood that many referrals to the Public Guardian came through

reports of neglect and abuse. She asked what other referral opportunities there were and was curious about other circumstances under which people came into contact with the Public Guardian's Office.

Ms. Bowles responded that the largest referral source was area hospitals. She reported that individuals sometimes arrived in a hospital, usually from a medical event, but could not be discharged because they lacked capacity. She disclosed that many of those individuals did not have homes, and the hospital would petition the Public Guardian to step in. She added that, recently, their second-largest referral source was nursing homes. She said that was unique, and she thought individuals were being discharged from hospitals to nursing homes through funding sources, but when that funding ran out, they could not access the necessary additional funds. She informed that they also got many referrals from Adult Protective Services. She said the court sometimes determined, for one reason or another, that other people could not serve as a guardian for an individual. She advised that there were circumstances in which a family member who acted as a guardian for a time could no longer be in that role. The protected person was referred to the Public Guardian in those cases.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Bowles and her team for their work. She discerned that they regularly encountered heavy, emotional things happening to others, and she hoped everyone would take care of themselves as well. She thought that was important. She thanked Ms. Bowles for the information and remarked that eight years was a long time to have a guardian relationship with a person. She asked if the Public Guardian's Office had a lot of turnover.

Ms. Bowles responded that the Public Guardian's Office did not historically have a high turnover. She attributed that to recruiting individuals who loved doing that work and stayed with the department for a long time. She said the turnover they had was indicated on her PowerPoint. She noted that there were three Guardian Case Manager Is, but in the last year, several people who had been with the department for a long time planned to retire. She said she was aware of those retirements in advance and undertook extensive succession planning to be able to backfill those positions and promote from within. She revealed that they were excited to make the decision because of the internal training academy that was planned. She looked forward to hiring and working with new staff who had not previously done guardianship work. She advised that they did not have any turnover in the past year, and she hoped they would not because she really liked all of her team. She supposed that when people found the niche they worked in and enjoyed the work, they wanted to stay. She shared that one of their new staff members started a morale committee. She reported that the committee held their first event the prior Friday, and she looked forward to more from them in the coming year to keep spirits high in the department. She agreed with Commissioner Andriola's observation about the importance of balance for staff members between taking care of themselves and taking care of others. She described that a difficult and often unrecognized part of the work was that guardianship did not end for most people until death. She said that her staff dealt with the loss of one of their protected people almost every week, and it was important to balance out the heaviness of that by encouraging lightness in other ways.

Commissioner Andriola was sure that there were other challenges in the work, especially with the prevalence of elderly abuse, which the Board was aware of. She determined that the Public Guardian's Office staff were an exemplary team. She emphasized the importance of their leadership and admired the innovation they demonstrated by finding ways to leverage internal resources and not always depend on external resources. She hoped that others would be inspired, and the Public Guardian's Office's culture could be emulated. She appreciated that there was space to be innovative. She commended the creation of the morale committee and noted that the department would be recognized nationally at the upcoming NGA conference and would have an opportunity to share its best practices with others. She listed other examples of innovation, including the creation of a relationship with REMSA, the internship program, and the associated recruitment opportunities that the program created with UNR. She concluded that the Public Guardian's Office was a place where people wanted to work, which she found inspiring because of the difficulty of their work. She applauded them for accomplishing more with fewer resources and congratulated them for their innovative leadership and vision in leveraging partnerships. She thanked them for everything that they did and for the assistance they gave to so many vulnerable people. She theorized that many people probably did not fully understand their work and its benefit to others. She observed that the relationship with a Public Guardian's Office staff member was likely the last relationship many protected people had.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Bowles for her report and her staff for their work. He said it was special work and a calling that people who entered their field had. He especially liked their internal training academy and encouraged cross-training all staff so everybody understood what everyone was doing. He summarized that the Public Guardian's Office was doing a good job, and he thanked them for the work they did.

Chair Hill said the Board looked forward to continuing to support Ms. Bowles. She said they wanted to get more permanent supportive housing in the County. She thought 150 units would potentially become available soon, but she noted that, based on a recent study, another 1,150 units were needed in the community. She suggested it would be great to establish a task force to find ways to improve the situation. She thought that it was manageable, and the County could lead the effort. She welcomed any suggestions Ms. Bowles had for the Board regarding permanent supportive housing.

DONATIONS

25-0362 **6A1** Recommendation to accept donations [\$300,000.00] from the Wilbur May Foundation retroactive to date of receipt: \$200,000.00 restricted for Fiscal Year (FY) 26 general operating support of the Wilbur D. May Center, excluding all County overhead; and \$100,000.00 restricted to support FY26 temporary exhibits at the Wilbur D. May Museum. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

25-0363 **6B1** Recommendation to accept a pass-through cash donation of [\$5,000.00] from the Rocky Mountain Information Network to the Washoe

County Sheriff's Office for the Western States Sheriff's Association venue and audio/visual equipment costs in support of the 2025 Conference held March 9, 2025 - March 13, 2025 at the Peppermill Casino; and direct Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6A1 and 6B1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7H1

- 25-0364** **7A1** Recommendation to Approve a State of Nevada Manufacturer's Craft Distillery License application, with recommendations contained in the staff report, for Jeremy Baumann, dba Verdi Local Distillery; and if approved, authorize each Commissioner to sign the State of Nevada Application for Manufacturer's License with direction for the County Clerk to attest the license application. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)
- 25-0365** **7A2** Recommendation to approve an Easement Deed - Access and Utility Easement and Temporary Construction Easement between Washoe County (grantor) and Sierra Pacific Power Company doing business as NV Energy (grantee), on a portion of Sierra Sage Golf Course, Assessor Parcel Number 554-010-01, granting a temporary construction easement for gas mains totaling ±7.64 acres and a permanent easement for a gas regulator station totaling ±24,636 square feet [at the appraised value of \$10,887.00 in addition to improvements to the property's access road valued at \$14,342.00]. If approved these easements will support NV Energy's gas distribution utility services to the Stead and North Valleys areas of Washoe County. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)
- 25-0366** **7A3** Recommendation to adopt Resolution R25-44, to initiate proceedings pertaining to formation of a Park District pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 318A.070; and if adopted, approve an Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County and the City of Reno to reimburse the City of Reno for costs associated with development of a Service Plan to investigate the feasibility of a regional Park District required by NRS 318A.090 [in the amount of \$100,000.00]. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0367** **7B1** Recommendation to accept a renewed Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant to the District Attorney's Office in the amount of [\$220,387; \$55,097 required in-kind match], from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS) to provide funding to retain a full-time Victim Witness Advocate and two

temporary Victim Witness Advocates (via Marathon Staffing) retroactive from July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and retroactively authorize the District Attorney or his designees to sign the grant agreement. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0368** **7C1** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to retroactively acknowledge a grant of \$35,000 [\$15,000 County match required], awarded to the Second Judicial District Court from the Supreme Court of Nevada, Administrative Office of the Courts to enhance the administration of drug and alcohol testing services for the grant period April 30, 2025 to December 31, 2026; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0369** **7D1** Recommendation to approve the amendment to Washoe County's fund balance policy to include specific net position targets for the Health Benefits Internal Services Fund and to establish minimum levels for working capital within the Health Benefits Fund, aligning with the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) best practices. The policy will set a target range of 15% to 25% of annual operating expenses and other uses, excluding capital outlay, to ensure financial sustainability and mitigate risks associated with unforeseen revenue fluctuations or unanticipated expenditures. Additionally, the policy will include provisions for replenishing net position balances to the target levels within a timeframe not exceeding two years and holding insurance rates steady when the net position exceeds the maximum of 25%, taking into account the current insurance market environment. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0370** **7D2** Recommendation to approve the use of General Fund Contingency in the total amount of [\$175,000] for fiscal year 2025 in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 to increase expenditure authority in Alternate Public Defender's Office for Expert Witness Fees, Interpreters, and Travel [\$175,000] to support reasonable and necessary costs to meet minimum Due Process rights in the Avram Nika Trial; and direct Finance to make the appropriate cross-functional budget appropriation transfers. [Total fiscal year 2025 impact \$175,000; net fiscal impact \$-0-]. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0371** **7D3** Recommendation to certify charges, levy and direct the Treasurer to collect \$126,613.91 in special assessments for fiscal year 2025/2026 as requested by the State Engineer of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, for Black Rock Desert Groundwater Basin (\$68.91), Honey Lake Valley Groundwater Basin (\$3,424.44), Hualapai Flat Water District (\$6,528.73), San Emidio Desert District (\$2,914.65), Warm Springs Valley Groundwater Basin (\$9,349.11), Washoe Valley Groundwater Basin (\$4,328.07), Warm Springs/Winnemucca Creek Basin (\$4,000.00), Cold

Springs Valley Groundwater Basin (\$5,000.00), Lake Tahoe Groundwater Basin (\$10,000.00), Lemmon Valley Water District (\$10,000.00), Pleasant Valley Groundwater Basin (\$6,000.00), Spanish Springs Valley Groundwater Basin (\$5,000.00), Tracy Segment Groundwater Basin (\$2,000.00), Truckee Canyon Segment Groundwater Basin (\$8,000.00) and Truckee Meadows/Sun Valley Groundwater Basin (\$50,000.00). Authorize the Treasurer to remove uncollectible assessments and/or correct assessments on the tax roll as requested by the Division of Water Resources; direct the Clerk to execute the State of Nevada Division of Water Resources certification letters and send them back to the Division pursuant to NRS 533.285; and direct the Comptroller to pay to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources the requested funds. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0372 **7E1** Recommendation to approve an Interlocal Agreement with Clark County for the purpose of providing Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Administration Services in the amount of [\$130,062] annually; retroactive for the period of April 1, 2025 through June 30, 2025 with the option to renew for six, one-year periods; and if approved authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0373 **7E2** Recommendation to accept an FFY25 Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP) subaward from the State of Nevada, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) in the amount of [\$90,881.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2025 to supplement food costs for the Older Americans Act Title III congregate and home-delivered meal programs which address the food and nutrition needs of seniors, retroactively authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the subgrant amendment and related documents, and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0374 **7E3** Recommendation to approve Amendment #1 to the Opioid Settlement Funds subaward through the Director's Office of the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services to increase the award amount to [\$160,872.00; no county match] retroactive to March 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025 to provide coordinated services to individuals with Severe Mental Illness (SMI), Substance Abuse Disorders (SUD), and/or Co-Occurring Disorders (COD) through an Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) program; retroactively authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant amendment agreement; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0375** **7F1** Recommendation to reappoint Clinton D. Hohenstein to the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council (NLJRCC) for a two-year term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027, pursuant to Assembly Bill 236 (2019), now codified at NRS 176.014. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0376** **7F2** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$20,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2024-2025; District 3 Commissioner Mariluz Garcia recommends a [\$20,000.00] grant to the Washoe County Community Services Department (CSD) - a government entity - to support the parks district service plan study; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary cross functional budget appropriation transfer. Manager. (Commission District 3.)
- 25-0377** **7G1** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2025 United States Marshals Service (USMS) grant award [amount not to exceed \$4,681.80, no County match required] as administered from the USMS, Obligation Document Control #M-25-D48-O-000063, for overtime costs to support the Washoe County Sheriff's Office in participating USMS operations for the retroactive grant period of February 24, 2025 through March 14, 2025; authorize the Captain to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0378** **7G2** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2025 United States Marshals Service (USMS) grant award [amount not to exceed \$21,741.00, no County match required] as administered from the USMS, Obligation Document Control #M-25-D48-O-000066, for overtime costs for the Joint Law Enforcement Operations (JLEO) Task Force for the retroactive grant period of February 4, 2025 through September 30, 2025; authorize the Captain to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0379** **7G3** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Forensic Support Services Agreements between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and various Local Law Enforcement Agencies: Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority \$1,500; Carlin Police Department \$10,055; White Pine County Sheriff's Office \$28,279; Yerington Police Department \$6,284 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 with a total income of [\$46,118.00]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0380** **7G4** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2024 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program grant award [amount not to exceed \$84,656.80, no County match required] as administered from the Office of Justice Programs and

Bureau of Justice Assistance through the City of Reno, Reno Police Department, Federal FY 2024 project number 15PBJA-24-GG-05299-JAGX, for the purchase of law enforcement equipment and supplies, law enforcement-related training, and travel for the retroactive grant period of October 1, 2023 through September 30, 2027; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0381 **7H1** Recommendation to approve and execute Resolution R25-40 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:076-310-81, 076-372-03, 076-381-02, 076-381-12, 076-900-04, WCAD 39 - Lightning W Water System Supply Imp, parcel: 055-382-15 (additional description of affected parcel contained in Exhibit "A" of attached Resolution.) Treasurer. (Commission District 2, 4 and 5.)

Commissioner Clark asked where the Agenda Item 7C1 retroactive funds came from and what they would be used for. Specialty Courts Manager Brooke Howard reported that the funds would be utilized by the Specialty Courts for drug and alcohol testing. Commissioner Clark wished to know if the funding would be used by Sober 24. Ms. Howard noted that the Second Judicial Court (SJC) was contracted with Sober 24. She explained that the SJC was under a request for proposal (RFP) and would return to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) around August for an update. Commissioner Clark asked if the SJC would hold the funding until the results of the RFP were announced. Ms. Howard indicated that the funding could be used within the next few weeks, depending on whether the item was approved, and hoped to use the funding from Agenda Item 7C1 as soon as possible.

Commissioner Clark referred to Agenda Item 7D2 and recalled that he had requested the Alternate Public Defender's (APDs) Office's expense records. He wanted a detailed report regarding what the proposed funding would be used for. Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Abbe Yacoben explained that the money spent in Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 could be provided as an itemized statement; however, the projected amount spent in June and beyond would be delayed. She reported that the details could be compiled once the case was complete, individuals had traveled, and witnesses had been paid. Commissioner Clark asked when those aspects would be completed. Ms. Yacoben believed the completion would take roughly 60 days.

Chair Hill pointed out that detailed information was in the Staff Report. Commissioner Clark asked if the unspent money was outlined in the Staff Report. Chair Hill reiterated that the information was in the Staff Report. Commissioner Clark indicated that there was no accounting if the money had not been spent and requested details of when that information was available.

Commissioner Clark asked if Agenda Item 7E1 was a continuation of an existing Clark County program or if it was supplemental. Human Services Agency (HSA) Division Director Pamela Mann explained that Clark County managed the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). She reported that Clark County received the best discount because it had the largest number of licenses; therefore, Washoe County purchased the licenses from Clark County to benefit from the buying power.

On the call for public comment, Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation (TMPF) and Truckee Meadows Trails Initiative (TMTI) Trails Manager Jay Howard said that the program sought to bring local, federal partners, and the trails community together. He noted that the TMTI had a working group that collaborated towards the mission of improving trail networks and creating connectivity in the area. He said he supported the parks district and reported that the Regional Trail Plan was created two years ago and completed late last year and would be heard soon by local governments for adoption. He mentioned that the TMTI supported the concept of creating a parks district in the Truckee Meadows region and encouraged governing bodies within the area to initiate a service plan to determine the scope boundaries and financial feasibility of the action. He explained that the TMTI expected the consideration of trails, pathways, and access for maintenance of existing resources in the planning and development of new projects and the potential creation of a parks district. He indicated that the TMTI would participate in the promotion and operation of the parks district as deemed beneficial and necessary by the TMTI working group. He thanked the BCC for passing Agenda Item 7A3 and believed that the parks district would be better understood after the research of a service plan.

City of Reno Parks and Recreation Director Nathan Ulyot thanked the BCC for the approval of Agenda Item 7A3. He indicated that the approval of Agenda Item 7A3 was important and another step towards progress. He explained that there were many steps and collaboration efforts involved in creating a parks' district. He invited those interested in the parks district to attend the joint City of Reno Recreation and Parks Commission meeting on June 26, where a consulting group would have a discussion regarding the parks district phasing process. He said that advocates were needed for continued progress.

One Truckee River (OTR) Director Iris Jehle-Peppard explained that her comments were her own and pertained to sustaining a healthy, thriving, and sustainable river. She supported Agenda Item 7A3 and the formation of a parks district. She mentioned that she was the OTR Director for seven years and had witnessed praise but very little priority for the Truckee River. She recalled that the City of Reno and OTR completed the Truckee River Vision Plan and approved the OTR Management Plan in 2016. She wondered if the plans would remain unused or if they would be a blueprint for the river to evolve into a thriving recreational, ecological, educational, economic, and social wellbeing asset for everyone in the region. She reported that the level of funding allocated to parks, recreation, and open space across all jurisdictions determined the success of the plans. She said that there was currently a lack of funding for parks, recreation, and open space compared to other departments. She understood that there was a budget deficit, but worried about the maintenance of trails, parks, pools, open space, and the Truckee River. She believed that the outdoors brought tranquility to many people and opined that the service

plan was the first step required for the park district to provide dedicated funding to parks, trails, open space, and the Truckee River. She said the service plan provided the data needed for the parks district and assisted agencies on how to collaborate. She speculated that supporting the service plan was essential to praising and prioritizing open space. She thanked the BCC for supporting the formation of a parks district and the service plan.

Truckee River Flood Management Authority (TRFMA) Natural Resource Manager Danielle Henderson said that her comments were her own and that the TRFMA was a joint effort among the Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County to reduce the devastating impacts of flooding along the Truckee River. She indicated that TRFMA built infrastructure and managed the floodplain to reduce flood damage, safeguard public health, and create a more resilient community. She explained that the TRFMA preserved open space, restored the ecosystem, and enhanced recreational opportunities along the Truckee River. She believed that the service plan would inform elected officials and stakeholders about collaboration to care for the public parks and open space that she felt were vital to the community. She thanked the BCC for approving Agenda Item 7A3 and looked forward to progress.

Nevada Land Trust (NLT) Executive Director Alicia Reban mentioned that NLT was a 28-year County partner. She noted that former Commissioner Grant Sims, Community Development Director John Hester, Division Director Bill Whitney, Regional Parks and Open Spaces Director Karen Mullen-Ehly, and County Manager John MacIntyre were essential to the founding of the NLT. She explained that the NLT worked with the County on many projects, such as regional park expansions, trailhead acquisitions, and emergency wildfire restorations. She commented that the NLT engaged in grassroots efforts to enable legislation in 2017 to create a new parks district. She appreciated the County's leadership and support of the service plan concept, which she speculated would provide data to help fully assess the potential benefits and challenges of developing the parks district. She indicated that the County could not continue performing business as usual while hoping parks, trails, and open space would be fine in the future. She felt that parks, trails, and open space were an essential part of community greatness and that it was time for residents to be braver, bolder, and dream bigger. She said that moving forward with the service plan was the next step in creating a great community. She reported that it had been 25 years since the voters approved \$40 million for parks, trails, open space, and libraries. She communicated that the support and conservation for parks was strong in the community, even with the outcome of the previous election. She thanked the BCC for their leadership, being brave and bold, and dreaming big.

Mr. Cliff Low wished County Manager Eric Brown well in his future endeavors and apologized for not personally getting to know Manager Brown during his tenure. He looked forward to working with Manager Brown's successor. He noted that he did not understand why there were three retroactive items on the agenda. He pointed out that he was in the relatively small percentage of individuals who had a good idea how the County worked; however, the retroactive items pertained to over hundreds of thousands of dollars. He explained that some of the agenda items were retroactive to June 30, 2024, when there were only a couple of weeks left in the FY. He asked why there were so many

retroactive items and why the money was spent without the required approval of the BCC because he thought that money being spent without the BCC's approval was wrong. He suggested the BCC should instruct the Office of the County Manager (OCM) that the staff report for any retroactive item needed a detailed explanation for the reason it was not brought to the BCC in advance. He felt that a dollar limit should be set on retroactive items and thought the public was owed an explanation as to why the BCC voted on an item if the FY was almost over. He thought the BCC would feel better voting on an item with more information.

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

Chair Hill requested that the BCC study the staff reports and reach out with questions prior to the meeting.

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

BLOCK VOTE – 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, AND 19

25-0382 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the annual report of the Assessor's Technology Fund (IN20280), a fund created by NRS 250.085 and Washoe County Ordinance 1300 for the acquisition and improvement of technology in the Assessor's Office, which has projected expenditures in Fiscal Year 2026 of \$4,638,300. Assessor. (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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8 be acknowledged.

25-0383 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to: 1) award Bid ITB #3274-25 for Water and Wastewater Treatment Chemicals; 2) approve the associated Agreements for Service with Olin Chlor Alkali Products, [in the estimated annual amount of \$818,100.00] for the supply and delivery of bulk liquid sodium hypochlorite to the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility and Thatcher Company of Nevada, Inc., [in the estimated annual amount of \$30,000.00] for the supply and delivery of liquid sodium hypochlorite to the Lemmon Valley Water Reclamation Facility and the Cold Springs Water Reclamation Facility; and 3) authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Service Agreements. The period of

award is July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026, with the provision for two, one-year extensions at the County's option. All costs are funded through the collection of rates from the users of Washoe County's sanitary sewer services program. Community 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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be awarded, approved, and authorized.

25-0384 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve the fiscal year 2026 [payment of \$325,496] which constitutes Washoe County's share in annual funding for the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) pursuant to NRS 278.0264(7) and an adopted interlocal agreement. The total amount will be paid to TMRPA in quarterly installments with the first occurring on July 1, 2025. Community 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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be approved.

25-0386 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to approve a Sole Source Waiver and execute a contract with Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada to provide food services at the Nevada Cares Campus for an initial term of twelve (12) months commencing July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 in an amount not to exceed [\$400,000], with the provision for up to four (4), one (1) year renewals; and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Agreement. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Clark asked if there would be a food tasting for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) from the Cares Campus, Senior Center, Washoe County Jail, and Douglas County. Chair Hill indicated that Commissioner Clark could have his own food tasting off-site.

Commissioner Clark noted that there was a representative from the Human Services Agency (HSA) who was willing to provide answers and asked why Chair Hill did not allow that representative to speak. Chair Hill believed that his question was not appropriate for the presented contract.

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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be approved, executed, and authorized.

25-0387 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to approve the Cooperative Agreements between Washoe County Sheriff's Office and Lovelock Paiute Tribe, Reno Sparks Indian Colony, Walker River Paiute Tribe, and Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe for reimbursement to Washoe County for custody services of tribal inmates at the rate of \$109 per day per inmate and \$88.62 per hour for guard/transportation services for an estimated annual revenue to Washoe County in the amount of \$309,124. Sheriff. (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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved.

25-0388 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Forensic Support Services Agreement between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and City of Sparks on behalf of the Sparks Police Department in the total amount of [\$1,000,000] (includes \$50,000 Toxicology Services Fee) for the retroactive term of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 for the provision of Forensic Laboratory Analysis Services. Sheriff. (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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be approved.

25-0389 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation to approve a new FY25 Capital Improvement Project - Sheriff's Office - Real Time Operations Center (RTOC) contingent and effective upon approval by the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) committee; accept the Sole Sourced Service Agreement for the Real Time Operations Center Remodel Project at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office [staff recommends Constant Technologies, Inc. in the amount of \$629,896.74] to remodel and launch a live intelligence exchange to collaborate amongst law enforcement networks nationwide for the retroactive period of May 7, 2025 - September 30, 2025; approve cross-fund budget appropriation transfer in the total amount of [\$658,708.74] for the RTOC project, from the Sheriff's Office, General Fund (100) to the Capital Improvement Fund (402) and, if approved, direct Finance to make the necessary net zero cross-fund budget appropriation transfers (net-zero

impact, no additional funding is requested); authorize the County Purchasing and Contracts Manager to retroactively execute the agreement. Sheriff. (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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be approved, accepted, directed, and authorized.

25-0390 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to approve the Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and City of Reno on behalf of the Reno Police Department in the total amount of [\$1,500,000] for the retroactive term of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 for the provision of Forensic Laboratory Analysis Services. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Mr. Cliff Low relayed comments from Mr. Tom Daly due to Mr. Daly being unable to attend the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting. He noted that he agreed with Mr. Daly's comments pertaining to the proposal of an agreement for forensic services between the City of Reno and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO). He mentioned that Mr. Daly said the agreement would expire in two weeks at the end of the Fiscal Year (FY), if approved. He asked if another agreement for FY 2026 would be on the next meeting's agenda and recalled that the former Commissioners terminated the agreement when the County auditor determined that the previous agreement cost taxpayers more than \$560,000 per year, to the City of Reno's benefit, for more than a decade. He indicated that subsequent agreements for FY 2021 through 2025 were approved for more than \$5 million without a County audit. He wondered why the recent agreement would not be subjected to the same abuse by the City of Reno. He believed that the approval should include a mandatory audit of the agreements from FY 2021 through 2025, and all future agreements to ensure taxpayers were not being abused by the City of Reno. He clarified that the word *abuse* was Mr. Daly's choice of words, whereas he would phrase the agreement as a subsidy. Mr. Low asked if the BCC would amend Agenda Item 15 to include an audit of the agreement. He commented that it had cost the County substantially more money than the City of Reno was paying to provide forensic services.

Commissioner Clark agreed with Mr. Low and said that not everyone had access to the Staff Report. He indicated that he asked questions because constituents requested clarified answers. He speculated that he was being told to tell constituents to look at the staff report, do their homework, and not ask questions. He resented being scolded when requesting clarification on the record. He mentioned that an individual may want to research the records in the future to receive answers.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be approved.

25-0391 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to award, on behalf of the Washoe County Regional Basemap Committee member agencies (Washoe County, City of Reno, City of Sparks and NV Energy), Washoe County Bid No. 3263-24 for orthoimagery and elevation contour products over a three-flight acquisition schedule in the years 2025, 2027, and 2029 to The Sanborn Map Company, Inc., 1935 Jamboree Dr., Suite 100, Colorado Springs, CO 80920; and to approve and execute an agreement for such services in the amount not to exceed [\$306,835.32]. 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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be awarded, approved, and executed.

25-0392 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Recommendation to approve the reimbursement of costs incurred by the City of Sparks, the City of Reno, 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 May 15, 2025, in an amount not to exceed [\$1,559,510.71] 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 4-1 vote with Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 19 be approved.

25-0385 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to approve a Contractor Agreement between Washoe County, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, and Royal Ambulance, Inc. a California corporation authorized to do business in the State of Nevada to provide emergency medical services for a two and a half year term to the Gerlach area of Washoe County effective July 1, 2025 and ending December 31, 2027 with an option for a two year extension. [annual cost \$603,000.00]. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

This item was pulled. Please see Agenda Item 4, Minute Item Number 25-0359 for discussion on this item.

25-0393

AGENDA ITEM 11 Recommendation to approve the appointment of one candidate to fill a partial term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on November 4, 2027, for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. Applicants for the vacancy include: Paola Agramon, Breanne Antos, Will Arndt, Christopher Baker, Michael Bosma, Yuli Chavez Camerena, Matthew DeMartini, Brian Erbis, Sophia Heidrich, Jill Hinxman, Jean Johnson, Matthew Kaempfe, Kody Kendrick, Matt Polley and Rita Vinci. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson announced that there were 15 applicants for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC) partial term. She reported that anyone not selected could be considered for the next WCOSRPC available term in July.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Christopher Baker noted that he had been a Washoe County resident for over 30 years, resided in District 4, and owned a business in District 1. He mentioned that he was a local private sector land use and city planner for over 25 years. He indicated that he was an avid outdoorsman and user of parks and open spaces. He wanted to ensure that parks and open spaces continued to be available to current and future generations. He stated his goal was to actively engage with private sector stakeholders and encourage public private partnerships (PPP) to help protect, promote, maintain, and expand recreational resources, if appointed to the WCOSRPC. He believed that it would be an honor to be a part of the WCOSRPC and felt that he had the perfect combination of personal and private experience.

Ms. Sophia Heidrich indicated that she grew up in Reno and enjoyed the many open spaces, trails, and parks in the area. She recalled that she had wanted to see other areas and spent much of her twenties traveling and living in other states. She explained that living in different areas made her realize how special Washoe County and Nevada were. She noted that while Lake Tahoe was remarkable and Nevada had the highest percentage of public lands in the Nation, the incredible parks, trails, and open spaces in the area were also great. She mentioned that people and businesses relocated to the area due to the open spaces and access to opportunities. She said that she had a son, another child on the way, and was grateful for access to the area's recreational facilities. She thought that parks, trails, and open spaces were more critical than ever for the community's physical and mental health, demonstrated by the increase in outdoor usage during COVID-19 (C19). She described that people sought refuge in areas less impacted by climate change and referred to an analysis that indicated that Reno was the fastest-warming city in the Nation. She communicated that having green places and respite was critically important to the area. She commented that she started working for the County as a Park Planner in 2019 and learned a lot in her role. She was surprised that there was so much that was managed by the County, including 10,000 acres of open space, 39 neighborhood and community parks, 10 regional parks, and other special districts. She said that the community recognized the need to build new things but overlooked outdated infrastructure and open spaces. She expressed that she learned about the challenges faced when managing a diverse array of park and open space areas, the incredible partnerships, and the demand for recreation

during the three years she worked for the County. She wanted to give back to the community and reconnect with parks, trails, and open space. She understood the priorities, programs, and projects of open spaces and thought that as a conservation professional, she would have a lot to add to the WCOSRPC.

Chair Hill asked how many candidates needed to be selected for the first round of voting. Ms. Wilson explained that the Commissioner's top two candidates were needed.

Commissioner Andriola noted that there were two District 1 representatives, four District 2 representatives, one District 3 representative, zero in District 4, and one District 5 representative on the WCOSRPC. She hoped that District 4 candidate, Mr. Baker, impressed the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). She reported that all candidates were amazing and incredible but requested District 4 representation.

Clerk Jan Galassini read the votes into the record. Chair Hill summarized the top candidates were Mr. Baker and Ms. Heidrich. She said that the BCC would vote between the two candidates. Ms. Galassini read the results from the second round of ballots and identified Mr. Baker as the top candidate. Chair Hill said that the candidates were great and reiterated that there would be another opening for the WCOSRPC in July.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Mr. Christopher Baker be appointed to fill a term beginning on the date of appointment, June 10, 2025, and ending on November 4, 2027, for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission.

25-0394 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Discussion and direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by legislators, by Washoe County, or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues as may be deemed by the Chair or the Board to be of critical significance to Washoe County. Pending legislative bills can be located here: <<<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025/Bills/List>>>. Current bills the County is tracking that may be reported on or discussed are listed under Government Affairs at <<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>>. Due to time constraints inherent in the legislative process, a list of specific bills that staff will seek direction from the Commission on during this item will be posted on the web site under Government Affairs at <<https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/divisions/government-affairs/index.php>> by 6:00 p.m. the Friday before the meeting. Due to the rapid pace of the legislative session, additional bills upon which comment may be sought from the Board of County Commissioners will be posted as soon as known. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich announced that the 83rd Legislative Session adjourned June 3, 2025. She explained that 1,210 bills and resolutions were introduced, and 39 resolutions were passed and delivered to the Secretary of State (SOS). She indicated that the Legislature's electronic database was updating constantly; therefore, the data she would provide could change. She noted that 606 bills were passed by the Senate and House of Representatives and delivered to Governor Joe Lombardo for action. She said that 318 bills were signed by Governor Lombardo while 56 were vetoed thus far. She mentioned that the Nevada Constitution, Article 4, Section 35 allowed the governor to take action following the adjournment of the Legislature, 10 days from receipt of the bill, not including the day of receipt or Sundays. She reported that if the governor signed the bill, it became law unless vetoed and returned to the Legislature in the following session.

Ms. Matijevich explained that Assembly Bill (AB) 316 failed and would have required the BCC to appoint a student representative to the school board. AB 333, related to the Nevada State Fairgrounds, passed and was signed by Governor Lombardo. AB 367 concerning election recounts, Senate Bill (SB) 65 regarding records maintained by the Medical Examiner and Coroner, and SB 73 pertaining to voter registration signature records failed. SB 319, which required the County and the Cities of Reno and Sparks to enter into an interlocal agreement to create a study board regarding fire prevention service consolidation, passed and was signed by Governor Lombardo. She anticipated that agenda items related to SB 319 would appear at a future meeting.

Chair Hill asked Ms. Matijevich to highlight the funding victories from the session. Ms. Matijevich noted that there were many discussions regarding child welfare during the legislative session. She reported that the Extended Young Adults Support Services Program (EYASSP) allowed child welfare agencies to utilize Title IV-E funding to provide support to young adults. She mentioned that children who turned 18 and had not achieved permanence with a family would stop receiving financial or case management support. She indicated that the County prepared for SB 504 in prior sessions and would see \$3.2 million to provide subsidies, funds, and caseloads for young adults in need. She commented that \$410,000 was included in the governor's budget and was approved to provide additional transportation options for youth in foster care. She said that foster families sometimes had challenges providing transportation for various activities, which the funding would help with. She communicated that the Adoption Savings program allowed access to Title IV-E funding.

Ms. Matijevich said that AB 515 removed the reversion clause, and the money appropriated for the program would remain with the County until it was expended. She explained that AB 515 required the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), the governor's financial office, Clark County, and Washoe County to collaborate to ensure funding was incorporated into the biennial budget process. She noted that the child welfare agencies would have stability if funding were allocated to the program. She indicated that AB 515 appropriated just under \$2 million to the County in the upcoming biennial budget to support adoptive and foster families in the community.

Ms. Matijevich commented that SB 488 and AB 562 allocated money for Voter Registration and Election Management Solution (VREMS). She noted that AB 534 created a Voter Access Grant Program and said that regulations still needed to be adopted since there was the possibility for the County to receive some funding to support election operations. She mentioned that Governor Lombardo brought forward a comprehensive housing bill with appropriations that the County could have access to, including \$133 million to the Nevada Attainable Housing account and \$25 million for local governments to provide incentives such as waivers of sewage fees. She pointed out that AB 475 contained a \$5.25 million allocation to the City of Reno for eviction diversion and rental assistance. She explained that the bill stated the funds were available equally to all residents of the County, whether they lived in or out of an incorporated city. She communicated that AB 366 established \$21 million to the Supportive Housing Development Fund (SHDF) in the State General Fund and was a continuation of work started at the last legislative session. She said that AB 366 pertained to housing and homeless services.

Ms. Matijevich explained that SB 281 did not move forward but would have resulted in funding allocated to the County for the LifeSet program and a bill pertaining to the Jail-Based Mental Health Unit (JBMHU). She indicated that the State identified unexpended American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds during research on SB 281. She said that some funding was found by the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to appropriate the identified ARPA funds to the existing JBMHU. She reported that early discussions had occurred with the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) and the Health and Human Services (HHS) Director to research other funding options. She pointed out that the Legislature could not make General Fund appropriations when out of session but could make expenditure authorization for other funds. She relayed that she would continue to research extra funding for the JBMHU. She noted that she would attend the IFC meeting on June 18 to express the need for funding allocations to work programs.

Ms. Matijevich said that, if needed, she could return the following week with other priority bills that the Governor may not have taken action on. She explained that she would prepare a comprehensive written report for the BCC regarding the 606 passed bills. Chair Hill reported that Ms. Matijevich could return the following week for an update if further discussion were needed.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Ms. Matijevich for her report and thought she was efficient and valuable to the County.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Ms. Matijevich for her dedication and thought the wins for child welfare and housing were important. She appreciated Ms. Matijevich advocating for the JBMHU. She pointed out that Ms. Matijevich was the only government affairs liaison she had worked with, but she continued to be impressed with her professionalism, communication, and thoroughness. She did not believe Ms. Matijevich was needed at a future meeting because a report would suffice.

Chair Hill commended Commissioner Andriola for being in Governor Lombardo's task force for housing and ensuring the County was represented.

Commissioner Andriola echoed appreciation to Ms. Matijevich. She thought it would be beneficial for someone to shadow Ms. Matijevich during the legislative session to witness the work she performed. She noted she served on the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and indicated that NACO continued to bring up Ms. Matijevich's great representation of the County. She recalled that the federal government extended the age of foster child support to 21 and wondered if it was still maintained at 21. Ms. Matijevich reported that support was provided up to the age of 21, and when a person turned 22, they were no longer eligible for participation in the program. Commissioner Andriola was glad to see funding to support the youth in need. She agreed with Ms. Matijevich providing a report in lieu of presenting to the BCC the following week. She thanked Ms. Matijevich for representing and supporting the whole community.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Matijevich for her insightful report and said she was always willing to answer questions and clarify information when needed.

Chair Hill believed that Ms. Matijevich was not needed at the next BCC meeting, but wanted her to continue to follow up with updated information. She asked how many days the governor had left to veto or sign bills. Ms. Matijevich said that he would have until June 17 to take action, but the Legislature's database indicated that there were still undelivered bills. She explained that the deadline would be extended if the bills were delivered.

There was no public comment or action on this item.

25-0395 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Initiation of a proposed ordinance amending Washoe County Code ("WCC") Chapter 45 to set the matter for an introduction and first reading of the ordinance on June 17, 2025, and, if supported, set a public hearing for second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance on July 8, 2025. If passed, the proposed ordinance will: 1) repeal WCC 45.430 (Adult Day Health Services/Daybreak Program) in its entirety; 2) modify WCC 45.410 (Division Directors) to reflect gender-neutral language, correct job title and selection process; 3) modify WCC 45.435 (Homemaker Program) to include permissive language and address any limitation based on funding availability; 4) modify WCC 45.445 (Nutrition Program) to include permissive language and address any limitation based on funding availability; 5) modify WCC 45.450 (Representative Payee Program) to include permissive language, provide for management of funding, and address any limitation based on funding availability; and 6) modify WCC 45.455 (Human Services Program) to reflect caseworkers' correct job title. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 21 be initiated and directed a first reading be set.

25-0396 **AGENDA ITEM 22** Public Hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's partial approval of Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0008 (Sweet Clover Residential Trust Abandonment) for abandonment of Washoe County's interest in two 40-foot-wide government patent access easements along the northern and eastern property lines of 15870 Caswell Lane (APN 049-080-19), and to reduce two 40-foot-wide public utility easements in the same locations to 10 feet. The appellant and applicant are Loise and Nikolai Travis. The Board of County Commissioners (Board) shall consider the appeal based on the record on appeal and testimony and materials submitted at the Board's public hearing. The Board may affirm, modify or reverse the Planning Commission's decision. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

Chair Hill disclosed that she had previously spoken with the appellant to hear their side of the appeal and wanted to ensure that such information was on the record. She asked if any other Board of County Commissioners (BCC) members had disclosures to make, but it was determined that there were none. Chair Hill explained that proceedings would begin with a staff report before the appellant conducted their ten-minute presentation, followed by Board questions, public comments, and a vote.

Senior Planner Katherine Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0008 (Sweet Clover Residential Trust) Appeal June 10, 2025; Abandonment of two access and public utility easements; Vicinity Map; Access Easement Request; Utility Easement Request; Planning Commission Decision (two slides); Reasons for Appeal; Findings; Possible Motion (two slides); Thank you.

Ms. Oakley displayed the slide titled *Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0008 (Sweet Clover Residential Trust) Appeal June 10, 2025*. She explained that the presentation outlined the appeal of the Planning Commission's (PC) decision on an easement abandonment for the Sweet Clover Residential trust.

Ms. Oakley showed the slide titled *Abandonment of two access and public utility easements*. She referred to the map on the slide and explained that the property was located south of the Mount Rose Highway, next to Montreux, and off of Caswell Lane. She reported that the request was specifically for the full abandonment of two access easements and the partial abandonment of two public utility easements at 15870 Caswell Lane.

Ms. Oakley referred to the slide titled *Vicinity Map* and explained that the property was approximately 1.25 acres and was surrounded by parcels developed with

single-family homes or by parcels of undeveloped United States Forest Service (USFS) federal land. She noted that the USFS parcels in that area were created from government patents under the Small Tracts Act. She elaborated on her reason for mentioning the methodology employed to create the parcels, as she attributed that to why the parcels were initially developed with 33 or 40-foot easements along all of their boundaries. She explained that the USFS parcels on the map in the slide accounted for the subdivision of half of one of the original Small Tracts Act parcels.

Ms. Oakley introduced the slides titled *Access Easement Request* and *Utility Easement Request*. She reported that the specific request was to abandon the 40-foot-wide northern and eastern access easements as highlighted in the image on the *Access Easement Request* slide. She noted that the request would leave the 40-foot easement intact on the western boundary of the parcel where Caswell Lane was sited. She further reported that an additional request was to partially abandon the utility easement in those same locations while retaining a ten-foot-wide strip of public utility easement (PUE) along the property boundaries, as depicted in the image on the *Utility Easement Request* slide.

Ms. Oakley referred to the first slide with the title *Planning Commission Decision*. She recounted that the PC considered all previously mentioned requests, which were subsequently approved, except for the request for the full abandonment of the northern access easement. She explained that the PC instead granted a partial abandonment of the northern access easement, which retained 20 feet of that easement along the northern property line. She noted that the partial abandonment aligned with staff recommendations for action on the item.

Ms. Oakley displayed the second *Planning Commission Decision* slide. She stated that she would provide background on the reasoning for the PC's decision and the staff analysis made for the request. She explained that one of the main factors staff reviewed when an abandonment was requested was whether there would be any implications and potential detriment from the abandonment of the easements. She noted that the map on the slide depicted two yellow parcels located directly to the east of the subject property, highlighted in blue. She explained that the yellow parcels were accessed through land owned by the USFS, which was depicted in green. She noted that access to those parcels was represented on the map with a purple line. She explained that access through the USFS land was currently unpermitted and was neither an easement nor legally established. She reported that there was subsequently no developed legal access to either of those yellow parcels. She reiterated that one of the factors staff reviewed regarding abandonment requests was whether there would be a potentially negative impact on access. She noted that the easement requested to be abandoned accounted for one of the legal access easements that could potentially provide access to the two yellow properties through the use of Caswell Lane. She acknowledged that there were pathways through the USFS to request the legalization of the purple unpermitted access easement, but the easement status was unpermitted and not legal at that time. She explained that for that reason, the potential need for the northern access easement remained and accounted for why staff recommended that 20 feet of the easement be retained. She emphasized that the PC made that decision in order to make the finding of no detriment.

Ms. Oakley introduced the slide titled *Reasons for Appeal* by explaining that the appellants filed an appeal of the PC's decision, as they sought the full abandonment of the northern access easement. She reported that the appeal referenced complaints of potential harm caused if the northern access easement was eventually developed into a road, with reference to concerns of safety, flooding, and erosion due to the topography of the easement. She noted that the appeal additionally stated that there was additional information regarding the Forest Road and Trails Act (FRTA) easements from the USFS that had not been presented to the PC for their consideration. She explained that staff commented on that reasoning by noting that what staff and the PC considered was the existing easement and access at that time, which was that the access through USFS land was not legal. She stated that if those circumstances were to change in the future, the appellants could return to seek the full abandonment of the northern access easement again.

Ms. Oakley displayed the slide titled *Findings* and explained that it included a list of the three findings that had to be made to grant an easement abandonment. She noted that the no detriment finding was the finding that the PC could choose not to make to grant the full abandonment of the northern access easement.

Ms. Oakley showed the first slide titled *Possible Motion* and explained that the language on the slide was for a possible motion that the Board could potentially utilize. She noted that the first *Possible Motion* slide included a motion to uphold the PC's decision should the Board agree with the partial approval. She explained that the second *Possible Motion* slide contained a motion to be utilized if the Board disagreed with the PC's decision and chose to grant the appeal, reverse the PC's decision, and fully grant the abandonment of the northern access easement.

Ms. Oakley noted that the appellants were in attendance at the meeting to conduct a presentation. She stated that she would be happy to answer any questions from the Board. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Oakley and welcomed one of the appellants, Ms. Loise Travis, to make her presentation.

Ms. Travis conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk and distributed to the Board, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Sweet Clover Residential Trust Easement Abandonment Request WAB24-0008; Addressing Staff Concerns; Parcel & Neighborhood Concerns; Aerial Property Video; WAB24-0008 Sweet Clover Residential Trust Abandonment update; Email Correspondence Nevada Dirt Works; Temporary Easement and Land Clearing; Potential Construction Zone Image; Flooding/Erosion Harm and Drainage System; Retention Wall and Guardrail System and Maintenance; Road Maintenance & Liability; Staff Concerns Addressed With USFS Documentation; Special Use Permit Question; WAB24-0008 Comments; Sweet Clover Easement 2nd Question; September 2016 Staff Recommendation; Planning Commission September 6, 2016 Vote; Parcels Would Not Be Landlocked; In Conclusion; Thank You.

Ms. Travis informed the Board that the documents she distributed to the Board were a physical copy of her PowerPoint presentation. She explained that the

presentation included a lot of documentation in the form of e-mail correspondence with the USFS. She noted that she distributed the documents, so that the Board could take a moment to look through the documents outside of the time constraints she was under. Chair Hill thanked her.

Ms. Travis thanked the Board for taking the time to listen to her appeal and consider the new information that she had gathered to present to them so the Board could make an informed decision. She thanked the utility companies involved in the process for lending their expertise and time to evaluate the requests presented by County staff, which she noted ultimately led to the staff recommendation to approve the reduced utility easement and subsequent partial approval from the PC. She especially wanted to thank Ms. Oakley for her copious amounts of time and patience guiding the appellants through the convoluted process and providing her expertise.

Ms. Travis displayed the slide titled *Addressing Staff Concerns* (page 2) and stated that there were two concerns that staff had, which she would address that day. She described the first concern was that a full abandonment of the easement would remove legal access to two parcels. She recounted that PC Chair Rob Pierce stated that he was in favor of a full abandonment, even without consideration of the new USFS documentation that she would show later in her presentation. She explained that the USFS would issue both the special use permit (SUP) to the residents of the impacted parcels and a FRTA easement to the County. She noted that the second staff concern was that full abandonment of the easement would be inconsistent with previous abandonment requests filed by the northern neighbor residing on parcel 049-080-20. She noted that staff recommendations and PC rulings were in favor of the full abandonment of the northern parcel's road access easements, but there was an unfortunate misfiling by the applicant that made the issue look discrepant. She explained that she had documentation for that staff recommendation and the choices of the PC from a 2016 ruling on the matter.

Ms. Travis introduced the slide titled *Parcel & Neighborhood Concerns* (page 3). She explained that a professional surveyor and construction analysis indicated that the topography was impractical for development and usability, which would result in subsequent harm to the farm from flooding, erosion, and safety hazards. She explained that one of the two parcels determined to have impractical topography belonged to the appellants, which was parcel 049-080-19. She noted that the other parcel, parcel 049-080-20, belonged to their northern neighbor. She further explained that there were fiscal and liability considerations to evaluate.

Ms. Travis noted that before she would continue to the following slide to play a video for the Board, she wanted to inform the BCC that the appellants were obliquely notified that they were not zoned for certain construction equipment. She explained that though a complaint had never been filed, the appellants had worked with Ms. Oakley and another County employee to resolve the issue. She stated that documentation on the matter had been provided to staff. She opined that while the issue had no bearing on the case, she did not want that notification to obfuscate why the appellants had appeared to make a presentation that day.

Ms. Travis displayed the *Aerial Property Video* (page 4) slide. She indicated that she would be narrating what could be seen on the aerial video embedded in the slide. She noted that a construction line in the center of the video would become clearer as the video played, which denoted the edge of the easement. She requested that the Board note the proximity of the easement to the appellant's home on the right and the northern neighbor's home on the left, as well as the copious amounts of very mature vegetation that could be seen throughout the property shown on the video. She reported that the aerial video was recorded in the spring, which accounted for why the vegetation had not fully bloomed at the time. She assured the Board that the vegetation shown in the video was alive and beautiful. She noted that the video was panning from an aerial view of the west side of the property to the east, where the two parcels owned by those who had expressed an interest in developing the easement were located.

Ms. Travis referred to the slide titled *WAB24-0008 Sweet Clover Residential Trust Abandonment update* (page 5), which depicted e-mail correspondence between Professional Land Surveyor (PLS) Randy Meyer and Ms. Oakley. She reported that she had the pleasure of working with their surveyor, Mr. Meyer, who notified the County that the impacts on the existing house and yard were significant. He wrote about his observation of drainage issues and offered that the road would be 5 to 6 feet higher than the house, requiring a civil design to mitigate the drainage, walls, and other impacts.

Ms. Travis displayed the slide titled *Email Correspondence Nevada Dirt Works* (page 6). She explained that Mr. Meyer's findings led the appellants to obtain a construction analysis to understand what would be needed to construct the access road on the easement and the implications of ongoing road maintenance.

Ms. Travis introduced the slide titled *Temporary Easement and Land Clearing* (page 7) by describing the displayed image. She noted that the easement was denoted by the label on the top of the image, with the black line depicting the property line. She explained that the land to the right of the property line belonged to their northern neighbor, who owned parcel 049-080-20. She stated that the appellant's home was on the left of the black property line. She introduced the areas included within the potential construction zones and reported that the image demonstrated a very conservative estimate of the area, as she did not want to over-inflate the size of the impacted area. She emphasized that the construction easement could be upwards of 40 feet. She explained that the construction would require the removal of 52 trees and their root system on the appellant's property, which was the factor that yielded the harmful flooding and erosion hazards.

Ms. Travis displayed the slide titled *Potential Construction Zone Image* (page 8). She explained that the area on the right side of the line across the image would become the construction zone. She noted that on the left of that line was the easement, which included the appellant's chicken coop.

Ms. Travis introduced the slide titled *Flooding/Erosion Harm and Drainage System* (page 9). She explained that the flooding and erosion hazards were compounded by

the steep topography change within 15 feet of the house at a slope with a 22 percent grade towards the house. She explained that the yellow line in the image on the left of the slide depicted the 22 percent grade of the slope. She described the image on the right, noting that the line made by yellow tape in the image on the right demonstrated the proximity of the easement to the appellant's home.

Ms. Travis showed the slide titled *Retention Wall and Guardrail System and Maintenance* (page 10). She explained that an engineered retaining wall would need to be designed and constructed because of the elevation change and proximity to the residence. She reported that the appellants received large amounts of precipitation in the area, including snowstorms that yielded five feet of snow in a single storm. She read from the included excerpt of the earlier construction analysis email, which recommended that the wall be constructed 5 to 6 feet tall and include an engineered barrier system to prevent harm to the house and property due to the potential of an errant vehicle. She hypothesized what would happen should a car slide off a patch of ice on the access road and noted that construction requirements would lead to the trees in the image being removed. She explained that as a result, a car sliding from ice would subsequently go off the road, down the 22 percent grade slope, and straight into the appellant's kitchen. She added that the retaining wall would assist with snow removal to ensure that no runoff occurred, which was another factor that would be needed.

Ms. Travis displayed *Road Maintenance & Liability* (page 11) and stated that maintenance was also a consideration. She noted that the development would be exorbitant according to the construction analysis. She explained that the two parcels located to the east of the appellant's property, 049-080-25 and 049-080-26, would be responsible for the construction cost and ongoing maintenance while bearing significant responsibility in the event of human failures. She described an example where flooding might occur if snow removal was not done correctly. She noted that flooding could ensue if the snow cleared from the road was not properly relocated to the two eastern parcels, but instead left on the appellant's property, the parcel to the north of the appellant, or on Caswell Lane. She provided an additional example of responsibility for the eastern parcels should someone's vehicle skid on a patch of ice on the road, as the vehicle could land in the appellant's property, likely in their kitchen, or into the home of the appellant's northern neighbor. She stated that the parcels would incur additional fiscal responsibility for improvements and maintenance for the Caswell Lane Road Maintenance Association (RMA). She explained that future owners of parcels 049-080-25 and 049-080-26 could consider such maintenance and liability hazards unnecessary and harmful. She noted that there would also be drainage for that road that would need to be maintained by clearing debris.

Ms. Travis referred to the slide titled *Staff Concerns Addressed With USFS Documentation* (page 12) and explained that subsequent slides would address staff concerns with documentation from the USFS. She displayed the slide titled *Special Use Permit Question* (page 13). She acknowledged that there had been some concern that the appellants' easement access would constitute a form of legal access, which might result in the USFS not issuing any permits for the impacted eastern parcels. She recounted having

contacted the USFS directly to ask about the appellant's undeveloped easement. She reported that a USFS representative stated that even considering the appellant's undeveloped easement, given the circumstances on Rose Rock Lane, the USFS would issue a SUP to the residents of those eastern parcels and a FRTA easement to the County. She noted that the access to Rose Rock Lane had been established 30 years prior and was the only access to parcels 049-080-25 and 049-080-26 since their creation, which constituted common use.

Ms. Travis introduced the slide *WAB24-0008 Comments* (page 14) by stating that the USFS had been very helpful and supportive in attempting to resolve the easement issue. She noted that the USFS had communicated with the owners of parcels 049-080-25 and 049-080-26, provided forms to the potential applicants, and offered multiple points of contact within the USFS to the residents of those parcels and County staff to facilitate a permit to legalize easement access. She referred to the image of the e-mail on the right of the slide, and noted that in February of 2025, USFS District Ranger Matthew Zumstein wrote that email to offer another option regarding the issue. That option was for the County to submit an application for a FRTA easement, as the USFS had discretion to legalize access on Rose Rock Lane.

Ms. Travis displayed the slide titled *Sweet Clover Easement 2nd Question* (page 15). She recounted that Ms. Oakley had stated during the original hearing for the easement abandonment and at the BCC meeting that day that if the existing access were legalized through the USFS processes, the staff concern that led to the recommendation to retain the 20-foot northern road access easement would be resolved.

Ms. Travis showed the slide titled *September 2016 Staff Recommendation* (page 16). She noted that in September of 2016, staff recommended full approval of the abandonment of the eastern and southern road access easements for parcel 049-080-20 under the case number listed on the slide. She referred to the image on the slide, which was taken from the staff report for the original PC hearing. She displayed the *Planning Commission September 6, 2016 Vote* (page 17) slide and noted that subsequently, during the PC meeting held on September 6, 2016, the PC voted unanimously in favor of the staff recommendation for the full abandonment of the eastern and southern road access easement for parcel 049-080-20. She introduced the slide titled *Parcels Would Not Be Landlocked* (page 18). She explained that both currently and during the 2016 PC hearing, the County determined that parcels 049-080-25 and 049-080-26 would not be landlocked should the appellant's full easement abandonment request be approved.

Ms. Travis introduced the slide titled *In Conclusion* (page 19). She opined that the undeveloped easement access to Caswell Lane was unnecessary and harmful. She noted that she would revisit a previous slide as she had additional time for her presentation. She displayed the slide titled *Planning Commission September 6, 2016 Vote* (page 17) and explained that the reason there appeared to be a discrepancy after the applicant had gained all of the approvals from the PC per staff recommendation was due to the applicant misfiling the paperwork. She noted that there was a period of two years to fix the misfiling,

but the time had since lapsed as the decision was made in 2016. She reiterated that the misfiling was the result of the discrepancy despite the documentation listed on the slide.

Ms. Travis displayed the slide titled *In Conclusion* (page 19) and repeated that the undeveloped easement access to Caswell Lane was unnecessary and harmful to multiple parties. She emphasized that every parcel owner on Caswell Lane had publicly stated their support for the full abandonment of the road access easements. She noted that Rose Rock Lane had provided access to parcels 049-080-25 and 049-080-26 for over 30 years, which constituted common use and was why the USFS provided two avenues to permit access. She opined that a simple permit to legalize access to the eastern parcels was in the best interest of the appellant's parcels, the neighborhood, and parcels 049-080-25 and 049-080-26.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Travis and opened the conversation to the Board for discussion and questions on the item.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Oakley and asked if anything would prevent the owners of the two parcels who used the access road under USFS jurisdiction from submitting documentation to the USFS to consider such use as legal. Ms. Oakley affirmed that those property owners could submit a SUP to the USFS to seek legalization of the access road or the ability to utilize the access road legally. She reported that based on her knowledge, such action had not yet occurred at that time but was a possibility. Commissioner Andriola asked if only the owners of the two parcels could submit the request to the USFS. Ms. Oakley confirmed that, based on her understanding, only the property owners could submit that request. Commissioner Andriola asked if the County could make the request to the USFS.

Ms. Oakley explained that Washoe County could submit a request for the FRTA easement, but it would not be submitting a request on behalf of the property owners to be granted the easement. She clarified that the only request the County could submit would be to seek an easement for which the County would subsequently be responsible.

Commissioner Andriola asked whether the recommendation staff proposed was based on the criteria that no legal access was defined at that exact moment. She inquired whether the applicant could come back to the Board to request a full easement abandonment if legal access were to be granted by the USFS. Ms. Oakley affirmed that the applicant could return to make such a request. Commissioner Andriola reiterated for confirmation that the reason the appellant could return to the County to request a full easement abandonment again in the future, should the impacted parcel owners request and be granted access by the USFS to provide legal access, was because the two parcels would then be considered as having legal access, which was not the case at that time.

Ms. Oakley affirmed that if the circumstances changed in the future, the appellants could return to seek the full easement abandonment, which the County would determine in consideration of the circumstances of the situation at the time the appeal was made. She noted that the presence of established legal access to those two parcels would

be a very significant change to the circumstances. She clarified that staff would then go through a full, comprehensive review while working with partner agencies to consider those changes in circumstance. She emphasized that such a change in circumstance would be key to such reconsideration.

Commissioner Clark asked Ms. Oakley what the anticipated time frame was for obtaining legal access to those parcels, based on dealing with the federal government. He inquired whether it would be a week, a month, or a year, and expressed certainty that one could not get such an easement road within a short period. He noted that he had another question and asked Ms. Oakley whether the easements were recorded somewhere when the purchasers of both impacted parcels looked into buying the properties. He suspected that a title insurance policy or a real estate broker might have disclosed the easements during the purchasing process because of due diligence, as the properties came with the easements that ran alongside the land. He indicated that such easements would be within the property and noted that he was uncertain about the underlying story. He stated that he did not know how many years people had been using the easements and asked Ms. Oakley whether the easements were legal.

Ms. Oakley affirmed that the easements the appellants sought to have abandoned by the County were legally established easements at that point in time. Commissioner Clark noted that the situation seemed to indicate that somebody was hoping the federal government might create another easement to replace those legally established easements. He suspected such action had yet to be taken and asked Ms. Oakley to confirm whether that was the case. Ms. Oakley noted that he was correct.

Vice Chair Herman asked whether the issue had first begun in 2016. Ms. Oakley explained that there was an abandonment request for an adjacent property in 2016, which was independent of the request brought forward by the appellants at the meeting. She noted that the request from 2016 was mentioned within the appellant's earlier presentation. Vice Chair Herman asked whether a decision had to be made on the matter immediately, as if the easement across USFS land could be established and renewed as necessary, then a legal easement would be obtained. She stated that there must have been a reason as to why the matter was coming before the Board at such a delayed date. Ms. Oakley reported that the Washoe County Code (WCC) specified that appeals of that nature had to be heard by the Board within 60 days, and it was very close to the end of that term. She responded to Vice Chair Herman's question regarding making a decision on the matter by reiterating that if there was an easement across the USFS parcel, the appellants could return to seek the full abandonment of the easement through the process she mentioned earlier.

Chair Hill remarked that she initially had the same question as Vice Chair Herman, as she thought the neighbors of the appellant could obtain the necessary SUP, and perhaps the County could apply for that request on their behalf. She indicated that she then thought about whether the County should be applying for private property and driveway easements, as those raised policy questions that she did not believe the Board had yet discussed. She added that the question was instead whether such actions were something

the Commission should be taking. She reiterated that she initially agreed with Vice Chair Herman regarding her belief that action from the Board on the matter was premature, though Chair Hill acknowledged that the Board had an appeal before them that State law required them to evaluate. She asked whether Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large wanted to add any remarks to her previous statement.

CDDA Large noted that, as stated by Ms. Oakley, the WCC and the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) specified that the Board needed to make a decision within 60 days of the appeal. He explained that the applicant brought the matter forward, and what was presented to the Board was a snapshot in time of what was pending regarding whether there was current legal access to the parcels. He noted that, as Ms. Oakley had mentioned, there was no legal access. He advised that the question the Board needed to answer was whether they could make a finding of no detriment based on the current circumstances, not on hypotheticals of what could happen or potential future costs, or what the access roadway would look like. He reiterated that the Board had to decide whether the County should abandon the property and whether there was a current detriment considering the present circumstances.

Chair Hill thanked CDDA Large and stated that his response was very helpful. Vice Chair Herman opined that the matter sounded more like a legal issue than something that should come before the County. Chair Hill asked whether there were additional comments or questions from the BCC, and it was determined that there were none.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Kristyn Young greeted and thanked the Board. She introduced herself and noted that she lived at 6020 Rose Rock Lane with her husband and two small children. She stated that her property bordered the applicant's parcel and backyard. She explained that her family and their neighbors, Mr. Jack Davis and Ms. Nancy Davis, who lived at 6000 Rose Rock Lane, had been put in a very difficult and unfortunate position. She noted that she stood before the Board that day to defend her legal access rights to her property. She stated that she opposed the appeal and fully supported the PC's previous decision of partial abandonment of the easement. She noted that through the USFS process, she had learned that a large portion of Rose Rock Lane, beginning at 5000 Rose Rock Lane, was built through an unsanctioned portion of government lots and was technically an illegal road. She explained that when she and Mr. and Ms. Davis purchased their homes, that fact was unknown to them. She noted that they were being directed to apply for and obtain a USFS SUP to use and maintain their current road. She recounted that she was only provided with a cost-sharing road agreement from 1993 for the western portion of Rose Rock Lane when she purchased her home in 2018. She noted that the USFS had deemed the cost-sharing road agreement invalid, as they were not party to it. She explained that the USFS informed her that her legal access was through the neighboring parcels on Caswell Lane, and that the USFS would not allow any other access points to be established on their parcels. She informed the Board that she was the second owner of the property and, consequently, did not know why the proper easement was not established during the building process. She noted that the two bordering homes on Caswell Lane were built in 1980, with her home and the home of Mr. and Ms. Davis being built

nearly 20 years later in 1997 and 1999. She assumed that the fencing, 52 trees, and landscaping were already well-established in blocking the easements. She opined that the issue was not a matter of the easements likely being unbuildable, as the appellant's attorney had suggested previously. She acknowledged that while obtaining a SUP was possible, it was not a permanent or long-term solution, and due to the uncertainty regarding the future of USFS parcels, there was a high likelihood that those parcels would be sold on account of high property values in the area, which she believed would put them at risk of losing their current access. She explained that she had no rights or control over how a new owner would develop the USFS parcels if sold. She opined that the only possible permanent or long-term solution would be for the County to submit an application for a FRTA easement to make Rose Rock Lane a road operated and maintained by the County. She stated that a SUP was temporary in nature and could be revoked during transfer of ownership, as they did not last forever and were subject to pre-determined term lengths. She reiterated that the SUP was only a permit that did not constitute permanent legal access. She noted that having a driveway through a neighboring parcel was a very common situation throughout similar government lot neighborhoods. She recounted her experience of sharing several examples of photos and maps of other parcel locations with similar access situations as her property during a previous PC meeting. She stated that she was simply seeking to maintain the road easement in place to have legal access to the front of her property, where her home and driveway were located. She noted that she was not creating something that did not already exist, as the easement on Caswell Lane was established long ago for good reason. She asked the County to protect the easement and her rights. She opined that the applicants were attempting to jeopardize the legal access to her property and the property of Mr. and Ms. Davis through ambiguous statements, untruths, and hypothetical situations without any relevance. She stated that the 20-foot road easement needed to be preserved as recommended by the PC. She thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Barrett Young introduced himself as Ms. Young's husband and noted that they owned one of the two homes neighboring the property of the appellant, who sought the full easement abandonment. He explained that he and Ms. Young completely supported the PC's decision to partially approve the easement abandonment to 20 feet. He noted that he wanted his neighbors to have as much space as they needed to develop and grow, but he opined that the PC's decision to reduce the easement from 40 feet to 20 feet was very fair. He acknowledged that his wife had previously mentioned the majority of what he wanted to say, though he emphasized that the SUP was not permanent legal access. He noted that the matter could change should the County choose to establish permanent protected easement access through the use of the FRTA. He offered to file that access request for the County. He reiterated his desire to have permanent and long-term solutions rather than temporary access. He noted that the problem was related to the County and wanted to continue utilizing solutions from the County. He opined that the federal government did not need to be involved in the process, as local solutions could be found with planners in the County who did their jobs well. He expressed his belief that with the expertise and the legal advice offered by the County, there was no reason to force the impacted homeowners to a decision from the federal government, as the County oversaw the issue. He reported that the third page of the PC's proposal on the matter included a section that explained that the PC did not mandate that a road needed to be built. He

suggested that the Board read the PC's proposal if they had not. He noted that he had no intention of trying to dig a road, as he only wanted to know that his property would have permanent legal access. He thanked the Board for their time and consideration of keeping the matter under the jurisdiction of the County.

Mr. Edward Devenyns thanked the Board for hearing the matter. He introduced himself and explained that he had lived at 15900 Caswell Lane for 40 years. He supported the easement abandonment applied for by the appellants, Mr. Nikolai Travis and Ms. Travis, who lived at 15870 Caswell Lane. He expressed his understanding that Mr. and Ms. Young were opposed to the easement abandonment. He noted that the USFS acknowledged the existence of Rose Rock Lane and provided documentation in February of 2025 of the two options available to Washoe County and Mr. and Ms. Young to formalize access to their residence. He explained that the USFS was willing to process either application according to federal regulation, which he stated he knew due to speaking directly to District Ranger Zumstein. He stated that the SUP could be applied for by the private residents of Rose Rock Lane, or the County could make an application under FRTA to make Rose Rock Lane a public road, with the option to establish the requirement that the road be maintained privately. He noted that either option would provide access via Rose Rock Lane for Mr. and Ms. Young and the other users of their residence, as it had for 30 years, without the unnecessary disturbance of an impractical easement through a landscaped yard that only led to a private road, which would not be expanded for additional users. He stated that Washoe County could make Rose Rock Lane a public road under FRTA, which would put an end to the situation. He found it difficult to understand the motivation to pursue an encroachment upon a neighbor's private property to pursue an unused and archaic easement, only to further encroach upon a private road and its residents who had invested decades of time, effort, and money to develop and maintain Caswell Lane. He noted that the property owners of Rose Rock Lane had acquired approved building permits, utilized their access road to their properties for 30 years, formed a maintenance association in 1993, and would only have to formalize their access by acquiring a SUP from the USFS or pursue having Washoe County make Rose Rock Lane a public road. He hoped that the Board would make what he described as the appropriate and reasonable decision to approve the appellant's request and work with the USFS to establish Rose Rock Lane as a public road. He thanked the Board for their time.

Ms. Davis greeted the Board and introduced herself. She explained that she and her husband, Mr. Davis, had lived at 6020 Rose Rock Lane directly east of Mr. and Ms. Young. She noted she owned one of the two properties that would be impacted by the appellant's request for the County to abandon the northern easement. She explained that she had done her due diligence for the 40-foot easements on each side of the property. She acknowledged that those who lived in the area could have a highway going through their properties that was larger than the Mount Rose Highway. She noted that such a fact was something all of the property owners in the area knew when they purchased their property. She emphasized that Caswell Lane was not entirely a private road, though she acknowledged that there was a portion at the end that was. She noted that the issue had not become a concern until the current abandonment request brought the matter forward. She explained that she had spoken to the building department on three occasions and had

learned from them that the public had the legal right to access the appellant's easement. She noted that similarly, anyone could access the easements on her property, which accounted for 40 feet of their land. She explained that while she paid taxes on it, that easement was not her property and could be taken at any time for a road to be placed through that land. She described that fact as something the property owners in the area just had to accept. She noted that it was her understanding that nothing permanent was supposed to be placed on an easement, which included buildings, fences, and trees. She acknowledged that the Board had heard several times that a partial easement abandonment was granted, which she stated she had no problem with. She opined that the reason for the easements was to ensure that properties such as hers were not left without any access. She opined that she was not sure whether other routes would become available or what the USFS plans were for the land in the future, which was why the easement needed to be in place. She emphasized that all she and the other impacted property owners wanted was a legal option to use the easement should the need arise. She noted that they would deal with the road, engineering, and any other issues in the future should they occur. She did not want to get too far ahead of what might happen and noted that the only issue being decided that day was whether the impacted property owners had lawful access. She emphasized that the matter was not one of opinions or preferences. She explained that she was not asking for anything more than what the staff had recommended, and the PC had already approved.

Mr. Nikolai Travis introduced himself and noted that he was Ms. Travis' husband. He thanked the Board for their time and stated that he would only speak briefly to address two concerns that had been spoken about previously. He noted that one concern was voiced by Commissioner Clark. He explained that the USFS had informed Mr. and Ms. Travis that the USFS had been trying to reach out to the County and to their eastern neighbors to attempt to legalize their neighbors' access. He noted that he was uncertain how long those attempts had been occurring, and documentation on that matter had been provided to their eastern neighbors. He acknowledged that the SUP from the USFS was not permanent, though he explained that it lasted for a term of 30 years. He opined that the FRTA easement was a permanent measure that would be best for all involved. He noted that everyone impacted by the issue needed the County's help for the FRTA easement to come to fruition.

Deputy Clerk Evonne Strickland stated that emailed public comments were received and placed on file.

Commissioner Clark referred to a question asked by Mr. Cliff Low during public comment for items heard earlier in the meeting. Commissioner Clark noted that Mr. Low had asked whether the Board would honor the decisions of previous elected officials who served before the current BCC members by keeping the choices of their predecessors in place or if the Board would change things. Commissioner Clark acknowledged that he was not serving on the BCC when the property was subdivided and the plot maps were made, but he noted that somebody had previously decided that the easements in place were appropriate at that time. He noted that it seemed as though the federal government was involved in those choices, though the County had to become responsible for serving as the

arbiters of the situation. He explained that the easements ran alongside the land and were recorded, and if an individual purchased the property, it became theirs. He opined that it did not make sense to change the easements for reasons such as them not accommodating the property owners' interests at that time, as the land and the plot maps would be in place much longer than any person would. He stated that the next person to purchase either the property burdened with the easement or the property served by the easement had a right to how the easements were initially developed. He stated that he would be opposed to abandoning the easement, as it should run alongside the land until the owners of both properties could agree or potentially obtain a permanent SUP from the USFS that ensured the parcels would not be landlocked in the future. He opined that the Board should let the easements remain as they were.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Clark. She noted that she had seen the findings in consideration of the PC's decision to grant the compromise by adjusting the easement to 20 feet and expressed agreement with that choice. Chair Hill indicated that she would make the motion for Agenda Item 22 and moved to deny the appeal, affirm the decision of the PC to partially approve WAB24-0008, Sweet Clover Residential Trust Abandonment, with the denial of the appeal and affirmance of the PC's decision being based on the Board's ability to make the findings required by WCC 110.806.20, *Findings*.

Chair Hill indicated that the Board could reconsider the matter in the future should any potential changes to access be made.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion was duly carried on a 5-0 vote, Chair Hill ordered that the appeal be denied and the decision of the Planning Commission to partially approve WAB24-0008 (Sweet Clover Residential Trust Abandonment) be affirmed. The denial of the appeal and affirmance of the Planning Commission's decision was based upon the Board's ability to make the findings required by Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20, *Findings*.

25-0397 **AGENDA ITEM 23** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 100 (Buildings and Construction), pursuant to NRS 244.105, to update the editions of the specialized or uniform codes adopted by reference. The newer editions for adoption by Washoe County include: the 2024 Northern Nevada Amendments; the 2024 versions of the International Building, Residential, Existing Building, Energy Conservation, Fuel Gas, Mechanical, Wildland-Urban Interface, and Swimming Pool and Spa Codes; the 2024 Uniform Plumbing and Mechanical Codes; the 2023 National Electrical Code; and the 2024 National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 54 and 58 Codes; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1736, Bill No. 1930.

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

On the call for public comment, Mr. Cliff Low shared that he would again speak on behalf of Mr. Thomas Daly, whose opinions Mr. Low noted he respected. Mr. Low described Mr. Daly as very knowledgeable about matters of safety. Mr. Low agreed with but had not researched the sentiment of the comments from Mr. Daly that he was preparing to share with the Board. He referred the Board to Mr. Gary Weichert's earlier comment during Agenda Item 3, which he described as similar to the one Mr. Low proceeded to make for Mr. Daly. He noted that he had taken a quick look at the Staff Report on his phone and did not see mention of any omission. Mr. Low stated that the Board was being asked to adopt new building, fire, and wildland codes via a new ordinance. He noted that for the wildland code, only one chapter dealing with construction requirements for new buildings was proposed for adoption. He explained that in Chapter 6, the defensible space requirements were not proposed for adoption. He stated that adopting the requirements for defensible space in Chapter 6 for all properties was a prudent move, especially in the parts of the County in high or very high wildfire hazard zones. He stated that it was known that defensible space worked, as the Rock Farm, Joy Lake, Davis, and Calahan wildfires had proved. He noted that if defensible space was had, a home would likely survive if wildfire approached. He opined that without defensible space, homes burned to the ground. He said adopting the wildfire code should be on the Board of County Commissioners' (BCCs) next agenda. He requested that the Board either include in the motion for Agenda Item 23, if passed, that the planning department address the rest of the wildland code, particularly Chapter 6, or the Board should request during the last item of the BCC meeting, when Commissioners could make announcements and requests for future agenda items, that the omission of defensible space requirements in the rest of the wildland code be addressed at a meeting in the near future.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1736, Bill No. 1930, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0398 **AGENDA ITEM 24** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Ordinance No. 1000 in order to change the boundaries of District No. 24 (Groundwater Remediation); AND, Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance imposing a fee on the parcels of land in Washoe County, Nevada, District No. 24 (Groundwater Remediation) to pay the costs of developing and carrying out a plan for remediation. The Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District was formed in 1997 to address the tetrachloroethene (PCE) contamination of groundwater in the central Truckee Meadows area. The District is tasked with remediating PCE contamination and annually updates both the Service Area boundary and Contaminant Area boundary based on continuous analysis and modeling efforts. There is no impact to the General Fund. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1737, Bill No. 1928.

County Clerk Jan Galassini reminded the Board that the item included public hearings for the second reading of two ordinances. Chair Hill noted that had been the reason for her confusion. Ms. Galassini clarified that there were two ordinances, with the first already being read. Chair Hill asked if two separate motions were necessary for the ordinances, which Ms. Galassini affirmed. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Galassini for the reminder. Chair Hill asked if the Board needed a staff presentation on the agenda item, and it was determined that no presentation was needed.

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. 1737, Bill No. 1928, amending the boundaries of District No. 24 (Groundwater Remediation), be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

Ms. Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1738, Bill No. 1929.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1738, Bill No. 1929, levying a fee for District No. 24 (Groundwater Remediation), be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0399 **AGENDA ITEM 25** Public Comment.

Mr. Roger Edwards greeted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and introduced himself. He expressed uncertainty about what he would do after the Board made an adjustment to the water recharge program. He reported that he had received a check for \$500. He explained that he had attended BCC meetings to levy complaints regarding the program for nearly eight years. He did not know the individual or the actions they had taken that led to the resolution of the issue but expressed appreciation. He explained that he had paid \$1,800 into the program and received \$500 back, which he indicated was unideal but acceptable. He reiterated that the issue had been resolved just eight weeks before the eight-year anniversary of the problem. He thanked the Board.

Mr. Cliff Low introduced himself and apologized, as he had learned during a break that many, but not all items addressed retroactively at the meeting that day had staff reports that had spoken to the reason for the item's retroactive submittal. He opined that the staff reports were not necessarily very informative and recited the reason for retroactive

submittal listed on the Staff Report for Agenda Item 17 as an example. He explained that the reasoning listed in the Staff Report did not explain why both forensic contracts were not taking place on a timelier basis. He apologized to any Commissioners who made statements relying upon his earlier public comment that suggested no information was available to the public for why the items were retroactive. He reiterated his belief that the staff reports should still be more informative. The main item he wanted to address was the thought he had mentioned much earlier at the meeting regarding items approved and voted on by the current Board's predecessors, which he opined was a matter of conscience and duty for County Commissioners. He clarified that he did not think the Commissioners had a duty to continue to take action on enforcing things they disagreed with, as elections had consequences, people changed, and individuals were voted into office because they had different views. He believed that if the Board members chose to vote against something that was promised by their predecessors or failed to take action on following through on those promises, such things should only happen if the Board members had revisited and read the minutes from that past meeting to decide for themselves what they would have voted for on that particular item if they had been in office at that time. He suggested that while doing so, the Commissioners might, in good conscience, affirm that they had different views from their predecessors and attribute that to why they succeeded. He stated that if the Commissioners failed to do that, they lacked the right to impose things upon their successors. He noted that it would be hypocritical for them to vote on something that would take place after their current term in office, which he pointed out for some BCC members was January of 2027, or the end of the following year, when some offices would be replaced. He urged the Board to act in good conscience by looking at what was previously discussed and taking appropriate action thereafter.

25-0400 **AGENDA ITEM 26** Announcements/Reports.

Chair Hill asked County Manager Eric Brown and the members of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) if they had any additional comments or questions, and it was determined that they had none.

Chair Hill referred to Mr. Cliff Low's earlier public comment, which had mentioned wildfire codes and ensuring community members complied with such codes. She reported that the County's Emergency Manager organized a wildfire working group with help from the Desert Research Institute (DRI). She explained that they would present recommendations for Board consideration in the future. She emphasized that the matter was a priority that the Board took seriously. She thanked Mr. Low for bringing the topic to the Board's attention.

* * * * *

2:07 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